

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: 15 ROKER PARK AVENUE ICKENHAM

Development: Erection of a first floor extension to side.

LBH Ref Nos: 41735/APP/2023/3496

Drawing Nos: 2373-PL-L&B
 2373-PL-001
 2373-PL-002
 2373-PL-101
 2373-PL-102

Date Plans received: 02-12-23

Date(s) of Amendments(s):

Date Application valid 02-12-23

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located on the western side of Roker Park Avenue. The site features an integral garage and a part recessed front wall at first floor level. The surrounding street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising similarly designed houses.

The site is not located in a Conservation Area and there are no heritage assets nearby.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor extension to the side.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

41735/APP/2023/140 15 ROKER PARK AVENUE ICKENHAM

Erection of a first floor side extension

Decision: 08-03-2023 Refused

41735/APP/2022/2764 15 ROKER PARK AVENUE ICKENHAM

Conversion of garage to habitable use, erection of a single storey rear infill extension and a first floor side extensions.

Decision: 28-11-2022 Approved

41735/APP/2007/2818

15 ROKER PARK AVENUE ICKENHAM

DETAILS OF SITE SURVEY - CONDITION 2, TREE PROTECTION MEASURES -
CONDITION 4, AND GROUND/FLOOR LEVELS - CONDITION 7, IN COMPLIANCE WITH
PLANNING PERMISSION 41735/APP/2006/3225, DATED 31-01-2007. (DEMOLITION AND
RE-CONSTRUCTION OF A THREE-BEDROOM DWELLINGHOUSE)

Decision: 02-10-2007

Approved

41735/APP/2006/3225

15 ROKER PARK AVENUE ICKENHAM

DEMOLITION AND RE-CONSTRUCTION OF A THREE-BEDROOM DWELLINGHOUSE

Decision: 31-01-2007

Approved

Comment on Planning History

41735/APP/2023/140 - Erection of a first floor side extension. Refused 08-03-2023. Appeal
Dismissed 06-09-2023.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed first floor side extension, by virtue of its size, scale, design and lack of a setback from the established front building line would result in an visually intrusive and visually incongruous addition that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and the symmetry of existing development along Roker Park Avenue to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Officer Comments: This current scheme seeks to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. The main alteration is the first floor side extension is now proposed to be set back 1m as opposed 0.5m previously proposed. However, it is concluded that the revised scheme fails to go far enough to overcome the previous concerns raised in the Officer Report and the Appeal Decision.

The following applications relate to recent planning applications within the immediate street scene which are relevant to the application:

33113/APP/2021/3245 19 Roker Park Avenue - First floor side extension. - Refused 19-10-21

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed first floor side extension, by virtue of its size, scale and design including the lack of a set backs from the established front building line and the boundary with No.17 Roker Park Avenue would result in an excessive, visually intrusive, disproportionate, incongruous and overbearing addition that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and the symmetry of existing development along Roker Park Avenue to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

2. The proposed first floor side extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, design, proximity to the boundary and having particular regard to the stepped nature of the properties where the application site sits forward of No.17 Roker Park Avenue, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjacent

occupiers at No.17 Roker Park Avenue, by reason of overdominance, loss of outlook, sense of enclosure, visual intrusion, loss of daylight/sunlight and overbearing impact. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Officer Notes: It is noted that the first floor side extension refused was set flush with the first floor building line.

33113/APP/2021/4118- 19 Roker Park Avenue -Conversion of garage to habitable use and erection of a single storey side extension and first floor side extension - Approved 11-02-22

Officer Notes: It is noted that the first floor side extension was amended during the course of the planning application to set the first floor extension back 3.6m from the front building line, as existing.

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

19 neighbouring properties and Ickenham Residents Association were consulted on 13-12-2023. No comments were received by the end of the consultation process.

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

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

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 and car parking provision.

Character and Appearance:

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 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. 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 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that alterations and extension of dwellings should not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

With regard to side extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

- i) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property;
- ii) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded;
- iii) garages should reflect the size guidelines set out in Appendix C Parking standards;
- iv) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary or in the case of properties in the Copse Wood and Gatehill Estates, at least 1.5 metres, but more if on a wider than average plot, in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses;
- v) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation;
- vi) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported; and
- vii) in Conservation Areas, single storey side extensions may be required to be set back.

