

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: 28 DAWLEY AVENUE HILLINGDON

Development: Erection of a single storey rear extension, a double storey side and single storey front extension/ front porch

LBH Ref Nos: 14440/APP/2024/428

Drawing Nos: 01
 04
 05
 06
 02
 03

Date Plans received: 19-02-24 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 19-02-24

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is situated in a prominent corner plot on the West side of Dawley Avenue, at the junction with Chester Close. The property is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse paired with no. 30 Dawley Avenue. The property has a hipped roof profile and is of a period build with pebble-dash exterior. To the side is a single storey pitched roof extension, a conservatory across the rear wall and has hardstanding to the front for two car spaces at tandem, and an average sized rear garden with a detached outbuilding at the bottom.

The streetscene is residential in character and appearance, comprising mainly two storey semi-detached dwellings with similar roofscape and varied architectural styles.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension, a double storey side and single storey front extension/ front porch.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

14440/PRC/2019/124

28 DAWLEY AVENUE HILLINGDON

Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and conversion of single dwelling into 1 x 3 bed and 1 x 2 bed dwellings with associated amenity space and parking

Decision: 28-05-2020

Objection

14440/APP/2019/644

28 DAWLEY AVENUE HILLINGDON

Part two storey, part single storey side extension to create semi-detached 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, and single storey rear extension to existing dwelling, involving demolition of existing conservatory and shed and installation of vehicular crossover

Decision: 24-04-2019

Refused

14440/A/84/0350

28 DAWLEY AVENUE HILLINGDON

Alterations to elevation (P)

Decision: 18-06-1984

Approved

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above. It is noted that in 2019 an application for Part two storey, part single storey side extension to create semi-detached 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, and single storey rear extension to existing dwelling, involving demolition of existing conservatory and shed and installation of vehicular crossover was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk, height, depth, width, proximity to the side boundary and projection forward of the return building line along Chester Close, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions and HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposed development fails to provide alternative off street parking provision for the existing property, 28 Dawley Avenue and therefore the development is considered to be deficient in car parking provision with regard to the Council's approved car parking standards, leading to on-street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety and therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

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

5 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 28.2.24. 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 D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm

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 adverse 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 rear extensions Policy DMHD1 requires:

- 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.

With regard to side extensions Policy DMHD1 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 regard to front extensions Policy DMHD1 requires:

- i) alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused;
- ii) porches should be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building; pastiche features will not be supported; and
- iii) notwithstanding the above, at least 25% of the front garden must be retained.

Character and Appearance

As set out in the history the site was subject to an application for extension and conversion which included similar extensions to those proposed here. Whilst the previous application pre-dates the adoption of the Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies and DMHD 1 within, the HDAS which would have been used to determine the previous application included similar policies relating to the design of extensions to restrict impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene. The Local Plan Part Two formalised this in the form of Policy DMHB 11 and DMHD 1. Having reviewed both the previous and current application, the proposal does not address the concerns raised which formed reason for refusal 1.

The proposed side extension fails to comply with the requirements of policy DMHD1. At a width of 4m the side extension would exceed half the width of the original dwelling. Furthermore, the side extension is not set back 1m from the front elevation at both levels and actually extends forward of the existing front building line. The property occupies a prominent corner plot and the extension would leave a gap of just 0.694m to the side boundary at its narrowest point for its full height and would project further beyond the return building line established by the adjacent properties in Chester Close. The proposed extension would therefore detract from the open spacious character of this junction. The set back of the properties in Chester Close and the space to the side at the application dwelling, albeit including a single storey element, gives an element of spaciousness on the street scene alongside this section of the highway. The proposed extension would fill in a significantly large portion of the space to the side of the existing dwelling, and would bring the built form into an uncharacteristically close relationship to the road such that it would become visually intrusive in the street scene.

It is considered that the proposal fails to address the concerns which formed reason for refusal 1 from the previous application. The proposed extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk, height, depth, width, proximity to the side boundary and projection forward of the return building line along Chester Close, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DMHB11; DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

The proposed extension would be largely screened from Number 30 by the host dwelling. The rear extension at a projection of 3.3m is not considered to give rise to an unacceptable loss of light or outlook. The application includes a plan indicating the 45 degree line of site

With regards to No. 1 Chester Close to the rear, due a separation gap of approximately 18 m between the two properties coupled with their orientation the proposal is considered not to appear overbearing, visually intrusive, overshadowing, and result in a loss of outlook and light.

Living Conditions

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

External Amenity Space

In terms of the garden area the development would fulfil the Part 2 Policy DMHD1 appendix A, Part A) vi), which states that for Alterations and extensions to residential dwellings; adequate garden space is retained.

There is sufficient space on site to park 2 cars.

Conclusion

As set out in more detail above, the application fails to address the reasons which resulted in the previous application being refused. As such 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 size, scale, bulk, height, depth, width, proximity to the side

boundary and projection forward of the return building line along Chester Close, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DMHB11; DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two.

INFORMATIVES

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 D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm

Contact Officer:	Nicola Taplin	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	---------------	----------------------	--------------