

DELEGATED 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 91 AND 93 HUNTERS GROVE HAYES

Development: Two storey front/side/rear extensions involving demolition of the existing side extension to number 91 and side/rear extension to 93

LBH Ref Nos: **74557/APP/2019/351**

Drawing Nos: 91 Existing and Proposed Roof Plan
 91 Existing Elevations
 91 Existing Floor Plans
 91 Proposed Elevations
 91 Proposed Floor Plans
 91 Proposed Landscaping Plan
 93 Proposed Landscaping Plan
 93 Existing and Proposed Roof Plan
 93 Existing Elevations
 93 Existing Floor Plans
 93 Proposed Elevations
 93 Proposed Floor Plans
 91 Design and Access Statement
 93 Design and Access Statement
 Location Plan (1:1250)

Date Plans received : 12/02/2019

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 12/02/2019

1. **SUMMARY**

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey front/side/rear extensions involving demolition of the existing side extension to number 91 and side/rear extension to 93. Concerns are raised in terms of the visual impact of the development and the likely impact upon the residential amenities of occupants of adjacent properties at numbers 89 and 95 Hunters Grove.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extensions, by reason of their siting, excessive bulk, depth and design, would fail to appear as subordinate additions, detrimental to the appearance of the original semi-detached dwellings and spacing of development in the immediate locality. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS Residential Extensions and to the emerging Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings of the London Borough Of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey front/side/rear extensions, by reason of their size, design, proximity and staggered siting with occupants of adjacent properties at Numbers 89 and 95 Hunters Grove, would result in overly dominant features that overshadow the adjacent properties, and as such would result in a visually intrusive and an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a loss of light and material loss of residential amenity to the occupiers. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS Residential Extensions and to the emerging Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings of the London Borough Of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (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 I53 Compulsory Informative (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.

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
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.
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

3 I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

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.

4 I71 LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Refusing)

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.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a pair of semi-detached dwellings located on the northern side of Hunters Grove which lies within the Developed Area as identified within the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). The pair of semi's share a staggered relationship with both adjacent properties, being set back into the plot.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey front/side/rear extensions involving demolition of the existing side extension to number 91 and side/rear extension to 93.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

57415/APP/2002/1462 93 Hunters Grove Hayes

ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION

Decision: 11-10-2002 Approved

63389/APP/2007/2403 91 Hunters Grove Hayes

ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION (APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR AN EXISTING USE OR OPERATION)

Decision: 12-09-2007 GPD

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

Hayes Garden Village Residents Association and 12 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 16.2.19 and a site notice was displayed to the front of the site which expired on 18.3.19. 1 letter of objection has been received from the occupants of Number 89 Hunters Grove raising concerns about loss of light, domination and serious loss of light to the side facing entrance and windows of Number 89.

6. 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:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
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.
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

In addition:

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Policies BE20, BE21 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) give advice 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.

Policies BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (Part Two) stress the importance of new buildings and extensions providing adequate amount of external amenity space, that not only protects the amenity of the occupants of the proposed development, but also of those of the surrounding buildings, as well as protecting both parties privacy.

This pair of semi's currently enjoys a staggered relationship with adjacent number 89 Hunters Grove which is set forward 2.8m from the application properties, having its main entrance to the side. The proposal would effectively extend the pair of semis 1.8m to the front, to within 1m of the side boundary at two storey level to the side and would project

6m to the rear of the rear elevation of Number 89 at two storey level. Whilst the submitted plans indicate that the 45 degree angle is not technically breached from the first floor window of number 89, the significant increase in scale and bulk of the property at Number 91 would unduly dominate outlook and light from the rear of this property. Furthermore the increase in width and forward projection would also overshadow the side facing windows and entrance to the Number 89 to an unacceptable degree. As such the proposal would represent an unneighbourly form of development to the occupants of this property.

Number 95 Hunters Grove is also set forward of the application properties and has been extended at single storey level by way of a side/rear extension. The proposed extension would project 6m to the rear of the original dwelling, and whilst to a lesser extent to that at number 89 (given the ground floor extensions), the occupants of Number 95 would suffer an unacceptably dominating impact by virtue of the scale and bulk of the proposed extensions.

The proposed two storey front/side/rear extensions, by reason of their size, design, proximity and staggered siting with occupants of adjacent properties at Numbers 89 and 95 Hunters Grove, would result in overly dominant features that overshadow the adjacent properties, and as such would result in a visually intrusive and an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a loss of light and material loss of residential amenity to the occupiers. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), to the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS Residential Extensions and to the emerging Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings of the London Borough Of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) .

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and locality 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. Furthermore policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) resist any development which would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or would fail to safeguard the design of existing and adjoining sites.

The HDAS guidance which is repeated in the Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings of the London Borough Of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), recommends that rear extensions should be no more than 3.6m deep on a semi-detached property with a plot width of more than 5m and that its height should not exceed the height of the existing building.

For side extensions, the HDAS guidance recommends that they should not exceed half the width of the original property and should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation. This advice is repeated in Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings of the London Borough Of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

For front extensions, the HDAS guidance states alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused. This advice is repeated in Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings of the London Borough Of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

Whilst the extension is set down from the main roof of the dwelling, it would not comply with the HDAS, as it extends the full width of the original property and cannot thus be considered to be a subordinate extension to the main house. It would, in fact be the dominant element of the rear of this property to the detriment of the visual appearance of the site and its wider setting.

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing single storey side/rear extension at number 93 and the erection of a two storey side/front/rear extension which would wrap around the original properties entire front/side/rear elevation. It is also proposed to replace the existing single storey side extension at Number 91 and build a proposed two storey front/side/rear extension which would wrap around the entire front/side/rear elevations of the original dwelling.

The proposals would effectively lose some of the characteristic set-back of this pair of semi-detached dwellings by extending the properties 1.8m forward of the existing front building line. The front wall is currently 2.8m behind the front building line of number 89. The proposal would be set 1m behind. A gap of 1m would be achieved to each side boundary. The proposed extensions would entirely engulf the original property and cannot be described as subordinate additions. They would also fail to respect the architectural integrity of this pair of semis. The characteristic staggered spacing of development within the immediate locality would also be lost. As a result the proposed extensions would represent an incongruous addition to the street scene in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings of the London Borough Of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) considers whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety. Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) seeks to ensure that all development is in accordance with the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards.

Sufficient space would be retained within the frontage of each property to park 2 cars. As such the proposal complies with the Council's Parking Standards.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

see above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

The issues of design are addressed above.

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).

In terms of the garden area at least 100m² of rear private garden should be retained to provide adequate amenity space for a four bedroom dwelling. The resultant amenity space would be over 100sq.m for each dwelling 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.

7.6 Other Issues

No other issues raised.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - London Borough Of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019)

The London Plan (2016)

Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions

National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

Telephone No: 01895 250230