

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	16 BLACKLANDS DRIVE HAYES	
Development:	First floor side extension, conversion of existing garage to habitable room, single storey rear extension and detached garage involving demolition of existing rear extension	
LBH Ref Nos:	9067/APP/2016/1141	
Drawing Nos:	Location Plan (1:1250) CD-BAI-2015-001 CD-BAI-2015-002(B) CD-BAI-2015-003(B) CD-BAI-2015-004(B) CD-BAI-2015-005(B) CD-BAI-2015-006	
Date Plans Received:	21/03/2016	Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid:	05/04/2016	

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling (two bedroom) on the northern side of Blacklands Drive and on the eastern corner of its intersection with Meadow View Road.

The application dwelling has a main hipped roof, front bay features, front porch and a flat roof attached garage to its western side. The dwelling has a 3m deep flat roof single storey rear extension that lines up with a rear extension at the attached dwelling to the east, No. 14 Blacklands Drive. The front garden is partly hardsurfaced to form a driveway in front of the garage. The rear garden consists of a timber shed at the bottom and a mixture of shrubbery and non-protected small trees. There is a dropped kerb across the Meadow View Road highway boundary for vehicle access to the rear garden.

The streetscene is residential in character and appearance, and mainly comprises semi-detached dwellings with similar architectural compositions. The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This application follows on as a revision from the grant of permission (reference 9067/APP/2015/2863 on 10/11/2015) for a first floor side extension, conversion of the attached garage to habitable room with new pitch roof over and single storey rear extension involving demolition of the existing single storey rear extension.

This application proposes a revised scheme, which also incorporates the removal of the timber shed and erection of a detached 5.5m wide, 4m deep and 2.5m high flat-roof garage at the bottom of the rear garden, which would be accessed by the existing dropped kerb off Meadow View Road. With this application, the proposed first floor side extension would line up with the front wall of the dwelling and have a hipped roof that is

equal to the ridgeline height of the existing main roof.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

9067/APP/2015/2863 16 Blacklands Drive Hayes

First floor side extension, conversion of existing garage to habitable room with new pitch roof over and single storey rear extension involving demolition of existing single storey rear extension

Decision Date: 10-11-2015 Approved

9067/C/81/0061 16 Blacklands Drive Hayes

Householder development - residential extension(P)

Decision Date: 16-02-1981 Approved

Comment on Planning History

9067/APP/2015/2863 - First floor side extension, conversion of existing garage to habitable room with new pitch roof over and single storey rear extension involving demolition of existing single storey rear extension

Decision: Approved on 10/11/2015.

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 and the Home Farm Residents Association were consulted by letters dated 07/04/2016 and a site notice was displayed in the area on 18/04/2016. No responses have been received.

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

Part 2 Policies:

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.

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

LPP 3.5 (2015) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable host residential amenity for the dwelling and adequate off-street parking provision.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design. Furthermore Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) resist any development that would fail to harmonise with the existing streetscene, or which would fail to safeguard the design of existing and adjoining sites.

The proposed first floor side extension would be set back from the western side boundary with Meadow View Road by 1.1m, which complies with the guidance in paragraph 5.1 of the Council's adopted HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008). This guidance requires a minimum set-in of 1m for first floor/two storey side extensions from side boundaries. The existing attached side garage is set-in more than 1m from the side boundary, so there is no requirement for an additional set-in of the first floor side extension according to the guidance in paragraph 5.1 of the HDAS SPD. However, the corner plot location of the site is noted, and even though the existing garage is built close to the side boundary, it maintains considerable upper level open space. The upper level open space is complemented by the trees and shrubbery along that boundary and provides some visual relief in what is a densely developed area. Even though it is noted that a number of junction properties in the area have been built up close to their side boundaries including the adjacent dwelling on the opposite corner, No. 18 Blacklands Drive, the considerable open space to side boundaries is a feature of several junction properties in the surrounding area. It is considered that the 1.1m set-in of the proposed first floor side extension from the side boundary is such that it would virtually infill this upper level open space and visual gap, particularly at the front of the site, and it would result in the loss of this prominent feature of the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenity of the streetscene and the wider area. It is also considered that the set-in of 1.1m from the side boundary is such that the first floor side extension would result in post-development pressures and impact on the trees along the boundary. It is instructive to note that works to build up the adjacent dwelling at No.18 close to its side boundary took place well before the adoption of the current local plan, and it is considered that the building up of the proposed first floor side extension so close to the side boundary would exacerbate the impact already resulting from the extended dwelling at No.18 on the visual amenities of the streetscene and surrounding area. Furthermore, the 1.1m set-in of the proposed first floor side extension from the side boundary is such that it would significantly extend beyond the return front building line of adjacent dwellings on Meadow View Road (No. 2 Meadow View Road being the closest).

