

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

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey end of terrace property situated on the western side of Lime Tree Grove. The property is set beneath a hipped roof and currently benefits from a single storey side addition forming a garage. The property is set in a good sized plot with an area of landscaping and two additional parking spaces to the front and a good sized rear garden.

The area is residential in character and appearance comprising a mix of property types. There is a rear access path of 0.78m width serving no. 101, which runs between the application site and no. 105. The application site lies within the 'developed area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning consent for the erection of a two storey side extension, a small single storey side extension and the conversion of the loft space to habitable use, including a rear dormer window.

It is noted that the site location plan and the extent of the plot have changed from the previous submission. There is an existing access path to the rear garden of no. 101, which runs between nos. 103 and 105 and is fenced off from the rear garden of no. 103. This area was previously excluded but has been included within this proposal. Notwithstanding this, even if this land is within the ownership of no. 103, this pathway is separate and appears to allow shared access. As such it is not considered to form part of the curtilage of the dwelling and the assessment is based on the physical boundary identified by the fence on the site.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

75001/APP/2019/2545 103 Lime Grove Ruislip

Two storey side extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end

Decision Date: 01-10-2019 Refused

Comment on Planning History

The previous application (75001/APP/2019/2545) was refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and gable end roof design, would result in an incongruous addition which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the small terrace of houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area.
- 2) The roof alteration/extensions, by reason of the size, scale, bulk, and design of the rear dormer window would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area.
- 3) The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its size, scale, design and proximity to the side boundary, would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, 105 Lime Grove, giving rise to a cramped form of development and possible terracing effect, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area generally.

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

6 neighbours and the Eastcote Residents' Association were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 25 February 2020. A site notice was also erected on the telegraph pole opposite expiring on the 5 March 2020. There have been no responses.

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

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings and provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property.

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon 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 take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. It should also not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also requires that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers. Side extensions should not exceed more than half the width of the original house and two storey extensions should be set in a minimum of 1m from the side boundary. It further advises that dormer windows should be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves.

The proposed extension has not been shown on the submitted site plan; however the boundary line (including the side access path) is indicated on the proposed ground floor plan. The site plan appears to indicate the original dwelling at the rear is set back 4.13m from the boundary of no. 105 and this includes the access path of 0.78m and to the front the garage is set back 1.7m (also including the access path). These dimensions are consistent with the previously submitted plans. However the indicative boundary line on the proposed ground floor plan has the existing dwelling set back 4.273m and 1.92m respectively. As previously advised the assessment does not include the access path and the measurements are taken from the site plan as this is consistent with the previous plans.

The proposed two storey side extension measures 2.35m in width and 8.3 m in depth (the full depth of the house), set beneath an extended roofline, including the change to the pitch (39 degrees to 44 degrees) of the existing hipped roof. This is set back 0.8m from the side boundary with the access path that leads to the rear of no. 101. To the side of this is a smaller single storey extension of 0.6m in width and 4.28m in depth (set back 3.79m from the front elevation). This is set beneath a pitched roof of 3.45m in height. Although the proposal would comply with policy in terms of width, the proposed extension set in close proximity to the side boundary, would result in cramped form of development. The side boundary has been inconsistently shown, but assuming a hypothetical side boundary in terms of the set in from the boundary runs down the middle of the access path, the scheme fails to maintain a 1m set in for the full height of the proposal, contrary to policy. The proposed change in roof pitch would also unbalance the appearance of the terrace when viewed as a whole. To the rear of the property it is also proposed to include a

dormer window. This would measure 4.7m in width, 3.25m in depth and 2.4m in height. The proposed dormer is larger than the average width of the original roofslope (4.4m) and would fail to appear as a subservient addition to the roof slope. Although this proposal has removed the hip to gable change previously proposed, it is largely unchanged from the previous submission and still presents a large and bulky addition to the original property. It fails to integrate into the existing terrace and would represent an incongruous addition to the existing properties. Also the resultant two storey extension in such close proximity to the boundary will have a negative impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the development fails to comply with the requirements of Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

The side extension would be set between the existing property and the flank wall of the neighbouring property at no. 105 and would not contravene a 45 degree line of sight. The principle windows will face front and rear and will not significantly increase any overlooking and loss of privacy. In terms of the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenities therefore, the proposal complies with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon 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 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Policy DMHD 1 (appendix A, Part A) vi), states that for alterations and extensions to residential dwellings; adequate garden space should be retained. The property benefits from a reasonable sized garden and sufficient garden space retained.

The existing garage would not provide a parking space due to its restricted size so that there would be no loss of off-street parking as a result of the proposal. There is sufficient space to the front of the property to provide a minimum of 2 car parking spaces in compliance with adopted standards.

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 and increase in the pitch of the main roof, would result in an incongruous addition which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the small terrace of houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The roof alteration/extensions, by reason of the size, scale, bulk, and design of the rear dormer window would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -

Development Management Policies (2020).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by reason of its size, scale, design and proximity to the side boundary, would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, No. 105 Lime Grove, giving rise to a cramped form of development and terracing effect, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

INFORMATIVES

- 1** On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2016). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.
- 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 Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

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

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

Telephone No: 01895 250230