

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, Transportation and Regeneration**Address** 39 FERNDOWN NORTHWOOD MIDDX**Development:** Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension**LBH Ref Nos:** **62674/APP/2018/3880****Drawing Nos:** Location Plan (1:1250)
01
02
03
04**Date Plans Received:** 01/11/2018**Date(s) of Amendment(s):****Date Application Valid:** 10/12/2018**1. CONSIDERATIONS****1.1 Site and Locality**

The application property is located on the northern side of Ferndown and consists of a two storey semi-detached dwelling which has a main hip roof with white render external facing. The rear garden is flat and enclosed by panel fencing. The frontage is covered in hardstanding. The application already benefits from part two storey side/rear extension and part single storey side/rear extension with flat roof.

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 proposes the part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension.

It is important to note that application already benefits from part two storey side/rear extension and part single storey side/rear extension with flat roof which will be demolished as a result of the extension.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

62674/APP/2018/4319 39 Ferndown Northwood Middx
2 storey side and part 2 storey rear extension.

Decision Date: 17-12-2018 NFA**Comment on Planning History****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

7 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 12/12/18 and a site notice was displayed in the area. By the close of the consultation period no objections were 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 (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 and light levels of the adjoining neighbours, and provision of off-street parking provision.

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 3.0 Single Storey Rear Extensions states semi-detached houses with a plot more than 5m wide, an extension up to 3.6m deep is acceptable. A range of pitched roof and flat roof types may also be acceptable and must not exceed 3.4m and 3m at its highest point.

Section 4.0 Single Storey Side Extensions states the design of a side extension should not dominate the existing character of the original property. 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.

Section 5.0 Side and First Floor Side Extensions should retain a minimum of 1m distance from the side boundary at both levels, and if to a semi-detached dwelling should be set back 1m from the front building line at both levels, as well as set down from the original ridge line by 0.5m. The width should be considerably less than that of the original house and be between half and two thirds depending on size and character of the area. Design of the roof should follow that of the existing roof. Flat roofed extensions will not generally be accepted.

Section 6 Two Storey Rear or First Floor Rear Extension states semi-detached houses with a plot more than 5m wide, an extension up to 3.6m deep is acceptable. It is desirable that any two storey extension to a house with a pitched roof should also have a pitched roof. The new roof should appear subordinate to the original roof and so have a ridge height at least 0.5m lower than the original roof. Poor designs and applications out of character with their surroundings will be rejected.

The proposed side/rear extension would be constructed flush with the front elevation of the existing house, and would measure 11.94m in length and would wrap across the rear wall of the existing house to a maximum depth of 4.5m and 3.65m at western side and eastern side respectively which doesn't comply with paragraph 3.3 of HDAS SPD. The proposed side/rear extension would have a width of 3.54m, which is between half and two-thirds of the original house width (7.67m). The proposed side/rear extension would be characterised by a mono-pitched roof at the front measuring a maximum height of 3.78m and would be characterised by a flat roof at the rear measuring a maximum height 3.15m which would not comply with HDAS SPD. The 3.78m mono-pitched roof height of the proposed side extension doesn't comply with the maximum 3.4m pitched roof height for side extensions, as specified in paragraph 4.2 of the HDAS SPD. Also, the 3.15m flat roof height of the single storey rear extension doesn't comply with the maximum 3m flat roof height for rear extensions, as specified in paragraph 3.6 of the HDAS SPD. As such, the proposed single storey side/rear extension by virtue of its size, scale, depth and height would constitute an incongruous feature and would appear overbearing and/or oppressive from views on neighbouring properties and would not harmonise with the existing character and appearance of the street scene.

The proposed first floor side/rear extension would be set back by 1.5m from principal elevation at first level. The proposal would measure 3.54m in width to the front at first floor, would extend the full depth of the existing dwelling across the flank elevation by approximately 9m in length at first floor. The 3.54m side extension width to the front would be less than half and two thirds of the main house (7.67m) and therefore complies with the HDAS SPD as specified in paragraph 5.10. However, the proposal would measure 6.04m in width to the rear at first floor which would be considerably more than half and two thirds of the main house (7.67 m) and therefore doesn't comply with the HDAS SPD as specified in paragraph 5.10. The proposed part first floor side/rear extension would be characterised by a pitch roof measuring a maximum height of 7.84m which would have a ridge height by approximately 0.55m lower than the original roof. The ridge height of the two storey side/rear extension would comply with the height for two storey extensions, as specified in paragraph 5.8 and 6.6 of the HDAS SPD. The proposed two storey side/rear extension would wrap across the rear wall of the existing house to a maximum depth of 3m at first floor and therefore complies with paragraph 6.4 of the HDAS SPD.

Policy BE22 states residential extensions of two or more storeys in height should be set back for the full height a minimum of 1m from the shared boundary to preserve the

visually open gaps between properties and preventing dwellings from coalescing to form a terraced appearance.

HDAS Section 5.0 and 6.0 sets out the requirements for first floor side/rear extensions on semi-detached properties and requires a 1m set back from the front building line on ground and first floor level and a 1.5m set in from the side boundary when there is an existing single storey side extension.

The proposed first floor side/rear extension would be set back 1.5m from the front elevation at first floor only. The proposed extension would not retain a separation distance from the shared boundary at western side for the full depth of the proposal. Whilst it is accepted that there is an existing two storey side extension set on the boundary with the adjoining property, this is set back some considerable distance from the front such that a clearly visible gap between the properties is evident, which prevents a terracing effect and preserves the visually open gap between properties, which is a characteristic of the road. The proposal would totally infill this gap and would fail to set the extension in from the boundary or set it back from the front at both levels as required by the SPD.

As such, the proposed extension, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk, proximity to the side boundary and the lack of a set back from the front at all levels would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, 37 Ferndown, giving rise to a cramped form of development, which would be detrimental to the appearance of the original house, to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

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.

The adjoining neighbour at No. 37 Ferndown, benefits from a 1.14m deep part two storey side/rear extension. The adjoining neighbours at No. 41 Ferndown (pair of semi-detached houses) doesn't benefit from any form of rear extensions, and 3.65m deep and 3.15m high single storey side/rear extension would comply with the HDAS SPD. The proposed development by virtue of its size and scale would not have an adverse impact upon the adjoining neighbours at No. 37 or 41. The proposed extension would not extend beyond a 45 degree horizontal angle measured from the middle of a principle window to a habitable room on the adjoining dwelling at No.37. As such, the proposal would not result in a loss of their residential amenities and light levels, by way of appearing overbearing, visually intrusive, overshadowing, and loss of outlook and light.

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 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Paragraph 5.13 of Residential Extensions. HDAS: Residential Extensions requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. There would be sufficient garden space retained.

There would be ample parking to the front of the property. As such, the proposal would not therefore conflict with policy AM14 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 extension, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk, and proximity to the side boundary would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, 37 Ferndown, giving rise to a cramped form of development, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 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 two storey side extension, by virtue of its siting, size, scale and design, including the lack of a set back from the front at all levels, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the appearance of the original house, the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of 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 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 the 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:

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	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Hoda Sadri

Telephone No: 01895 250230