

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** 127 BEVERLEY ROAD RUISLIP**Development:** Part two storey part single storey side/rear extension**LBH Ref Nos:** **48927/APP/2020/282****Drawing Nos:** 2074.2 REV B
2074.1 REV A
Location Plan**Date Plans Received:** 28/01/2020**Date(s) of Amendment(s):****Date Application Valid:** 28/01/2020**1. CONSIDERATIONS****1.1 Site and Locality**

The application relates to an end of terraced dwelling located on the corner junction of Bessingby Road and Beverley Road. The building is set back from the highway of Beverley Road, benefits from off road parking to the front driveway and the external walls of the building have been finished in facing white render. The property has a centrally pitched hipped roof and is adjoining by a terraced dwellings to the south and the highway of Bessingby Road to the north. The dwelling has a private garden to the rear of the building.

The application site lies within a 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This application proposes part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension

The current application is a slightly amended version of a previously refused application which was refused on 27/11/19 (48927/APP/2019/3229). The essential differences are:

- The single storey side/rear extension will benefit from a mono pitch roof to the front and a flat roof to the back which would be 3.6m and 3.3m high respectively
- The proposed first floor side/rear extension would be set back from the front elevation by 2.78m
- The proposed first floor side/rear extension would be 3.52m wide to the rear which will be reduced comparing to previous application from 4.9m
- The proposed first floor side/rear extension would be set-in from the side by 1.67m

1.3 Relevant Planning History

48927/APP/2019/3229 127 Beverley Road Ruislip

Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension

Decision Date: 27-11-2019 Refused

Comment on Planning History

48927/APP/2019/3229 - Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey

rear extension. Refused on 27/11/19.

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

4 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 30/1/20 and a site notice was displayed in the area. By the close of the consultation period, no objections were received.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

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, protection and long-term retention of valuable trees and provision of off-street parking provision.

Policy DMHD 1: Planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that:

i) there is no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area; ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; iii) new extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height; iv) new extensions respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials; v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers; vi) adequate garden space is retained; vii) adequate off-street parking is retained, as set out in Table 1: Parking Standards in Appendix C; viii) trees, hedges and other landscaping features are retained; and ix) all extensions in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, and to Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, are designed in keeping with the original house, in terms of layout, scale, proportions, roof form, window pattern, detailed design and materials.

B) Rear Extensions

- i) single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth or 3.6 metres where the plot width is 5 metres or more;
- ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- iii) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level;
- iv) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet;
- v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;
- vi) two storey extensions should not extend into an area provided by a 45-degree line of sight drawn from the centre of the nearest ground or first floor habitable room window of an adjacent property and should not contain windows or other openings that overlook other houses at a distance of less than 21 metres;
- vii) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house;
- viii) pitched roofs on extensions should be of a similar pitch and materials to that of the original roof and subordinate to it in design. Large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported; and

C) Side Extensions

- i) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property;
- ii) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded;
- iii) garages should reflect the size guidelines set out in Appendix C Parking standards;
- iv) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary or in the case of properties in the Copse Wood and Gatehill Estates, at least 1.5 metres, but more if on a wider than average plot, in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses;
- v) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation;
- vi) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported;

The proposed single storey side/rear extension would be constructed flush with front elevation, wrap across the rear wall of the existing house to a maximum depth and length of 3.6m and 9.93m respectively. The proposed extension would have a mono pitch to the front and a flat roof to the rear to the height of 3.6 and 3.3m respectively which doesn't comply with the DMHD 1. The proposed single storey side/rear extension would have a depth of 3.6m, which complies with the maximum 3.6m depth for rear extensions at terraced dwellings on a plot more than 5m wide as specified in DMHD 1. The proposed single storey side/rear extension would have a width of 2.25m, which is less than half of the original house width (5.26m) so it complies with DMHD 1.

The proposed part two storey side/rear extension would be set back by 2.78m from the principal elevation at first level. The proposal would measure 1.2m in width to the front at first floor, would extend the full depth of the existing dwelling across the flank elevation by approximately 9.93m in length at both level. The 1.2m side extension width to the front would be less than half of the main house (5.3m) and therefore complies with the DMHD 1. However, the proposal would measure 3.52m in width to the rear at first floor which would be considerably more than half of the main house (5.3 m) and therefore doesn't

comply with the DMHD 1. The proposed part two storey side/rear extension would be characterised by a pitch roof measuring a maximum height of 7.17m which be lowered by 1m from the original ridge. The proposed two storey side/rear extension would wrap across the rear wall of the existing house to a maximum depth of 3.6m at both level and therefore complies with DMHD 1.

The proposed part two storey side/rear extension would be set-in by 0.78m from the shared boundary with Bessingby Road which would be reduced to 0.18m to the rear of the proposal at ground floor and would be set-in by 1.67m from the shared boundary with Bessingby Road which would be reduced to 1.24m to the rear of the proposal at first floor. As such, it would not retain a sufficient separation distance. The lack of set in from the side boundary at both levels results in the closing of the visually open gap between this and neighbouring property, giving rise to a cramped form of development, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene and therefore doesn't comply with policy DMHD 1.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and 12 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should also not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. The Council will aim to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents and it will resist proposals where there is an unreasonable level of overlooking between habitable rooms of adjacent residential properties or onto private open spaces. A minimum of 21m separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain privacy. The Council will also expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook.

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 from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over-dominance. 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.129. 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. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

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).

Policy DMHB 18 requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. There would be sufficient garden space retained.

The proposal would benefit from two existing off road parking spaces to the front of the house. It is therefore considered the proposal would not result in demand for on street

parking and would be in accordance with Policy DMT 6 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by reason of its overall size, scale, bulk, depth, width and proximity to the side boundary, 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 DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and 12 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

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:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Hoda Sadri

Telephone No: 01895 250230