

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 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 Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval | ☐ |
| 25. WORKS TO TREES | ☐ |
| 26. OTHER (please specify) | ☐ |

The delegation powers schedule has been checked. Director of Residents Services can determine this application.

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informatives 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 DATES SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS TO THE ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces**

Address 44 RESERVOIR ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Two storey side extension

LBH Ref Nos: **11644/APP/2014/3329**

Drawing Nos: MD/1076-01/FP
MD/1076-05/FP Rev. A
MD/1076-04/FP Rev. A
MD/1076-02/FP Rev. A
MD/1076-03/FP Rev. A

Date Plans Received: 17/09/2014

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 19/09/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey detached property in the south east side of Reservoir Road. The property is constructed OF brick beneath a tile roof and has a small front garden area and modest sized rear garden. The roofspace of the property is currently being converted. The property is set down below pavement level. The property appears to have originally had a garage to the side, now removed and a parking space in front.

To the east is Ruislip Lido. The wider area has a range of properties of varying styles and designs.

The site is located within the developed area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning consent for the erection of a two storey side extension (resubmission of a previous refusal) to provide a family room, lounge extension and an additional bedroom.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

11644/APP/2014/2129 44 Reservoir Road Ruislip

Two storey side extension

Decision Date: 12-08-2014 Refused

Comment on Planning History

11644/APP/2014/2129 - Two storey side extension (refused).

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

The following neighbours were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 14 October 2014 as follows: -

- 42a Reservoir Road
- 25 Reservoir Road
- 27 Reservoir Road

One response was received from adjoining neighbours, objection to the proposal of the following grounds:

1. The amended plans actually bring about a further reduction in available amenity space from the earlier application as further land has been lost to car parking. Car parking space should not be doubled counted as amenity space.

2. Reservoir Road is a busy bus route with heavy traffic to Ruislip Lido particularly in the summer. Car parking is permitted on the opposite side of the road to number 44. This limits significantly the useable width of the carriageway. Additional cars reversing onto or off the car parking spaces at No 44 will create additional safety risks.

3. The off-street parking at No 44 is unlikely to be adequate for the development and the extension will add to the already significant problems of the very limited on-street parking.

4. The extension, even as modified, will lead to an adverse impact in the street scene with a combination of cars, the extension itself and loss of open space.

In addition my original reasons for objecting to the extension remain.

5. The proposed extension would seriously reduce the light through my east facing kitchen door.

6. The extension would reduce the distance between my house and the living area of No 44. The extension and the already commenced loft extension (which appears to be 2 feet higher than that allowed without planning permission) will dwarf my property and box in my back garden.

7. It would devalue my property.

8. Given my experience of the loft conversion building work already undertaken, I have no confidence that proper building safety precautions will be observed in any new building work.

9. My wife now requires dialysis. Her condition and recent injury to her right arm has made her housebound. She would be faced with months of building work and the stress would be unbearable.

10. The extension would have a detrimental impact on the house martins that nest on the gable end of my property.

Ruislip Residents Association - No response

Thames Water Utilities - No objection with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

Standard Informatives

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration relate to the effect of the application proposal on the character and appearance of the original house, visual amenities of the surrounding area and on the residential amenity of the proposed and adjoining occupiers, parking issues related to the extra bedroom and the remaining private amenity space.

The previous proposed side extension ran the full length of the current side elevation of the property and was considered acceptable in design terms. This proposal is slightly different in that it set back 0.55m from the front elevation and is 0.2m lower at ridge height. HDAS: Residential Extensions para 5.10 requires side extensions to be less than two thirds the width of the original house, the current proposal meets this requirement. The proposed extension would be set in approximately 0.8m from the boundary with No.42A. The pitch of the roof is considered acceptable.

Therefore, the proposed extensions are not considered to detract from the visual amenities of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and therefore would be in compliance with policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 and policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Saved Policies (November 2012) and HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The proposed two storey side extension would not have any side windows and it is considered that it would not harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property in terms of increased overshadowing, visual intrusion and/or over-dominance. The outlook to the rear of the property albeit closer to No. 42 would be not be significantly more harmful than the existing outlook form the first floor windows of the

property. It is not considered that the impact upon the neighbouring kitchen door would be sufficient to warrant a refusal of permission. The proposed extensions is sited 4.8m from the neighbouring property. To the north there is the Lido and there will be no impact on residential amenity.

As such, the application proposal would not represent an unneighbourly form of development and in this regard, would be in compliance with policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and section 3.0 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions as well as the London Plan (2011) Policy 7.4.

There would be a requirement for a 4 bed house to have at least 2 off street spaces. Whilst the floor plan indicates that the parking would comply with the size requirements, the block plan shows the provision of 2 parking spaces with a combined width of 4.7m and a length of 4.5m from the back of the pavement to the front of the side extension, this is an increase due to the inset of the front of the extension. However the minimum dimensions for a standard car parking bay should be 2.4m x 4.8m, therefore the proposal fails to provide adequate car parking space. Reservoir Road is a busy road and at the time of the site visit there was no available on street parking and the site is on a bus route. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal fails to provide an adequate level of off street parking. Also the proposal would involve the increase in the width of the crossover in order that the two parking spaces can be adequately accessed. This would result in a crossover of an excessive width, particularly when combined with the existing double width crossover, and would also result in damage to or loss of the existing street tree, which would be unacceptable in visual amenity terms. It is considered that the proposed development is likely to lead to the need for on street parking, would result in a crossover of excessive width and would also result in loss of or damage to an existing mature street tree, which would not be in the interests of highway safety and the visual amenity of the street scene and therefore does not comply with policies AM14 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposed development would provide approximately 88sq.m of amenity space for the enlarged property. Paragraph 5.13 of the HDAS guidance requires at least 100 sq. m of private usable garden space for a 4 bedroom house. Therefore, it is considered that the current proposal which would create at least a four bed and possibly a five bed house, given the loft conversion, not shown on the plans, fails to provide an adequate private amenity space and would therefore be harmful to the residential amenity of the occupiers of the property. As such the proposed development does not comply with HDAS: Residential Extensions and policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Therefore, the application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal results in the removal of existing/potential parking provision and fails to provide adequate replacement off street parking. The proposal is, thus, likely to result in additional on-street parking, in an area where such parking is at a premium, to the detriment of highway safety contrary to Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would result in the provision of an excessively wide crossover, when combined with the existing crossovers, to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety 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.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would result in damage to or possible removal of an existing mature street tree to the detriment of the visual amenity of the street scene and the wider area, contrary to Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the extended property. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation for current and future residents contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

1 On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies. On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development (which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

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 Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (July 2011) and national

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14 New development and car parking standards.

guidance.

BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

Telephone No: 01895 250230