

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 58 BOLDMERE ROAD EASTCOTE

Development: Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, raising of ridge and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 side roof lights

LBH Ref Nos: **49427/APP/2019/1618**

Drawing Nos: 1015/P2/1B

Date Plans Received: 14/05/2019 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 14/05/2019

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two storey, detached dwelling house located to the South of Boldmere Road. The brick, render and tile dwelling is set back from the road by 7 metres of soft landscaping. To the rear of the dwelling lies a garden area and a garage which acts as private amenity space and off street parking.

The application site is located on a prominent corner plot located on the junction with Boldmere Road and Chandos Road. It shares a side boundary with No.56 Boldmere Road to the West to the rear lies the side boundary of No.29 Chandos Road.

Boldmere Road consists of a variety of semi-detached and detached dwellings of differing designs. The area is residential in character in character and appearance and the site lies within the Developed Area as identified within the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and raising of ridge and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 side rooflights.

The side extension would project to the side by 1.86 metres. It would be built flush with the front elevation and would span for a depth of 12.5 metres wrapping around into a rear extension. At ground floor would project to the rear of the property by 3.651 and would be attached to the existing rear extension. At first floor it would have a depth of 3.2 metres and would have a width of 3.4 metres.

The ridge of the roof would be raised by 6.5 metres and a dormer would be installed within the rear roof plane. The dormer would have a width of 2.7 metres, a depth of 2 metres and would be characterised by a flat roof with a height of 1.4 metres.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

49427/A/94/1538 58 Boldmere Road Eastcote
Erection of a single-storey rear extension

Decision Date: 07-11-1994 Approved

49427/APP/2018/4143 58 Boldmere Road Eastcote

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, raising of ridge and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 side roof lights

Decision Date: 04-02-2019 Refused

49427/APP/2018/731 58 Boldmere Road Eastcote

Single storey side/rear extension, first floor side extension, raising of ridge and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 3 front roof lights.

Decision Date: 25-04-2018 Refused

Comment on Planning History

This is a resubmission of 49427/APP/2018/4143 which was refused on 04/02/2019. The attached cover letter with the submission explains that there are no amendments to the refusal, however, the appeal deadline was missed and so a new application is required.

Prior to the previous application, one for a two storey side/rear extension and raising and enlargement of roof was refused on 25/04/2018 (ref: 49427/APP/2018/731). It was considered that the roof extension would fail to harmonise with the existing dwelling house, street scene and surrounding area. In addition, it was considered that the two storey side extension would have resulted in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area resulting in a cramped appearance.

This application was subsequently dismissed at appeal. The Planning Inspector agreed that the two storey side extension would further close the gap and erode the remaining spaciousness at the junction and would lead to a cramped and congested appearance. They also agreed that the extension would completely alter the roofs appearance to its detriment.

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

Six neighbouring properties and the Residents Association were notified of the proposal on 17/05/2019. A site notice was also displayed which expired on 13/06/2019.

No responses 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:

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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
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 for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling house, the impact of the visual amenities of the street scene, the impact on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers, provision of residential amenity space and the provision of parking.

Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fails to harmonise with the existing street scene. Policy BE15 states extensions to existing buildings will be permitted where they harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Policy BE19 states that the Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. Policy BE22 states that residential extensions of two or more storeys in height should be set back a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary of the property for the full height of the building.

Section 3 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (HDAS) states that single storey rear extensions on detached dwellings should not exceed 4 metres in depth and 3 metres in height if a flat roof is proposed. Section 6 adds that first floor rear extensions should be set down by 0.5 metres from the ridge. Section 5 states that two storey side extensions should not exceed two thirds of the width of the original dwelling house and for detached properties there is no requirement for a set back from the front and set down from the ridge. The side extension should be located 1 metre from the side boundary of the property and return building lines should not be breached. Section 7 states that the more visible a roof, the more important that any proposed dormer should be well designed. It is important that dormers appear secondary to the size of the roof face and not create an appearance of a flat roofed third storey. Dormers located on detached properties should be set in from all roof edges by 1 metre.

At ground floor the rear extension would have a depth of 3.651 metres to match the existing extension. The proposed and existing ground floor extension would benefit from a flat roof with maximum height of 3.175 metres which would exceed HDAS recommendations. However, due to the limited depth it is considered that the additional height would be acceptable and it would appear subordinate. The first floor rear extension would have a depth of 3.2 metres and would be set down from the ridge by 1.8 metres which complies with HDAS recommendations.

