

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 12 EDINBURGH CLOSE ICKENHAM

Development: Alterations to porch and pitched roof to existing single storey front element (Retrospective)

LBH Ref Nos: **3191/APP/2019/1361**

Drawing Nos: 0419/CP/02
0419/CP/03
0419/CP/04
0419/CP/05
0419/CP/06
0419/CP/07
0419/CP/08
0419/CP/01

Date Plans Received: 23/04/2019 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 23/04/2019

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application property comprises of a semi- detached house located to the northern side of Edinburgh Close within the Developed Area as identified within the Hillingdon Local plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). The property has a detached garage to the rear of the property and a shared driveway. The area is residential in character.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Retrospective consent is sought for an alterations to porch and pitched roof to existing single storey front element

The dimensions of the porch are 2.86m in width by 0.95m in depth finished with a pitched roof measuring 3.4m and 2.5m eaves.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

3191/APP/2018/4170 12 Edinburgh Close Ickenham

Alterations to porch and pitched roof to existing single storey front element (Retrospective)

Decision Date: 26-02-2019 Refused

Comment on Planning History

3191/APP/2018/4170 - Alterations to porch and pitched roof to existing single storey front element (Retrospective)
Refused on 26/2/19

Refusal reason:

The front extension, by reason of its siting, size, scale and roof design results in an incongruous and overly dominant addition which is detrimental, to the architectural

composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal is 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 - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

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

10 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 25/4/19 and a site notice was displayed in the area. By the close of the consultation period, 3 comments were received. Two in support of the proposal and one objection raising the following concerns:

1. The reasons for the refusal of the original retrospective application were clearly explained in Case Officer's report which detailed several and significant breaches of several of Hillingdon's policies. This resubmission seems neither to have understood nor taken any account of these.

2. Apart from a very minor and insignificant cosmetic change (replacing one end of the pitched roof from a flat to a hipped end) the development would still fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or safeguard the design of existing and adjoining sites.

3. The retrospective porch will still be an incompatible and inappropriate change to the frontage which will affect and unbalance the symmetry of the semi detached pair of houses while the size, scale, bulk and design will not complement with the existing character and appearance of the original dwelling or the street scene.

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.

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

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character and appearance of the existing property and streetscene, the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers 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 Council's adopted SPD, the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions states in Section 8.0 that porches should be designed in character with the existing building, subordinate in scale and form and not extend past the line of any bay window. They should also generally be confined to the front entrance area and their roof should be finished in materials to match the main roof.

It is noted that application REF: 3191/APP/2018/4170 was refused on 26/2/19 mainly for size, scale and roof design of the development. It is noted that current proposed plans in terms of size, scale and design are quite similar to the previous refusal plans. The only difference is in the angle of the proposed roof which will match the existing western side pitch angle roof (replacing one end of the pitched roof from a gable to a hipped end). This change has not addressed the fundamental issues raised by the previous reason for refusal relating to the size, scale and roof design being an incongruous and overly dominant addition which is detrimental, to the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area.

As such it is considered that proposed development has not addressed the previous refusal reason and the proposal is recommend refusal.

It is noted that the property used to benefit from a porch with the same width and depth as the retrospective porch. The only difference is the height and design of the roof which has changed from a flat roof to a mono pitch roof which the eave height remains as 2.5m. The retrospective single storey front extension (porch) would measure 0.95m, 2.86m and 3.4m in depth, width and height respectively. Therefore, the retrospective porch appears as an incongruous change to the frontage, which will impact the symmetry of the pair and the street scene. Given the character of this and adjoining properties the front extension is unacceptable.

The retrospective extension would not be in line with the recommended dimensions as stated within the supplementary guidance and would not appear subordinate to the main dwelling by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and design and would not harmonise with the existing character and appearance of the original dwelling and street scene. The proposed extension would not comply with the objectives set out in Policies BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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.

Sufficient separation distance between the flank walls of the retrospective porch and the neighbouring properties, which is separated by the garage between, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook to the occupants of this property and therefore would be in accordance with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two: Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposal would not result in the loss of parking or private amenity space.

Given the above considerations, the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The front extension, by reason of its siting, size, scale and roof design results in an incongruous and overly dominant addition which is detrimental, to the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal is 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 - 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. 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. No pre-application advice was sought. However the applicant would have been aware of the previous 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.
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

Contact Officer: Hoda Sadri

Telephone No: 01895 250230