

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	☐
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	☐
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	☐
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	☐
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	☐
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	☐
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	☐
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	☐
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	☐

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses	☐
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	☐
14.	Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use.	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	☐
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	☐
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	☐
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	☐
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	☐
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	☐
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	☐
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	☐
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	☐
25.	WORKS TO TREES	☐
26.	OTHER (please specify)	☐

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Item No.	Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control		
Address:	7A MANOR ROAD RUISLIP		
Development:	Retrospective application for hip to gable roof extensions on both sides, 3 x rear dormers, small front gable (amendments to previous planning permission)		
LBH Ref Nos:	69063/APP/2023/1490		
Drawing Nos:	01A (Pre-existing Floor plans and Elevations) 02A (Proposed Plans - As approved Floor Plans and Elevations) 3A (Location Plan and Proposed Plans - As Built Floor Plans and Elevations)		
Date Plans received:	Date(s) of Amendments(s):	22-05-23	
		22-05-23	
Date Application valid		22-05-23	

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two storey detached dwelling located to the South of Manor Road. The brick, render and tile dwelling is set back from the road by over 8 metres by an area of hardstanding which allows space to park at least two cars safely within the curtilage of the site. To the rear of the dwelling is a garden area which acts as private amenity space.

The application property was principally built as an infill development on No.7's original plot. It shares side boundaries with Nos. 7 and 9 Manor Road to the East and West respectively. To the rear of the site lies the rear garden of No.21 Church Avenue.

The application site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is seeking planning permission for the conversion of roofspace to habitable use. The proposal would involve the installation of 3 dormers on the rear roof plane and conversion of a hipped roof to gable end to both sides. The front elevation is also showing a new gable end element with a glazing. It should be noted that this is a retrospective application.

The application is a resubmission related to a planning permission allowed on appeal (LPA ref: 69063/APP/2019/912/ Appeal Decision PINS ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232120). The key differences is that this current application involves a larger front gable end with the introduction of glazing and larger rear dormers.

It is noted that the submitted 'as built' elevations show smaller dormers than those built out and

therefore the proposed drawings do not accurately reflect the built out development. Notwithstanding the errors in the elevation drawing, the application being retrospective, has been assessed on the basis of the development that has been carried out. The submission of inaccurate elevations has not affected the LPAs ability to assess the application.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

69063/TRE/2023/87

7A MANOR ROAD RUISLIP

Scots pine (T1) - fell - this very tall tree has moved as can be seen by the fact it is now in contact with the fence and is liable to fall in high winds

Decision: 27-04-2023

No Further Action(P)

69063/APP/2019/912

7A MANOR ROAD RUISLIP

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 rear dormers and conversion of roof from hip to gable end to both sides

Decision: 10-05-2019

Refused

69063/APP/2017/2386

7A MANOR ROAD RUISLIP

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 1 x front and 2 x side rooflights. (Resubmission)

Decision: 07-09-2017

Refused

69063/APP/2017/393

7A MANOR ROAD RUISLIP

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a 3 rear dormers, 2 front rooflights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end to both sides

Decision: 29-03-2017

Refused

69063/APP/2013/564

7A MANOR ROAD RUISLIP

Single storey rear extension (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision: 26-04-2013

Approved

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 19th July 2023

3. Comments on Public Consultations

5 neighbours, Ruislip Residents Association and Ruislip Village Conservation Panel were consulted by letter dated 30-05-23. A site notice was displayed on 14-06-23 and a press notice was published on 28-06-23. No comments were received.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the street scene and appearance and character of the conservation area and the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that: Development proposals should: D1) enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) states that: C) Development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states: A) The Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment.

Development that has an effect on heritage assets will only be supported where: i) it sustains and enhances the significance of the heritage asset and puts them into viable uses consistent with their conservation; ii) it will not lead to a loss of significance or harm to an asset, unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide public benefit that would outweigh the harm or loss, in accordance with the NPPF; iii) it makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area; iv) any extensions or alterations are designed in sympathy, without detracting from or competing with the heritage asset; v) the proposal would relate appropriately in terms of siting, style, scale, massing, height, design and materials; vi) buildings and structures within the curtilage of a heritage asset, or in close proximity to it, do not compromise its setting; and vii) opportunities are taken to conserve or enhance the setting, so that the significance of the asset can be appreciated more readily.

Policy DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that New development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, within a Conservation Area or on its fringes, will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design.

Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also requires that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

With regard to roof extensions, Policy DMHD 1 states:

- i) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line;
- ii) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;
- iii) raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported;
- iv) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling.

