

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	39 MURRAY ROAD NORTHWOOD	
Development:	Single storey rear extension involving part demolition of an existing extension (Part Retrospective)	
LBH Ref Nos:	27558/APP/2017/3292	
Drawing Nos:	PL-001 PL-002 Design and Access Statement	
Date Plans Received:	11/09/2017	Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid:	11/09/2017	

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the East side of Murray Road with the principal elevation facing West. The site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling which is brick built and finished in render at first floor level. There is a modest two storey projected front with a gable roof with the main dwelling set under a hipped roof. The area to the front has some existing soft landscaping with an area of hard-standing which also provides off-street parking. The majority of the rear garden is laid to lawn and there are mature trees and hedges along the boundaries and to the rear. There is also a detached shed. The property has been extended in the past and benefits from a two storey rear extension with a crown roof and a rearward facing gable and square bay window, alongside a lean-to with a large flat roofed dormer. The two extensions run across the whole width of the rear and form the boundary with the other half of the semi.

The immediately adjoining semi is no.37 which is the other half of the pair of semis, to the North. To the South is no.41 which is set in slightly from the boundary to the application site. Neither property has been extended although no.37 has a modest and very shallow lean to rear projection.

The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' and Northwood Town Centre Conservation Area, Green Lane, as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan (2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension involving part demolition of an existing extension (Retrospective).

The proposal involves a rear extension 3.3 metres deep across the existing rear extension set under a pitched roof with a height of 3.67 metres. However the total depth from the original rear elevation would be 6.2 metres.

It is also noted that the submitted plans are inaccurate and appear to be scaled incorrectly, in particular the floor plans.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

There appears to be no planning history.

However it is understood that works for this proposal had commenced and were subsequently reported to the council's Enforcement Team.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 18th October 2017

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

3 neighbouring properties and Northwood Residents Association were consulted on 18.09.2017 and the site notices were posted to the front of the site on 19.09.2017. No comments or objections were received.

London Underground Infrastructure Protection - No objection:

London Underground Infrastructure Protection has no comment to make on this planning application for single storey rear extension.

Conservation Officer:

This is one of a pair of handed, 1920's roughcast semi-detached houses, with good red brick detailing and timber studding, in the Northwood Town Centre Conservation Area.

The house has already been extended by means of a two storey rear extension with a crown roof and a rearward facing gable and square bay window, with alongside, a lean-to with a large flat roofed dormer. The two extensions run across the whole width of the back of the house, and form the boundary with the other half of the semi. It is not known when these rear extensions were built, though it was probably some years ago.

The applicant was in the process of building a flat roofed, or almost flat roofed, rear extension across the back of the previous extensions when the work was reported to the enforcement team, who requested a planning application. There is proposed to be a walled terrace beyond that extension.

The new extension is considered to respect neither the floor plan nor the design of the existing house, nor the two existing rear extensions, which are of differing depths, heights and form to each other and to the one being built across both of them. The result is a mix of extensions which are very bulky and deep, with no overall architectural cohesion. There may be an issue too for the adjoining house in terms of overshadowing and potentially overlooking from the terrace, although the details of the latter are not known.

It may be possible to extend the house behind the two storey element, but a suitable design will need to be explored.

Recommendation: Unacceptable.

Trees/Landscape Officer:

This site is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached house on the east side of Murray Road. The site lies within the Northwood Town Centre Conservation Area - a designation

which protects trees. There are trees in the back garden.
No tree loss is planned and there should be no direct impact on nearby trees. However, temporary tree protection should be conditioned in order to safeguard back garden trees from accidental damage during the construction operations.

Recommendation: No objection subject to conditions RES8 and RES10.

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:

BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas

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

LPP 7.8 (2016) Heritage assets and archaeology

NPPF7 NPPF - Requiring good design

NPPF12 NPPF - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the street scene and locality, including the Conservation Area, the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden and car 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.