The application site and the surrounding properties are similar in their design in terms of their form, proportion and appearance. The two storey dwellings on Roker Park Avenue have a unique design with the first floor elements staggered and the scale of the first floor elements are reduced adjacent to the adjoining properties. It is acknowledged that almost every property in this cul-de-sac is designed this way with staggered first floors and almost all have retained this feature. It is considered that the existing layout of the properties allows the properties to be broken down in massing whilst ensuring positive break up/views between the properties, giving them their detached presence as well as a pleasing continuity in design and form.

The application proposes a first floor side extension which would essentially infill the first floor gap towards the front, the proposal would measure a depth of 2.6m, a length of 3.3m and follows a similar ridge line as the host dwelling. In comparison with the previously refused scheme, the proposal is now set back 1m from the first floor line as opposed to the 0.5m set back proposed under planning application reference: 41735/APP/2023/140. In assessing the scheme at Appeal, the Inspector stated that although the extension would have the same ridgeline as the host, the original building's staggered form, which is so typical of Roker Park Avenue, would be much diminished. In the streetscene, the resultant building would thus be markedly at odds with the prevailing style of houses in the road.

Despite the increase in the proposed set back from the first floor building line, it remains considered that the proposed first floor extension, and markedly the loss in the characteristic set back would fail

to harmonise with the original architectural composition of the host dwelling and the surrounding properties, and would result in a visually incongruous addition that would affect the symmetry of the development along Roker Park Avenue.

It is highlighted that the application site benefits from a recent planning permission for a first floor side extension which is located to the rear of the dwelling, and importantly has retained this important gap to the front (41735/APP/2022/2764). In a similar manner, the Planning History at 19 Roker Park Avenue is important; where planning permission was refused for a first floor side extension which was set flush with the front building line. It was concluded in the Officer Report that the proposed first floor addition would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development.

It is also noted that No. 8 Roker Park Avenue benefits from a first floor side extension (24573/APP/2016/3850) which was approved in 2017 and which is marginally set back from the first floor side extension. The Inspector did review this at the recent appeal, stating that the development was approved before the adoption of HLPP2, at a time when, according to the officer report, there was no policy requirement for extensions to be set back from the front wall of detached houses. Thus, whilst Councils should strive to issue consistent decisions, there has been a material change in circumstances since that one was made. That development, which appears to be unique in the road, and whose form is at odds with the other properties in it, does not provide cogent justification for the scheme before me.

Taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the proposed development does not go far enough to mitigate the harm identified in the Officer Report and the Appeal Decision. Despite the use of matching materials, due to its form, style and siting, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would thereby conflict with policies DMHB 11 and DHMB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One: Strategic Policies (2012).

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. 13 and No. 17 Roker Park Avenue are the principal properties that need to be considered in terms of residential amenity.

No. 13 is located to the south of the site and comprises a two-storey detached dwelling. It is considered that a sufficient separation gap will remain between the first-floor side extension and the property at No.13 to protect the neighbouring property in terms of overshadowing or loss of light. It is noted that there is one window serving the landing on the western elevation of No. 13, it is not considered that this window would be adversely affected by the proposal. The proposed plans demonstrate that the proposal would not breach the 45 degree line taken from the first floor window along the front elevation of the application site.

No. 17 is located to the north of the site and comprises a two-storey detached dwelling. The

proposed first floor side extension is situated on the western elevation, and it is not considered that the neighbouring property would be adversely impacted by the proposal.

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).

Conclusion:

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Harm to the character of the area

The proposed first floor side extension, by virtue of its size, scale, design and lack of a sufficient setback from the established front building line would result in an visually intrusive and visually incongruous addition that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and the symmetry of existing development along Roker Park Avenue to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

INFORMATIVES

1. 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.

Standard 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. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance..

Part 1 Polices

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Polices:

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

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

Contact Officer:

Niamh McMenamin

Telephone No:

01895 250230