The proposed first floor side extension would be 7.6m deep, 4m wide and it would line up with the front wall of the dwelling. The lining up with the front wall is contrary to the guidance in paragraph 5.6 of the HDAS SPD, which requires first floor/two storey side extensions to be set back 1m from the main front building line of a semi-detached dwelling. Furthermore, the matching hipped roof of the first floor side extension would be equal to the height of the existing main roof, which is contrary to the guidance in

paragraph 5.8 of the HDAS SPD. That guidance specifies that the roof height of side extensions at semi-detached dwellings should be lowered by at least 0.5m from the main roof line. The original width of the dwelling is 6m, and the proposed 4m width of the proposed side extension would comply with paragraph 5.10 of the HDAS SPD, which specifies that the width of a side extension should be between half and two thirds of the main house depending on the plot size and character of the area. Notwithstanding the fact that there is no objection to the proposed conversion of the side garage to a habitable room in and of itself, it is considered that the first floor side extension would not integrate well visually with the host dwelling, and would not constitute a subordinate and proportionate addition to the dwelling. As such, the first floor side extension would appear incongruous and dominating in relation to the host existing dwelling, neighbouring properties and the streetscene.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be 3.6m deep along the shared boundary with No.14, 9.8m wide and 3.8m high with a pitch roof. Whilst the depth of the proposed rear extension complies with the related guidance in paragraph 3.3 of the HDAS SPD, the height exceeds the 3.4m maximum required for a pitch roof for a rear extension, as specified in paragraph 3.7 of the HDAS SPD. However, the attached dwelling to the east at No. 14 Blacklands Drive has an existing 3.1m deep single storey rear extension with a flat roof height of 3.2m. The degree of the sloping pitch of the proposed rear extension relative to the flat roof height of the extension at attached No.14 is such that it would not constitute an unduly bulky and/or overbearing addition to the application dwelling. As such, it is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension, in and of itself, would constitute an acceptable proportionate addition.

With regards to the siting of the proposed detached garage in the rear garden, even though it would not be accessed from a rear service road as specified in paragraph 9.5 of the HDAS SPD, it would be accessed from an existing vehicular crossover off the Meadow View Road highway. As such, there is no material objection to its proposed siting in the rear garden. The proposed garage would be set-in from the back edge of the highway by 5m, which exceeds the minimum required of 2.4m in paragraph 9.5 of the HDAS SPD. The garage would have a roller shutter and its internal dimensions would exceed the required minimum of 4.8m width and 3m depth as specified in paragraph 9.5 of the HDAS SPD. The proposed height of 2.5m is similar to the maximum height permitted for outbuildings in residential curtilages by Class E, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. As such, it is considered that the proposed garage would constitute an acceptable proportionate addition in the curtilage of the existing dwelling.

Notwithstanding the considerations in relation to the single storey rear extension and detached garage, the proposed first floor side extension would not constitute a subordinate and/or sympathetic addition to the existing dwelling, and it would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, thereby contrary to the requirements of 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 guidance contained in the adopted HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

The proposed single storey rear extension would project 0.5m beyond the rear extension at attached No.14, but its depth would comply with the specified maximum depth required by the HDAS SPD. The proposed first floor side extension would be screened off from attached No.14 as it would not project beyond the original rear wall of the dwelling. There would be no upper level side-facing windows in the first floor side extension, which would otherwise look out to the View Road highway. The proposed garage would be screened

off from views at the closest adjacent property at No. 2 Meadow View road by an intervening attached garage at the side of that neighbouring property. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining neighbours in terms of increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, loss of outlook and visual intrusion. As such, the proposal is in compliance with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Paragraphs 3.13 and 5.13 of the HDAS SPD requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. Even though the proposal would result in the creation of a three bedroom dwelling with a required minimum area of 60 sq.m, an approximate area of 137 sq.m would be retained in the rear garden, which significantly exceeds the required minimum and would ensure the provision of adequate usable amenity space for the occupiers. This would ensure compliance with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Although the existing attached side garage would be lost as a potential off-street parking facility, the loss would be offset by the proposed detached garage in the rear garden and the existing front garden parking area, which is capable of accommodating at least two cars parked safely at right angle to the highway. Therefore there would be no conflict with Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) in respect of the provision of adequate off-street car parking.

Notwithstanding the above considerations in respect of the provision of adequate amenity and off-street parking, the application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed first floor side extension, by virtue of its siting, scale, bulk, width and design including the lack of a set back from the front building line of the existing dwelling and lack of a set down of the ridge from the main ridge of the roof, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the appearance of the original dwellinghouse, the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms a part and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal 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 adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed first floor side extension, by reason of its close proximity to the western side boundary and siting in this open prominent corner position, would result in the loss of vegetation along that boundary and an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an over-development of the site to the detriment of the character and the visual amenities of the area and to this existing open area of the street scene. Therefore the proposal is 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 adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 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.
- 2 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.

There are elements of the scheme, which are considered unacceptable in principle and in practical terms. There is an extant planning permission for a similar scheme with considerable smaller dimensions (reference 9067/APP/2015/2863), which was granted on 10/11/2015. The applicant did not take up the offer of utilising the Council's pre-application service before submitting this application. The Council has therefore decided to determine the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to exercise their right of appeal and to have a formal decision to provide the context for any future redesign and resubmission.

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

Part 2 Policies:

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.

guidance.

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.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Victor Unuigbo

Telephone No: 01895 250230