

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 27A BEECH CLOSE WEST DRAYTON

Development: Single storey side extension and installation of brick boundary wall to side

LBH Ref Nos: **73168/APP/2017/4524**

Drawing Nos: 1806.1 Rev. A
 Location Plan (1:1250)
 1806.3

Date Plans Received: 15/12/2017 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 15/12/2017

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises of a new build chalet bungalow situated on land to East of 27 Beech Close. The property lies within a triangular shaped plot and is constructed from brick with a gable ended roof, and is set back from the frontage to accommodate forecourt laid entirely in hardstanding with a fair sized amenity area which spans across the rear and side and is finished in soft landscaping.

The surrounding area is residential in character and is made up of mainly semi-detached and terraced dwellinghouses, generally bungalows, that are set back from the frontage to accommodate fair sized front gardens and are of a similar size, scale and appearance.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Householder consent is sought for the erection of a single storey side extension and installation of brick boundary wall to side.

The proposed single storey side extension would measure 3.8 m in width, 7 m in depth and would be characterised with a mono-pitch roof with a maximum height of 3.7 m. The new brick boundary wall to the side would extend the entire length of the Southern side and rear boundary with a maximum height of 1.8 m.

The proposed extensions and alterations would be finished in materials to match the main dwelling.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

62028/APP/2008/118 Land Forming Part Of 29 Beech Close West Drayton

ERECTION OF A DETACHED THREE-BEDROOM CHALET BUNGALOW, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND AMENITY AREA (EXISTING GARAGE AND SHED TO BE DEMOLISHED).

Decision Date: 02-04-2008 Approved

73168/APP/2017/3305 27a Beech Close West Drayton

Side extension and installation of new boundary wall to side

Decision Date: 26-10-2017 Refused

Comment on Planning History

73168/APP/2017/3305HH: Side extension and installation of new boundary wall to side - Refused.

The application was refused on 3 grounds,

- i. Due to its size, scale bulk and proximity to No. 29 Beech Close, was considered to have a detrimental impact upon their residential amenities and light levels.
- ii. Failed to maintain an adequate amount of usable private amenity space, resulting in over-development of the site and detrimental to the amenities of the current and future occupiers of the host dwelling.
- iii. By reason of its design and roof form represented an incongruous and contrived form of development detracting from the character and appearance of the original dwelling, and given its size and proximity to the side boundary resulting in the closing of a visually open gap between the adjoining property.

The current application has reduced the size and bulk of the extension to remain as a single storey side extension, however it would continue to lack an adequate amount of private usable amenity area for the current and future occupiers of the original dwelling, and is therefore recommended for refusal.

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

A total of 5 adjoining and nearby neighbouring properties were consulted via letter dated 27.12.17, including a site notice displayed outside the premises on 10.01.18.

One letter of representation received from the occupier of 29 Beech Close stating that the current parking plans do not match with the originally approved parking plan part of the permission granted in 2010.

Officer comment: It is correct that the site of this proposal was the approved location for parking on the original planning permission and that a condition requiring retention of that was imposed; however that does not preclude consideration of this proposal.

The concerns raised will be addressed within the main body of the report.

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:

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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original building, the street scene and the level of impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbours.

Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part two (Saved UDP Policies) requires alterations and extensions to existing buildings to harmonise with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building. Policy BE13 requires the layout and appearance of extensions to harmonise with the existing street scene and Policy BE19 ensures any new development complements or improves the amenity and character of the area.

The Council's Adopted SPD the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008) or HDAS, contains design guidance (below) for all types of extensions which should appear subordinate in scale to the original building.

Section 4.0 Single Storey Side Extensions states the design of a side extension should not dominate the existing character of the original property and should be no more than half to two thirds the width of the original property. Pitched roofs will be acceptable where they do not exceed 3.4 m at its highest point. In order to appear subordinate the width and height should be considerably less than that of the main house and be between half and two thirds of the original house.