The side extension would have a width of 1.86 metres which would be approximately a quarter of the width of the original dwelling. The extension would be flush with the front elevation. The extension would be set in from boundary line by 1 metre in compliance with HDAS. However, although the extension would not result in the appearance of terracing, it is considered that its location on a corner plot would result in the loss of a visually open gap which is important within the heavily built up area.

The application site represents a very prominent corner plot. The front and side of the property can be easily viewed from Boldmere Road and Chandos Road. The rear of the property is very conspicuous when driving down Chandos Road towards its junction with Boldmere Road.

It is acknowledged that No 60 Boldmere Road includes a two storey side extension which has been built in close proximity to the pavement. However, this was granted permission in 1987, well before the adoption of the Council's current policies and standards. However, it is clear that the frontages on Chandos Road and the space to the side of the application property provide a prevailing uniformity of space between and around the properties and in the main most of the buildings follow a common building line. These positive attributes add distinctive character to the locality.

In this particular case, the two storey side extension would unacceptably break the aforementioned building line to a greater extent than it does even now. Such development, which would be positioned close to the boundary with the pavement, would appear dominant and intrusive in the street-scene and would detract from the sense of open space which exists between the dwellings and the highway on this part of Chandos Road. The existence of the two storey side extension at No 60 is not considered to set a precedent for granting this proposal, which was agreed with by the Planning Inspector when reviewing the previous appeal. Indeed, if the proposal were to be granted it would have the effect of creating a visual pinch point when driving into Chandos Road. This would be an unacceptable impact detracting from the prevailing sense of open space that exists between the highway and most of the existing properties.

The height of the side extension would exceed the height of the existing ridge, however it would form part of the enlargement of the roof aspect of this proposal. The roof would be raised by 0.65 metres to a maximum height of 8.8 metres. The neighbouring semi-detached properties at Nos.54 and 56 Boldmere Road benefit from a higher ridge height than the existing application property and so it is considered that the raising of the ridge would allow No.58 to be of a similar height to these neighbouring properties and so it would not appear out of keeping with the street scene. The proposed dormer would be located centrally within the roof plane and would be located 1 metre from the eaves and over 1 metre from the sides and new ridge. It is considered that it would appear subordinate within the roof plane and would not create the appearance of a flat roofed third storey.

Subsequently, it is considered that by reason of the size, bulk, design and siting of the proposed two storey side extension the proposal would result in the closing of a visually open gap which would have a detrimental impact on the existing dwelling house and on the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Policy BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that buildings should be laid out so that adequate daylight and sunlight can penetrate into and between them and the amenities of existing houses are safeguarded.

Policy BE21 states that permission will not be granted for new buildings or extensions which, by reason of their siting, bulk and proximity would result in significant loss of residential amenity. Policy BE24 seeks to protect the privacy of the occupiers of the application site and surrounding properties.

The rear extension would be located 0.5 metres from the shared boundary with No.56 Boldmere Road, however, the extension would not exceed the depth of the existing extension and the maximum height would be reduced. The first floor extension would be located 5.9 metres from the shared boundary line and would not intersect the 45 degree horizontal line and the dormer would not project to the rear of the existing roof plane. It is considered that No.60 Boldmere Road and No.26 Chandos Road are located a sufficient distance away to ensure that the extension would not have a detrimental impact on these neighbouring properties. Two side windows would be installed facing Chandos Road, however, both serve non-habitable rooms bathrooms and so a condition could be added to ensure that these are obscure glazed. The first floor rear extension would benefit from a new window facing No.26 Chandos Road, however this would overlook the flank wall and front garden of the property. Subsequently, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on any neighbouring property in terms of loss of light, loss of outlook, loss of privacy and sense of dominance and therefore would comply with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

It is considered that all proposed habitable rooms and those altered by the development would have adequate outlook and natural light. Therefore, the proposal would comply with Policies BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Following development over 100 square metres of private amenity space would be retained. As such, the proposal would comply with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The parking would not be impacted by the proposal.

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, depth, height, proximity to the side boundary and projection forward of the return building line along Chandos Road, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development 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 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. 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. We have however 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:

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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
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: Charlotte Spencer

Telephone No: 01895 250230