

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 20 MILTON COURT ICKENHAM

Development: Single storey side/rear extension and first floor rear extension

LBH Ref Nos: **74741/APP/2019/2442**

Drawing Nos: 20MC-2-02
 20MC-2-01
 Proposed Block Plan
 Design and Access and Planning Statement
 Existing Block Plan
 1:1250 Location Plan

Date Plans Received: 22/07/2019

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 29/07/2019

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

This is an attractive link-detached, Arts & Crafts influenced, 1930s property. It is one of many similar, but mostly individually designed houses on Milton Court which is situated within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.

Milton Court is formed around a rectangular green, having three gateway roads and being open and verdant in its landscaping. This property sits on the corner of one of these gateway roads and therefore holds a prominent position. No. 20, shares this gateway position with No.22 and has been designed with some matching architectural details to the east side elevation.

This property, No. 20, has a projecting bay to the principle elevation with a curved two storey bay window, with tiling, to the front, surmounted by bracketed, deep projecting eaves. The entrance porch appearances suggest that the existing porch was originally open and was enclosed at a later date. The rear wing sits under a half hipped gambrel roof and offers an impressive elevation to the streetscape of Almond Avenue. Unusually, three of its elevations front a highway. These elevations are therefore more important to the public realm than they would be if the property were in a more usual position.

The application site lies within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area as designated in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This application proposes a single storey side/rear extension and first floor rear extension

This is the second proposal for a similar scheme which was refused on 3/6/19 (ref: 74741/APP/2019/1194). This proposal seeks to extend the building with a wrap around (rear and side) single storey extension, extending 4m out to the rear, and a 2m deep inline extension to the first floor and roof. Changes to the front are to be addressed in a different application.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

74741/APP/2019/1194 20 Milton Court Ickenham

Single storey side/rear extension, first floor rear extension and extension to existing porch to front

Decision Date: 03-06-2019 Refused

74741/APP/2019/2464 20 Milton Court Ickenham

Porch to front

Decision Date:

Comment on Planning History

- 74741/APP/2019/1194 - Single storey side/rear extension, first floor rear extension and extension to existing porch to front - Refused on 3/6/19

Refusal reason:

The proposed single storey side/rear extension, front porch and rooflights, by reason of their size, scale, bulk, design and siting in this open prominent position would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ickenham Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore 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), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions and the NPPF.

- 74741/APP/2019/2464 - Porch to front
Under assessment

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 5th September 2019

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

4 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 31/7/19, together with the Ickenham Conservation Area Panel and the Ickenham Residents' Association and a site notice was displayed outside the site. By the close of the consultation period, 0 responses had been received.

1) Conservation and Urban Design Officer:

1 Summary of Comments

These proposals still fall short, failing to harmonise with the form of the building and failing to preserve or enhance the conservation area. Further revisions are needed, including the removal of the west side-extension and the rooflight to the rear half-hip, stepping back of the east side-extension from the rear and other changes to the rear single storey extension. See comments for further information.

2 Observations

As advised in previous comments the depth of the rear extension has been reduced to an acceptable 4m. However, the proposed extent of its width, which extends right across from behind the garage to beyond the West elevation of the rear wing, remains

unacceptable. It creates a dominant addition which fails to harmonise with the original form.

The change from dummy pitch to flat roof with parapet has reduced the horizontal emphasis introduced by the single storey extension, but these new proposals remain overly dominant. To reduce this further and better emphasise the rear form of the building the west side-extension should be removed and a respectful step-back created to the East side extension. This would help restore a sense of symmetry and vertical emphasis to this rear feature elevation.

The proposed rear glazed wall/door form and design is a very dominant feature, cutting across the rear elevation. It seems out of scale with the property and is not subservient to the rear elevation or other original features of the property. A quieter, design approach should be taken.

Rooflights are generally discouraged to streetscape elevations in conservation areas. The proposed rooflight to the rear half hip is not a desirable addition to the property nor the Almond Avenue streetscape. This half-hipped gambrel elevation is a key feature in a prominent position, replicated in the proposed extension. The addition of a roof light in this position would be detrimental and is clearly out of scale for the size of the slope.

The other conservation roof lights proposed are of acceptable scale and position but should lie flush within the tiles for a subtle effect, not all brands of conservation type rooflights achieve this. The flat rooflights proposed for the ground floor extension should be very low profile.

The form of the proposed second storey extension has not been changed and remains acceptable.

