

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 140 HIGH STREET HARLINGTON

Development: Single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as a garage/store/gym involving demolition of existing outbuilding

LBH Ref Nos: **61722/APP/2015/1806**

Drawing Nos: Design and Access Statement
01A

Date Plans Received: 18/05/2015 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 19/05/2015

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

This application relates to a two storey semi-detached property located on a corner plot on the west side of High Street, Harlington. The application site is highly visible from a number of positions, with the southern facing side elevation of the application site fronting Victoria Lane. The property has previously been extended by way of a two storey side extension. The area to the front of the property is covered by hard standing providing room for two vehicles to be parked within the curtilage of the application site.

The property is adjacent to the White Hart PH which is a Grade II listed building.

The property has a substantially sized garden located to the rear, measuring 170sqm. The surrounding area is residential in character, with a high level of consistency in the scale and design of surrounding properties. The application property is located within a 'Developed Area' as identified within the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012). The property is also located within the Harlington Village Conservation Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as a garage/store/gym involving demolition of existing outbuilding.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

61722/APP/2006/1029 140 High Street Harlington

ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION); USE OF EXISTING & NEW ROOFSpace AS HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION WITH INSTALLATION OF REAR DORMER WINDOW & FRONT ROOFLIGHTS AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY DETACHED GARAGE/STORE AT BOTTOM OF REAR GARDEN.

Decision Date: 14-06-2006 Refused

Comment on Planning History

A garage was included under application 61722/APP/2006/1029, with the following points made;

- No objection in principle to a detached garage but the proposed is too large.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 1st July 2015

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

The occupiers of the following neighbouring properties were consulted on the application by a letter dated the 21st of May 2015;

- 1 Victoria Lane;
- Victoria Lane; and
- 5 Victoria Lane.

By the close of the consultation period on the 11th of June, three objections were received with the following comments made:

- The application property is already heavily overdeveloped;
- Proposal is likely to become a 'bed in a shed' proposal;
- Concerns over the proposed floor space- similar scale to surrounding properties;
- Proposal will be used as living accommodation;
- Consideration should be given to the fact that the proposal is within a designated Conservation Area;
- Concerns that the proposed outbuilding will be used as a garage, as front driveway has been converted to hardstanding to park cars;
- Suspicious as to why a garage needs cavity walls; and
- Likely to be used as additional accommodation.

Harlington Conservation Area Advisory Panel objected to the proposal on the 10th of June 2015, with the following comments made:

- We consider the size of the proposed outbuilding (c.54sqm) is inappropriate on this site, and that its scale and appearance would be over-dominant and visually intrusive rather than that of an ancillary structure;
- We also consider it capable of independent occupation from the main dwelling and thus tantamount to a separate dwelling in a position where such a dwelling would not be accepted; and
- As so much of the original rear garden has already been built on and the house has also been extended into the roof-space, we wonder if sufficient amenity area would remain. For all these reasons we hope planning permission will not be granted.

Internal

Conservation and Urban Design Officer

BACKGROUND: This is a two storey, semi detached 1930s house which has been extended and altered in the past. It is located on a prominent corner within the Harlington Village Conservation Area opposite the grade II listed White Hart Public House. Its corner location means that the property's rear, side and front aspects are highly visible from the street. Therefore any alterations or additions would need to be sensitively designed.

COMMENTS: The proposed outbuilding would be considered in principle unacceptable. It would be an overly large building that would be highly visible from Victoria Lane. The exact positioning of the garage/outbuilding is unclear in relation to the site. Nevertheless any outbuilding would need to be 500mm away from all boundary edges. Therefore this should be appropriately revised.

It is recommended that the proposed building is significantly reduced in size. This will ensure it remain subservient to the existing house and in keeping with the character of the surrounding conservation area.

CONCLUSION: Unacceptable

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

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.

BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.

BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.

BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas

HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The primary issues for consideration in the determination of this application relates to the impact of the proposal upon the visual and residential amenity of the application property and the residential amenity of occupants of the neighbouring properties.

As the property is located within the Harlington Village Conservation Area, a high level of sensitive design is required ensuring the proposal preserves or enhances the special architectural quality of the area, in accordance with Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

Section 9.0 of the HDAS Residential Extension Guidance outlines the key considerations for determination in the assessment of a detached outbuilding, such as the proposed garage.

In order to prevent the outbuilding from overshadowing adjoining houses, it should be situated as far away from the house as possible, as stated under paragraph 9.1 of the HDAS Residential Extension guidance. The application has adhered to this requirement,

however, has failed to maintain an adequate separation distance of 0.5m from the side boundaries as required.

Paragraph 9.3 of the HDAS Residential Extension Guidance recognises that bulk, height, proportion, floorspace, building materials and details of windows and doors are the design criteria which should be considered. The application proposes to be constructed from materials which match the host property, which is particularly important given the application site is located within a conservation area.

The application proposes a height of 3.6m, which conforms to the maximum permissible heights for a detached garage, but which in this case makes the building highly visible given its visually prominent location. The proposed floor space is also considered excessively large for an outbuilding to be used as a garage/store. The proposed floorspace also exceeds the minimum floor space required for a 1 bedroom flat, (50sqm) as designated within the London Plan (2015).

As such, the proposed single storey detached outbuilding is regarded as being capable of independent occupation from the main dwelling and is therefore tantamount to a separate dwelling in a position where such a dwelling would not be accepted. As such, the proposal is viewed as being contrary to Policies BE19, BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

Within the determination of the application, consideration must also be given to the impact of the proposal upon the residential amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties. Plans indicate that windows are only proposed on the front elevation of the garage, which fronts the garden of the host property. As a result, the level of privacy enjoyed by occupiers of neighbouring properties remains protected as a result of the proposed development.

The Garden Space Standards contained within the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) requires that sufficient private amenity space is retained as a consequence of an extension. Plans indicate that over 100sqm of private amenity space is would be retained, which therefore satisfies both the Garden Standards and Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

Considering the above, the proposed single storey detached outbuilding is considered to have an unacceptable visual impact upon the visual amenity of the application property which is situated within a visually prominent location within the surrounding street scene. By virtue of the excessive floorspace of the proposed outbuilding, it is also tantamount to a separate dwelling in a position where an additional dwelling would not be acceptable.

Critically, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the special architectural quality of the Harlington Village Conservation Area. As such, the proposal is viewed as failing to comply with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies BE4, BE13, BE19 and BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed outbuilding, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, size,

scale, bulk, height and design, would fail to preserve or enhance the special architectural quality of the Harlington Village Conservation Area and would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider Harlington Village Conservation Area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 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 proposed outbuilding by virtue of its size, scale, layout and the existence of an independent access, would be tantamount to the creation of a self contained separate dwelling, where such a dwelling would not be acceptable due to its impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider locality, the need for additional parking and amenity space and issues relating to impact on the existing and adjoining dwellings. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies AM14, BE13, BE15, BE19, BE20, BE21, BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's 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 (2015). 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.

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 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
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

guidance.

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.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: Karen Mckernan

Telephone No: 01895 250230