

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 BEAUFORT TILE KILN LANE HAREFIELD

Development: First floor rear extension and alterations to single storey rear roof from flat to pitched

LBH Ref Nos: **19064/APP/2018/2036**

Drawing Nos: 1020/P/1
1020/P/2

Date Plans Received: 01/06/2018 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 11/06/2018

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application property is located on the Western side of Tile Kiln Lane and consists of an extended two storey detached dwelling which has a gabled roof with white render and brick external facing. The rear garden is flat and enclosed by panel fencing. The front garden is hardsurfaced and forms an area of off-street parking.

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

This application proposes a first floor side/rear extension.

It is important to note that permission was granted on 05/05/99 for an erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey front extension and a single storey rear extension (involving demolition of the existing garage) (application 19064/D/99/0164). That permission was implemented.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

19064/APP/2018/661 Beaufort Tile Kiln Lane Harefield
First floor side/rear extension

Decision Date: 16-04-2018 Refused

19064/C/98/2287 Beaufort Tile Kiln Lane Harefield
Erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension and detached garage in front garden

Decision Date: 18-01-1999 Refused

19064/D/99/0164 Beaufort Tile Kiln Lane Harefield
Erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey front extension and a single storey rear extension (involving demolition of the existing garage)

Decision Date: 05-05-1999 Approved

Comment on Planning History

19064/D/99/0164 - erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey front extension and a single storey rear extension (involving demolition of the existing garage)
Decision: Approved on 05/05/99.

19064/APP/2018/661 - First floor side/rear extension
Decision: refused on 16/4/18.

REFUSAL REASONS:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its overall size, bulk and scale, in conjunction with previous substantial extensions, would be materially larger than the original building and therefore would significantly increase the built up appearance of the site. The proposal would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Policy 7.16 of the London Plan, Policies OL1 and OL4 (ii) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed first floor side/rear extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, width and triple hip roof design would constitute an overdevelopment of the plot, resulting in incongruous and unsympathetic additions to the original dwelling which would subsume and engulf its character to the detriment of the architectural composition of the original dwelling 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), 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.

3. The proposed first floor side/rear extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and proximity to the side boundary, would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, Silver Birches, 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. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP 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

5 neighbouring properties, along with the Ruislip Residents Association, were consulted by letter dated 13/6/18 and a site notice was displayed in the area.

By the close of the consultation period on 13/7/18, no objection was received.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

Standard Informatives

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains

Part 2 Policies:

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

OL4 Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings

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.

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 7.16 (2016) Green Belt

NPPF- 13 NPPF-13 2018 - Protecting Green Belt land

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, provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property and provision of off-street parking provision and the impact on the Green Belt.

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 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 which should appear subordinate in scale to the original building.

Section 5.0 HDAS advises that two storey side or first floor side extensions should be set back a minimum of 1 m from the side boundary to protect the character and appearance of the street scene and protect the gaps between properties. Where a single storey side extension exists and is within 1 m of the boundary, the first floor extension should be set in a minimum of 1.5 m. It further advises that for semi-detached properties; the extension

should be set back 1 m from the front building line of the existing house and set down 0.5 m at roof level to ensure a subordinate appearance. In order to ensure extensions maintain a subordinate appearance to the original dwelling they should not protrude out too far from the rear wall of the original house.

Section 6.0 Two storey Rear or first floor rear Extensions states detached houses, an extension up to 4 m deep is acceptable. The new roof should appear subordinate to the original roof and so have a ridge height at least 0.5 m lower than the original roof. Moreover, section 6.2 states large two storey extensions, which are positioned close to a boundary, may not be acceptable if they have a significant overshadowing and overbearing effect on the habitable rooms of adjoining dwellings. In this respect any two storey extension extending beyond a 45° horizontal angle measured from the middle of a principle window to a habitable room on the adjoining dwelling may not be acceptable.

Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states:

"A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
 - not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
 - not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority."