The proposed side extension would be set back 1 m from the principal elevation of the main dwelling and would be characterised by a pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.7 m which although would exceed the limitation within the Hillingdon SPD, given its set back from the front wall and front boundary and significant the set down below the main ridge would continue to appear subservient. The proposed extension would measure approximately half of the width of the host dwelling, would extend parallel with the building line of the host dwelling and by reason of its size and scale would appear as a subordinate addition which combined with the pitched roof form would satisfactorily integrate with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the visual amenities of the street scene.

The proposed side boundary wall would be erected along the full length of the shared side and rear boundary, and would have a maximum height of 1.8 m. The boundary wall would reflect the height of the existing fence and would be finished in materials to match the host dwelling, and as such is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed extension would comply with the objectives set out in Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

and the adopted HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

Policy BE20 requires any new development to be laid out so as to protect the daylight and sunlight levels of existing houses. Policy BE21 requires new extensions by virtue of their siting, bulk and proximity would not result in a significant loss of residential amenity to neighbouring properties and Policy BE24 should protect the privacy of the occupiers and their neighbours.

No.27 adjoining to the East; the proposed side extension by reason of its siting to the opposite flank and the adequate separation gap is considered not to result in an adverse impact upon their residential amenities by way of being over-dominant, overbearing, visual intrusion and loss of outlook and light.

The previous application ref: 73168/APP/2017/3305 was refused given the proposal comprised of a two storey extension erected to full height and infringed upon a 45 degree line of sight taken from the centre of the nearest rear habitable window of the adjoining neighbour at No. 29. The current revised proposal seeks a single storey side extension with the use of a relatively low level mono- pitched roof which subsequently reduces the bulk and mass of the roof void and pitches away from the shared side boundary, furthermore combined with the orientation between the application site and the neighbouring property, the proposed extension is considered not to appear overbearing, over-dominant and visually intrusive when viewed from their nearest aspects.

The proposal would retain a separation gap of approximately 24 metres from the rear walls of the adjoining neighbours to the rear along Blackthorn Avenue and combined with its single storey height would not give rise to loss of privacy and overlooking.

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 the Mayor of London's Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016).

The proposed single storey side extension is considered to have an acceptable level of impact upon the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers at No. 27 and 29 Beech Close and as such would accord with Policy BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

Policy BE23 seeks to ensure all new residential development and extensions provide or maintain external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of the occupants of the proposed building in terms of its shape and siting. This will be assessed in accordance with the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions. The HDAS: SPD states a 4 bedroom dwelling must retain a minimum of 100 sq m of rear usable amenity to be considered sufficient to protect the residential amenities of the occupants of the host dwelling.

The proposed floor plans indicate an enlargement of the current bedrooms as opposed to additional bedrooms. The floor plans also indicate a study room, however as the internal layout of the proposed development cannot be controlled by the Local Planning Authority, the study room could essentially be reverted back to a fourth bedroom and therefore will be assessed as such.

The proposed development would result in a reduction of the existing amenity private amenity area retained to measure approximately 78 square metres as indicated on the

proposed site plan and as such would fall considerably below the minimum Hillingdon SPD requirement of 100 square metres. Furthermore the Hillingdon SPD for New Residential Layouts (June 2006) states the space should be functional and attractive, and narrow strips of ground around buildings will not be considered suitable as usable garden space and will be excluded from calculations accordingly. Given the proposed rear amenity area would comprise of a narrow strip of grass to the rear measuring a maximum of 2.5 m wide, this would not be deemed sufficient to protect the residential amenities of the current and future occupiers of the host dwelling.

It is therefore considered the proposal would result in over-development of the site, with the remaining rear usable amenity area not sufficient by reason of its size to protect the amenities of the occupants of the main dwelling and would be contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

The application site proposes two off road parking spaces to the front of the property to accord with Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension, by virtue of its failure to maintain an adequate amount of private usable external amenity space for the occupiers of the extended property, would result in an over-development of the site detrimental to the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE19 and BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

- 1** 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, however we have been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from this retrospective application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

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:

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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Naim Poptani

Telephone No: 01895 250230