

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: 1 HATCH LANE HARMONDSWORTH

Development: Erection of a double storey extension to the side, conservatory and single storey extension to the rear following the demolition of existing side garages.

LBH Ref Nos: 69207/APP/2024/271

Drawing Nos: 1 / P / 2022 - 01
 1 / P / 2022 - 09
 1 / P / 2022 - 08
 1 / P / 2022 - 09
 1 / P / 2022 - 08
 1 / P / 2022 - 03
 1 / P / 2022 - 02
 1 / P / 2022 - 06
 1 / P / 2022 - 07

Date Plans received: 02-02-24 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 02-02-24

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling located on the east side of Hatch Lane, Harmondsworth. The property benefits from a large single storey rear extension and garages at the rear. To the front of the site is a large area of hardstanding and to the rear is an enclosed garden which acts as private amenity space.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a double storey extension to the side along with a conservatory and single storey extension to the rear following the demolition of existing side garages.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

69207/PRC/2020/2

1 HATCH LANE HARMONDSWORTH

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two storey, 23 bed hotel

Decision: 10-03-2020

Objection

Extension to front dormer, extension to side dormer, infill porch to front and render to elevations
(Retrospective Application)

Decision: 09-10-2013

Approved

Comment on Planning History

The planning history for the site 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

12 neighbouring properties and the Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association were consulted by letter dated 07.02.24. There was no local response.

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

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

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.

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 regard to side extensions, Policy DMHD 1 requires:

- 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.

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

- i) 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;
- ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- iii) 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;
- iv) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet;
- v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;
- vi) 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;
- vii) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house;
- viii) 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
- ix) full width two storey rear extensions are not considered acceptable in designated areas or as extensions to Listed Buildings or Locally Listed Buildings.

The proposed development involves a double storey side extension and a single storey rear extension along with a conservatory. The side extension would not measure more half the width of the existing dwelling making it policy compliant in that regard, however it would not be set back from the front elevation by 1m, not set in from the side boundary by 1m and not set down from the main ridgeline which overall fails to comply with Policy DMHD 1. The side extension would as a result of

its position on the property result in a prominent addition which would, because of its lack of set backs and set downs from the ridgeline and proximity to the boundary wall appear as an insubordinate addition which does not reflect the character or appearance of the host dwelling. It would result in a poorly designed addition which would not improve the character and quality of the dwelling making it appear as a dominant addition and cramped due the lack of subordinate features which Policy DMHD1 requires to maintain.

The proposed rear extension would be single storey in nature, the extension would measure 6m in width and 7.6m in depth. Whilst large it does match the depth of the current rear extension, inbetween these two extensions is the proposed conservatory addition which will infill this area.

The rear extension would as a result of its position on the property result in a prominent addition which would, because of its large forward projection depth and flat roof design appear as an incongruous insubordinate addition which not reflect the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the area in general. It would result in a poorly designed addition which would not improve the character and quality of the area. The proposed conservatory would result in the infilling of a substantial part of the space between the current and proposed rear extensions resulting in a combined rear addition to the dwelling which is unacceptable and would form a disproportionate, overly dominant addition.

The overall proposed development would, by virtue of its excessive scale and bulk, and its breach of the return building line, represent an over-development of the site to the detriment of the character and the visual amenities of the surrounding area, and leading to insubordinate additions to the host dwelling. Concerns are also raised in terms of the design of the roof which introduces a large expanse of flat roofed elements to the rear which would be very prominent from the rear view of the neighbours to the south and which is uncharacteristic of the development in the area in terms of its scale.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020).

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.

Flats 1-12 Littlefield Court on Zealand Avenue are considered to be the only neighbours at possible risk in terms of a loss of residential amenity when assessing this proposal.

In view of the separation and the positioning of the proposed development, the proposed extension to the side and rear is not considered to give rise to an undue loss of amenity to the occupants of Littlefield Court.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would not adversely effect the amenities of

neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Light and outlook for occupiers of the resulting dwelling:

It is considered that all of the resulting habitable rooms, and those altered by extension, maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

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 parking provision would remain unaffected by the proposal, in accordance with 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

Due to the excessive massing, size, bulk, depths and design of the extensions, the proposal would form a disproportionate and overly dominant collections of additions to the host dwelling which would fail to respect its original size or architectural composition, subsequently causing harm to its character and appearance. Furthermore due to the design and prominent open plot location, the resulting property would appear unduly prominent and overdeveloped when viewed from the flats at Littlefield Court and from the main road, causing significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 4, DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

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. This is a

resubmission of a previously refused scheme, where the Inspectors Report identified issues to be addressed, which were reflected in the reasons for refusal, allowing the opportunity to address those issues within this submission.

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 Policies

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Daniel Ambrose **Telephone No:** 01895 250230