

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.	ADVERTISMENT 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: 2 ROCHESTER ROAD NORTHWOOD

Development: Erection of a single storey extension to rear (Retrospective application)

LBH Ref Nos: 1383/APP/2023/2294

Drawing Nos: Location Plan
 PL02
 PL01

Date Plans received: **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached property located on the northeastern side of Rochester Road. The property is set back from the highway with a low level brick wall with hardstanding to the front providing parking for 2 vehicles. The property features a single storey side extension. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprising similarly designed two storey semi-detached properties.

The application site is not designated within a Conservation Area, nor an Area of Special Local Character. The site does not contain any Listed Buildings. There are no trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order within the site or on adjoining land. The site lies in Flood Zone 1 and is designated within a Critical Drainage Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension, which adjoins a pre-existing single storey rear extension. The extension is constructed and this application is therefore retrospective.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

1383/APP/2006/2808	2 ROCHESTER ROAD NORTHWOOD
ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING	
DEMOLITION OF	
EXISTING OUTBUILDING)	

Decision: 30-11-2006	Approved
-----------------------------	----------

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

Eight neighbouring properties, and Northwood Hills Residents Association were consulted on 09-08-2023.

Northwood Hills Residents Association - No comments received.

Neighbour Objections (3):

1. Do not oppose the erection of the extension, but have an issue with the guttering and impact on flooding.
2. Extension is oversized and dominates view of rear of neighbouring property. Poorly constructed - side and roof is not in keeping with other buildings/extensions in the area and is of poor quality;
3. Does not contribute positively to the overall aesthetic of the neighbourhood - finishing appears hastily put together and aesthetically unpleasant with respect to neighbouring properties.

Officer Comments:

1. The comments in relation to drainage are noted. However, this would be a matter for building control;
- 2/3. The impact of the proposal on character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area will be discussed in further detail below.

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 11 Design of New Development

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and locality the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden, trees and landscaping, flood risk impact and car parking provision.

Character and Appearance:

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 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 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

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 required that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

With regards to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 states that:

- 1) single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth or 3.6 metres where the plot width is 5 metres or more;
- 2) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- 3) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level;
- 4) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet;
- 5) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;
- 6) two storey extensions should not extend into an area provided by a 45-degree line of sight drawn from the centre of the nearest ground or first floor habitable room window of an adjacent property and should not contain windows or other openings that overlook other houses at a distance of less than 21 metres;
- 7) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house;
- 8) pitched roofs on extensions should be of a similar pitch and materials to that of the original roof and subordinate to it in design. Large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported; and
- 9) full width two storey rear extensions are not considered acceptable in designated areas or as extensions to Listed Buildings or Locally Listed Buildings.

The application site benefits from an existing single storey side and rear extension. The rear extension covers the width of the property and features a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.9m. The application proposes a single storey rear conservatory extension which would measure a depth

of 3m, a length of 9m and features a sloping roof measuring a maximum height of 2.9m. The resulting single storey rear extension measures a depth of 6m, a width of 8.9m and features a part flat roof and part sloping roof. Policy DMHD 1 states that single storey rear extensions should not exceed 3.6m in depth. Further, supporting paragraph A1.7 of the Local Plan (2020) states that the addition of conservatories or other extensions to buildings that have already been extended will not be permitted.

It is acknowledged there are a number of properties in the surrounding area that benefit from rear additions. However, the proposed depth of the rear extension of 6m, is not common within the surrounding area. Moreover, the mismatch of materials (and their construction quality which appears incomplete), and the mismatched roof design and junction, exacerbate the harm of the 6m deep extension. The development would represent a poor standard of design to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling, as well as that of the surrounding area.

Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Together the above policies seek to ensure that developments are of a high quality and that extensions appear subservient to the original dwelling and respect the design.

Residential Amenity:

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, amongst other matters, that: ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

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.

No. 4 Rochester Road is located to the north of the property and comprises the adjoining dwelling. The neighbouring property benefits from a single storey rear extension. The proposed rear extension would protrude 2.46m from the rear building line at No. 4. Having regard to the presence of the neighbouring extension, it is unlikely that the proposal would result in overshadowing or a loss of light. There are no windows on the side elevation which would result in overlooking or a loss of privacy.

Nos. 64 Norwich Road is located to the south of the site. The rear boundary of the neighbouring properties abuts the side boundary of the application site and the rear extension. The flank wall of the rear extension would be located approximately 12m from the rear building line at No. 64. Given the separation distance, and the single storey nature of the proposal, it is not considered that the proposal would significantly adversely impact the amenity of No. 64.

The proposed windows on the rear elevation would overlook the private rear garden and would not result in undue overlooking to neighbouring properties.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposal would not cause undue harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

External Amenity Space Provision:

The proposed development would retain sufficient rear garden space. This would be in accordance with the minimum private amenity space standards set out in Table 5.3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). As such, it is considered that the proposal would not undermine the provision of external amenity space for the existing occupiers at the site, in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Parking and Highway Safety:

The site benefits from hardstanding outside the front of the property with enough space for two cars. It is therefore compliant with the recommended parking standards set out in Table 1 of Appendix C, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to significantly exacerbate the pressure for street parking or prejudice highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with the overarching objectives of policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion:

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension by reason of its overall depth and scale, design, materials and appearance, in conjunction with the existing rear extension, would fail to appear subordinate to the original property or respect its architectural composition and appearance, giving rise to a visually harmful, dominant and poorly designed form of development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part One (2020), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

INFORMATIVES

1. 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.

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 Policies:	
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

Contact Officer:	Niamh McMenamin	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	--------------