The current application is a resubmission to planning application ref: 69063/APP/2019/912 which was refused by the Council and allowed on appeal under Appeal Decision PINS ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232120. It is noted that works are substantially completed however the scheme has not been built out in accordance with the approved plans of the appeal proposal.

The allowed scheme involved the addition of three rear dormers that would be evenly spaced across the rear roof plane and would replicate the rear window design of the first floor of the existing property, which the inspector found that, as a result of the size of the property and the alterations to the roof style, the proposed dormers would sit comfortably within the roof and would not appear over dominant nor give the dwelling a top-heavy appearance. (Paragraph 8, Appeal Decision APP/R5510/D/19/3232120).

The allowed scheme provided three dormers of the same design and style. The approved plans showed the 3no dormers with a width of 2.3 metres, a height of 1.8 metres and a depth of 1.8 metres. They would be characterised by a flat roof and would be set in a minimum of 0.7 metres from the roof edges, 0.5 metres from the ridge and 1 metre from the eaves. Gable ends would be installed to both sides of the dwelling house extending the ridge from a width of 4.75 metres to 10.75 metres.

The hip to gable end conversion is the same as the allowed scheme and in this regard, this part of the scheme is considered to be acceptable. As previously presented, the alterations to the roof would obscure visibility of the chimneys, however this in itself, would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling.

The gable on the front elevation is larger in size, compared to the allowed scheme. It has moved higher up within the roof slope and away from the eaves. The approved timber detailing has also been replaced with new glazing. The overall visual effect of the changes to the gable is negative as it detracts from the traditional appearance of the dwelling and competes with the original forward gable end, whereas the allowed scheme harmonised far better with the existing building. The gable as presented represents visual clutter and unbalances the dwelling's appearance.

It is noted that the submitted 'as built' elevations show smaller dormers than those built out and therefore the proposed drawings do not accurately reflect the built out development. Notwithstanding the errors in the elevation drawing, the application being retrospective, has been assessed on the basis of the development that has been carried out. The submission of inaccurate elevations has not affected the LPAs ability to assess the application.

The rear dormers, as built, are bulky and insubordinate additions that are out of character with the form and proportions of the host building and create a top heavy appearance and dominate the rear elevation resulting in insubordinate and incongruous additions. The negative visual effect is further compounded by the excessive size of the dormers and its windows which are significantly larger than any of the first floor windows in the rear elevation. Whilst the constructed dormers are not visible from the street scene, they nevertheless are visible from neighbouring dwellings and gardens. In any event, the statutory of duty set by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is not confined solely to development apparent in the public realm.

Due to the overall excessive scale, size and design of the unauthorised roof dormers, together with the siting, size and design of the front gable, the resultant development does not integrate sensitively with the host dwelling, thereby harming its character and appearance. It is therefore considered the development proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building which lies within the Ruislip village conservation area.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states - 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'. In this instance, as the development proposal relates to the extending of a private dwellinghouse, there are no public benefits to outweigh the harm identified.

For the above reasons, the development proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local plan - Part Two (2020), Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2021).

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY:

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states: D7) that development proposals should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. The supporting text for this policy states that the Council will expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that: i) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and ii) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

In determining the appeal scheme, the inspector determined that sufficient space between the buildings would be retained to ensure that the change in outlook, sense of enclosure and light levels and overshadowing would not be to a harmful degree in both instances.

As discussed in the previous section, the windows and pair of doors installed in the dormers are taller than shown in the 'as built' plans. The submitted elevations shows a Juliet balcony screen in front of the central pair of doors. The screen had not been installed at the time of the site visit.

Notwithstanding the visual impact of the increased sized dormer windows, the outlook from these said windows are limited to oblique views of the neighbouring gardens. The as-built dormers is not considered to have resulted in a significant worsening with regards to overlooking and loss of privacy relative to the allowed scheme.

Therefore, on balance, the scheme is considered not to harm neighbouring residential amenity. However, this does not outweigh the harm identified above in respect to the impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding Conservation Area.

CONCLUSION:

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Character and appearance

The constructed rear dormers, by reason of their excessive size, scale and bulk, coupled with their unsympathetic design, appear as insubordinate and incongruous forms of development which significantly detracts from the original form of the host property and fails to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework

(2021).

2. NON2 Character and appearance

The constructed front gable feature, by reason of its excessive size, scale and bulk, coupled with its siting and design (including its uncharacteristic glazing), appears visually intrusive and significantly detracts from the architectural composition of the host property, and causes harm to the street scene and setting of Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

INFORMATIVES

1. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
2. On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2021). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.
3. In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

The development is retrospective and we have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

Part 1 Polices

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
---------	--------------------------

Part 2 Polices:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts

DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Christos Chrysanthou **Telephone No:** 01895 250230