

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 and Enforcement**

Address 27 DRAKES DRIVE NORTHWOOD

Development: Single storey rear extension and alteration to front elevation

LBH Ref Nos: **62831/APP/2016/3078**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan (1:1250)
Block Plan (1:500)
01 Rev. A

Date Plans Received: 11/08/2016 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 11/08/2016

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application property is a two-storey detached dwelling on a small close of similar dwellings. It is adjoined by No. 26 Drakes Drive to the South and No. 28 Drakes Drive to the North. The area is residential in character.

The application site lies within the developed area as defined in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposed development involves the erection of a single storey rear extension and alteration to front elevation. The rear extension will have a maximum depth of 4.5 metres closest to No. 28 and 3.5 metres closest to No. 26 Drakes Drive. It will have a flat roof with a rooflight, with the extension being 3 metres in height. The extension would be set in slightly from the boundaries to neighbouring properties. The alteration to the front elevation involves installation of double doors replacing a front window. The existing front door is retained.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

62831/APP/2007/1338 27 Drakes Drive Northwood

CONVERSION OF INTEGRAL GARAGE TO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION.

Decision Date: 27-06-2007 Approved

62831/APP/2007/600 27 Drakes Drive Northwood

CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE USE (APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT).

Decision Date: 25-04-2007 Refused

Comment on Planning History

Permission was granted in 2007 for conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation. This has been implemented (Reference No.62831/APP/2007/1338)

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

Neighbours were notified on 16/08/2016 and a site notice was displayed on 01/09/2016. At the end of the consultation period no objections or comments were received.

The Trees and Landscape Officer advises that this site is covered by TPO 18 and adjacent to TPO 465; however, no significant trees, protected or otherwise, will be affected.

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.

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

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 original dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property and the availability of parking.

Policy BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 seek to ensure that development harmonises with the character of the surrounding properties and street scene and in particular the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Policy BE19 further requires that development should complement and improve the amenity of the residential area.

Paragraph 3.1 of the HDAS states that a single-storey rear extension should always be designed so as to appear subordinate to the original house. In particular it should not protrude out too far because the extension may block daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties. Paragraph 3.4 states for detached houses an extension up to 4 metres deep is acceptable. These dimensions are taken from the rear wall of the original

house. Paragraph 3.6 confirms that in many areas a flat roof single-storey extension will be acceptable. These should not exceed 3 metres in height. Paragraph 3.8 states that no access to a flat roof should be provided so as to create the potential for a balcony.

The rear extension will not be visible from the street. The relevant impacts relate, therefore, to the relationships with neighbouring properties and on the host dwelling itself. The proposed rear extension would have a depth from the main wall of the host dwelling of a maximum of 4.5 metres on the side closest to No. 28 Drakes Drive to the North. The host dwelling is already approximately 1 metre back from the rear wall of that property and thus in effect the extension would be 5.5m beyond the rear wall of No.28. There is a habitable room in No. 28 close to the boundary. Whilst the proposed development accords with the height requirement for a flat roof of 3 metres, it is considered that the depth of the extension beyond the rear wall of No.28, combined with the proximity of the habitable room within No. 28 will result in a breach of the 45 degree angle which will result in a material loss of daylight and sunlight and the proposed depth will result in an overbearing impact. To the South the proposed extension is 3.5 metres deep and also 3 metres high. No. 26 Drakes Drive is located marginally beyond the rear wall of the application site. It is not considered that this aspect of the proposal will result in harm to residential amenities for the occupiers of No. 26 Drakes Drive. Overall, it is concluded that the proposal would conflict with Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) by reason of adverse impact on No. 28 Drakes Drive.

Paragraph 8.1 of the HDAS considers front extensions and canopies and states that the Council is very explicit with regard to its position on front extensions. Front extensions that extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused. Paragraph 8.2 states that any porch should be individually designed to follow the character of the existing building. Porches should be subordinate in scale and form. The depth must not extend past the line of any bay window or diminish its scale, design, character or appearance. They should generally be confined to the front entrance area. The roof design and material must match the main roof. The proposal to change from a window to a door on the front elevation does not raise any adverse design issues of itself since no extension is proposed beyond the front building line and the proposal would match the overall use of materials and design associated with the host dwelling. However, the proposal would mean that there are two front doors to the dwelling. The proposal shows the former main door leading to a utility room which is internally linked to the remainder of the house, the new opening becoming the main entrance. Whilst not considered a reason for refusal in its own right, it is recommended that an informative be added advising that sub-division into two or more units would be considered against Policy H7 and other relevant policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) (or any policies which supersede these)

The property benefits from hard-standing to the front of the site which will be increased as a result of demolition of the garage to the front of the site. This can accommodate at least two cars and no adverse car parking issues are raised. The development therefore accords with Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

The property benefits from a substantial garden in excess of 80 square metres. The amount of retained usable garden space is considered acceptable and the development would be compliant with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

It is recommended that planning permission be refused for reasons relating to the adverse impacts associated with the rear extension.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, depth and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 28 Drakes Drive by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 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 (2016). 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. The Council's supports pre-application discussions.

In this case, no pre-application discussions were sought by the applicant. It is considered that the planning issues are straightforward in relation to local planning policy and guidance and that amendment would not overcome the harm associated with the development.

3 The proposed would result in there being two front external doors to the dwelling. It would appear that the intention is to relocate the main entrance. Whilst not considered a reason for refusal in its own right, the applicant is advised that sub-division into two or more units would require planning permission and would be considered against Policy H7 and other relevant policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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 - 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:

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.
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

Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster

Telephone No: 01895 250230