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 proposed development is situated within the Northwood Town Centre, Green Lane Conservation Area. Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan states that new development within Conservation Areas will be expected to preserve or enhance those features which contribute to their special architectural and visual qualities. Policy BE4 reflects the relevant legal duties.

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 3.0 Single Storey Rear Extensions states extensions should always appear subordinate to the original house, and therefore should not protrude out too far from the rear wall. This is to prevent extensions from blocking the daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbouring properties. Paragraph 3.3 of the HDAS states that single storey rear extensions proposed on semi-detached/terraced houses with a plot measuring 5 metres wide or more should be no more than 3.6 metres deep and 3.3 metres for plots less than 5 metres wide. Likewise paragraph 3.7 states that such extensions should be no more than 3 metres in height for a flat roof and 3.4 metres at its highest point with a pitched roof. This is to ensure that the extension appears subordinate to the main house.

The proposal would involve a single storey rear extension which whilst itself would be 3.3 metres deep set under a pitched roof with a total height of 3.67 metres. However it is important to note that the proposal would in fact extend beyond the original rear elevation by 6.2 metres and this depth is also exacerbated by the excessive height. Both are clearly contrary to the recommended guidelines and together with the existing and significant two storey extensions fails to be subordinate, instead appearing as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition. The Council's Conservation Officer has also objected stating that development respects neither the floor plan nor the design of the existing house, nor the two existing rear extensions, which are of differing depths, heights and form to each other and to the one being built across both of them. The result is a mix of extensions which are very bulky and deep, with no overall architectural cohesion.

Therefore it is considered that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the subject property and fails to preserve the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area. As such, in terms of appearance, the proposal is considered unacceptable and fails to comply with the requirements of Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The application site is one half of a pair of semis, the other being no.37, which is the immediately adjoining property to the North and no.41 to the South. The extension in addition to the previous extensions would result in a total depth of over 6 metres including an element of two storey development. This is considered excessive in depth and height which causes significant harm to the neighbouring properties. No.39 is also located to the immediate North and therefore following the path of the sun through the day the excessive size, scale and bulk would it is considered result in loss light and overshadowing. Whilst no.41 is to the South, the existing two storey element sits on the side boundary and whilst the ground floor extension would be set in from the boundary, the overall depth would still result in over-dominance and loss of outlook. As such it is considered as an overbearing structure when viewed from the rear aspect and would have a harmful impact upon the residential amenities and light levels of both the neighbouring properties. It would therefore be contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part

Two: Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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).

Paragraph 5.13 of Residential Extensions. HDAS: Residential Extensions requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. The resultant amenity space would be over 100 sq.m which would be in excess of the paragraph 3.13 HDAS requirement. The proposal would be in accordance with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2.

The parking provision would remain unaffected by the proposal.

Since the end of August 2015 applications which are for development which was not authorised need to be assessed as to whether the unauthorised development was intentional. If so, then this is a material planning consideration. In this case officers have no indication that this was an intentional breach of planning control.

However taking all matters into consideration it is recommended that the application be refused.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design, would result in an incongruous addition which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building and would neither preserve or enhance the visual amenity, character and appearance of the wider Northwood Town Centre, Green Lane Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore 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), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 37 and 41 Murray Road 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** 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. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the 'Saved' UDP 2007, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service. This is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme, where the Inspectors Report identified issues to be

addressed, which were reflected in the reasons for refusal, allowing the opportunity to address those issues within this submission.

- 2 The applicant should note that the submitted plan, PL-002, is inaccurate in that the proposed floor plans are shown as being to a scale of 1:50. It has been assumed that this should be the same scale as the existing plans, 1:100, and the decision has been made on this basis.

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
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
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
LPP 7.8	(2016) Heritage assets and archaeology
NPPF7	NPPF - Requiring good design

NPPF12 NPPF - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Hardeep Ryatt

Telephone No: 01895 250230