UDP Policy OL4 states that the local planning authority will only permit the replacement or extension of buildings within the green belt if:

- (i) the development would not result in any disproportionate change in the bulk and character of the original building;
- (ii) the development would not significantly increase the built up appearance of the site;
- (iii) having regard to the character of the surrounding area the development would not injure the visual amenities of the green belt by reason of siting, materials, design, traffic or activities generated

With regards to the impact on the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt under Local Planning Policy the floor area increase normally permitted is 50%, however the NPPF allows for extensions that do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. It is important to note that permission was granted on 05/05/99 for the erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey front extension

and a single storey rear extension (involving demolition of the existing garage) (application 19064/D/99/0164). That permission was implemented. Therefore, the total floor area of the previous extension (164.86 sq.m) and total area of the proposed development (50.49 sq.m) would measure 215.35 square metres, with the host dwelling measuring a total of 235.9 square metres. The proposed extensions would measure a maximum of 92% of the original floor area, and as such the proposed extension, in conjunction with previous substantial extensions to the property, by reason of its size, scale, siting and design would not integrate with the character and appearance of the host dwelling would not appear as proportionate and subordinate to the original dwelling and would result in a gross overdevelopment when compared to the original dwelling on site and would have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the character of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policy 7.16 of the London Plan, Policies OL1 and OL4 (ii) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal is therefore inappropriate development in the Metropolitan Green Belt, and no very special circumstances have been suggested.

The proposed first floor side/rear extension would wrap across the rear wall of the existing house and would be 2.7 and 3.7 m deep and 16.6 m wide. The proposal would be characterised by one feature gable with one hipped roof which is almost central to the rear elevation measuring a maximum height of 8.05 m which would have a ridge height by approximately 0.86 m lower than the original roof which complies with the ridge height for first floor side/rear extensions, as specified in paragraph 5.8 and 6.6 of the HDAS SPD. The HDAS states extensions to detached dwellings up to a maximum of 4 m deep would be acceptable. The proposed first floor side extension would have a width of 4.4 m, which is between half and two-thirds of the original house width (13.58 m) so it complies with paragraph 5.10 of the HDAS SPD.

Furthermore, the proposed roof profile should match that of the existing roof. This would not be possible as the property would have a feature gable with one hipped roof and a very large crown/almost flat roof profile, which is a consequence of the fact that it is too wide, and thus would result in an extension which would be a considerable change to the character and appearance of the existing property and which fails to be subordinate to the original property. This results in an unbalanced appearance between the other dwellings in wider area and would impact unduly on the character and appearance of the existing and adjoining properties and the visual amenities of the street scene and the area in general.

Policy BE22 states residential extensions of two or more storeys in height should be set back for the full height a minimum of 1 m from the shared boundary to preserve the visually open gaps between properties and preventing dwellings from coalescing to form a terraced appearance.

HDAS Section 5.0 and 6.0 sets out the requirements for first floor side/rear extensions on semi-detached properties and requires a 1 m set back from the front building line on ground and first floor level and a 1.5 m set in from the side boundary when there is an existing single storey side extension. The application already benefits from a single storey side/rear extension and the proposed first floor side/rear extension would be set-in by 2 m from the shared boundary with Silver Birches for the full depth of the proposal and therefore would retain a sufficient separation distance and therefore would comply with policy BE22 and HDAS SPD.

As such, the proposed extension does not appear subordinate to the main dwelling by

virtue of its size, scale roof design and would not harmonise with the existing dwelling, and it is considered that it would not be in keeping with the architectural integrity of the dwelling and the character and appearance of the surrounding area, thereby the proposal would not comply with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 and OL4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008) and NPPF.

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.

The proposed extension by reason of its size, scale and location would not have an adverse impact on the light levels of the adjoining and nearby properties given the separation distance and the set in of the two storey element from the boundary.

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).

The proposed development would therefore accord with Policies BE20, BE21, and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two: Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

In terms of the provision of usable garden area, the proposal would retain approximately 1462 sq.m of rear usable amenity area which would be sufficient to serve a 4 plus bedroom dwelling and would therefore comply with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two: Saved UDP Policies and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement for residential extensions (HDAS).

The existing hardsurfaced front garden is capable of accommodating at least 2 parking spaces, a provision which is considered adequate for a dwelling of this size. As such, the proposal would not have any conflict with the objectives of Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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, bulk and scale, in conjunction with previous substantial extensions, would represent a disproportionate change in the bulk and character of the original building and therefore would significantly increase the built up appearance of the site and would be visually intrusive within the street scene and the wider area. The proposal would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to Policies OL1, OL4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.16 of the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed first floor side/rear extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design would constitute an overdevelopment of the plot, resulting in incongruous and unsympathetic additions to the original dwelling which would subsume and engulf its character to the detriment of the architectural composition of the original dwelling 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), 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 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.
 - 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. The Council's supports pre-application discussions however we have 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.
-
- 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.EM2 | (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains |

Part 2 Policies:

- | | |
|------|--|
| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |
|------|--|

OL4	Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings
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.
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 7.16	(2016) Green Belt
NPPF- 13	NPPF-13 2018 - Protecting Green Belt land

Contact Officer: Hoda Sadri

Telephone No: 01895 250230