This is a significant extension proposed for a prominent position. Great care should be taken to harmonise with the existing in design, materials and detailing.

3 Recommendations

Revisions are suggested to the single storey rear/side extension. The west side extension should be removed as should the rear rooflight. See comments for more information.

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:

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.
BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
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 7.4	(2016) Local character
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original building, the conservation area and the street scene and the level of impact on the residential amenity and light levels of the adjoining neighbours.

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 location of the application property within the designated Ickenham Village Conservation Area is of considerable importance within the determination of this application, and it is imperative that any development accords with Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012), which states; 'New development within or on the fringes of Conservation Areas will be expected to preserve or enhance those features which contribute to their special architectural and visual qualities.'

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.

Section 3.0 Single Storey Rear Extensions states detached houses an extension up to 4m deep is acceptable. pitch roofs can be acceptable and must not exceed 3.4m 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 6 Two Storey Rear or First Floor Rear Extension states the extension should always be designed so as to appear 'subordinate' to the original house. Rear extensions will only be allowed where there is no significant over-dominance, overshadowing, loss of outlook and daylight. The first floor should not extend beyond a 45-degree angle. Detached houses an extension up to 4m deep is acceptable. The height of the extension should not normally exceed the height of the existing building. The roof lines of the

extension should normally be parallel to those of the existing building and the eaves line. 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.

Unusually, the situation of this property is such that 3 of its elevations front a highway. This seems to have been considered in the original design of these prominent elevations, which all have a pleasing degree of architectural detail, with the primary elevation facing the green. This means that the design of any extension to these elevations will be held to a high standard for approval.

This is the second proposal for a similar scheme which was refused on 3/6/19 (ref: 74741/APP/2019/1194). This proposal seeks to extend the building with a wrap around (rear and side) single storey extension, extending 4m out to the rear, and a 2m deep inline extension to the first floor and roof. Changes to the front are to be addressed in a different application.

The Conservation Officer was consulted and stated that " the depth of the rear extension has been reduced to an acceptable 4m. However, the proposed extent of its width, which extends right across from behind the garage to beyond the West elevation of the rear wing, remains unacceptable. It creates a dominant addition which fails to harmonise with the original form.

The change from dummy pitch to flat roof with parapet has reduced the horizontal emphasis introduced by the single storey extension, but these new proposals remain overly dominant. To reduce this further and better emphasise the rear form of the building the west side-extension should be removed and a respectful step-back created to the East side extension. This would help restore a sense of symmetry and vertical emphasis to this rear feature elevation.

The proposed rear glazed wall/door form and design is a very dominant feature, cutting across the rear elevation. It seems out of scale with the property and is not subservient to the rear elevation or other original features of the property. A quieter, design approach should be taken.

Rooflights are generally discouraged to streetscape elevations in conservation areas. The proposed rooflight to the rear half hip is not a desirable addition to the property nor the Almond Avenue streetscape. This half-hipped gambrel elevation is a key feature in a prominent position, replicated in the proposed extension. The addition of a roof light in this position would be detrimental and is clearly out of scale for the size of the slope.

The other conservation roof lights proposed are of acceptable scale and position but should lie flush within the tiles for a subtle effect, not all brands of conservation type rooflights achieve this. The flat rooflights proposed for the ground floor extension should be very low profile.

The form of the proposed second storey extension has not been changed and remains acceptable.

This is a significant extension proposed for a prominent position. Great care should be taken to harmonise with the existing in design, materials and detailing."

The conservation officer stated that the proposed scheme fails to preserve or enhance the conservation area. They also stated that further revisions are needed, including the removal of the west side-extension and the rooflight to the rear half-hip, stepping back of

the east side-extension from the rear and other changes to the rear single storey extension.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1, HE1 of the Council's Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19.

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. Policy BE22 applies to extensions of two or more storeys which seeks to retain a 1m set in from the boundary.

With regards to the impact on neighbouring residential amenity, it is considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse harm on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings at nos 18 and 22 from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over-dominance. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposed extension would be in accordance with the objectives set out in Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 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. 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).

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 proposal, by reason of the size, scale, bulk, siting and fenestration of the single storey side/rear extension and the siting of a rear rooflight on the first floor rear extension on this open prominent site, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ickenham Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore 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

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 and 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
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

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.

BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
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 7.4	(2016) Local character
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Hoda Sadri

Telephone No: 01895 250230