

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 7 WINDRUSH CLOSE ICKENHAM

Development: Single storey front and side extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include raising of ridge height, 3 rear and 1 front dormers, 1 front roof light and and conversion of both sides of roof from hip to gable end

LBH Ref Nos: **31527/APP/2020/1684**

Drawing Nos: N.P. 4
 N.P. 5
 N.P. 2
 N.P. 3

Date Plans Received: 27/05/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 27/05/2020

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the south side of Windrush Close and comprises a single storey detached bungalow. The frontage is mainly laid to lawn with a driveway in excess of 13m that provides off street parking for two vehicles

To the east lies No.5 a two storey detached dwelling house and to the west lies No. 9, a neighbouring detached bungalow both of which have been extended to the side and the rear. The surrounding area is residential in character with a mixture of detached bungalows and two storey dwelling houses.

The site adjoins the boundary of an area covered by TPO 740 to the west and south west and also TPO 389 to the south east. TPO 389 also covers a very small area in the south east corner of the rear garden of the subject site however there are no protected trees within the curtilage of the application site

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The current application seeks planning permission for a single storey front and side extension, and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include raising of ridge height, 3 rear and 1 front dormers, 1 front roof light and and conversion of roof from hip to gable end.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

No planning history

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**

7 neighbouring properties and the local residents association were consulted by letter dated 25/6/2020. The consultation period expired on 16/7/2020

No local response

The Trees & Landscaping officer commented as follows: -

This site is occupied by a bungalow at the southern end of a residential short cul-de-sac off Woodstock Drive. The property has an integral garage which is accessed from a driveway along the west boundary of the plot. There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site.

COMMENT: No trees or landscape features of merit will be affected by the proposal. The extended footprint of the building will result in the loss of a garage parking space and part of the existing driveway, with the potential to park car(s) in the remaining area of hard standing. No details of the front garden layout have been provided, however, if the front garden / parking layout is re-arranged, a reasonable area of living green front garden should be retained.

RECOMMENDATION: No objection subject to conditions RES9 (parts 1, 2 and 5).

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 14 Trees and Landscaping

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

LPP 7.4 (2016) Local character

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 the 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 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 have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extensions of dwellings should 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 required that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers. This sets out the design criteria including external dimensions by which proposals are assessed with the general aim of ensuring that these are subordinate to the original building.

C) Side Extensions

i) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property;

D) Front Extensions

i) alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused;

E) Roof Extensions

i) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, 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 of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line;

A1.21 A dormer window should be no larger in size than those on the first floor and comprise an individual window and roof. Only rear roof extensions and rear dormer windows will be considered acceptable

The proposed single storey front and side extension would be flush with the front building line, have a depth of 6.7m and a width of 5.5 m, which would be less than half the width of the original dwelling house of 12.5 m (including the attached garage). That said, it would be set under a pitched roof which would also include the raising of the main roof ridge line together with the alteration of the original roof from a hip to a gable end. This would include the provision of additional habitable accommodation within the enlarged roofspace together with the construction of a front dormer. In addition, although not across the full width of the front elevation, it would be flush with the front building line and therefore it would have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. It would also alter the overall appearance of the original 'L' shaped footprint of the existing dwelling house and consequently fail to appear as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling.

The proposed single storey side and rear extension would have a width of 3 m, set under a pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.4 m and set well back from the front building line. The conversion of the original and additional roof space would also include the construction of three rear dormer windows and the provision of two additional bedrooms.

The application property is one of a pair of detached properties in a small residential cul-de-sac located off Woodstock Drive. Access to the cul-de-sac is taken between two properties which front on to Woodstock Drive via a narrow spur road which opens out to a small circular turning head, around which 7 detached properties are located.

The two bungalows are characterised by their square-plan front projections with a subsidiary hipped roof above. The application property, like the other bungalow, currently retains a hipped roof.

The application proposal contains a number of elements, in addition to a hip-to-gable elevation of both sides of the roof, including raising of ridge height, 3 rear and 1 front dormers, 1 front roof light and a single storey side/front and rear extension.

The proposed single storey front and side extension would be flush with the front building line, have a depth of 6.7m and a width of 5.5 m, which would be less than half the width of the original dwelling house of 12.5 m (including the attached garage). That said, it would be set under a roof which would also include the raising of the main roof ridge line together with the alteration of the original roof from a hip to a gable end. This would include the provision of additional habitable accommodation within the enlarged roof space together with the construction of a front dormer. In addition, although not across the full width of the front elevation, it would be flush with the front building line and therefore it would have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. It would alter the overall appearance of the original 'L' shaped footprint of the dwelling house and consequently fails to appear as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling.

The proposed side/front extension together with the hip-to-gable conversion and the raising of the height of the ridge would be large additions to an otherwise modest detached bungalow and when viewed from the front, would entirely subsume the existing property's front/side elevations. The proposal would incorporate a significant area of flat/crown roof to the front. This would introduce an incongruous roof form which, because of its form and extent, would dominate the resulting building, to the overall detriment of the building's character.

The extension would be flush with the front of the main house, in line with the front projecting element. Its positioning relative to this front projection would undermine the visual prominence of the front projection and thus the character of the bungalow.

Views into Windrush Close are restricted to a degree until past the visual pinch-point created by the boundary fences alongside the spur leading into the turning head itself. However, the application property, given its position at the head of the cul-de-sac is very visible.

The visual impact of the scale and design of the proposed extension, hip-to-gable conversion and the raising of the height of the ridge and their relationship with the existing main building, would therefore be fully felt immediately upon entering Windrush Close, where the scale of the extensions relative to the host building would be instantly seen and keenly felt. The visible extent of the property would be greatly increased and the modest proportions of the existing building would instead be subsumed by the extensions proposed.

For the reasons set out above, the proposed side/front extension, hip-to-gable conversion and the raising of the height of the ridge would fail to secure design of the highest standard. The overall size and scale relative to the main house and expanse of flat/crown roof would fail to adequately take into account the scale, character and appearance of the host property and of those around it. The extensions would fail to appear subordinate to the main house in terms of its scale and form, whilst the extension would erode or fail to take into account local context and characteristic features such as the front projecting

element. The side/front extension is, thus, contrary to policies DMHD1 and DMHB 11.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that for Planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Due to the orientation of subject site the proposed front extension would compromise the 45 degree line of sight from the windows in the front elevation of the adjacent property at 9 Windrush Close and would therefore harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of this neighbouring dwelling from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over-dominance.

The neighbouring property to the east at 5 Windrush Close would not be adversely affected by the development as the single storey side and rear extension element would extend to a depth of 4m beyond this property's rear wall. The single storey front extension would be located on the western boundary and would not be visible from No. 5 Windrush Close

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).

The proposed development would not result in a loss of rear usable amenity by reason of its siting and would comply with Policy DMHB 18 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

The site would retain two off road parking spaces to the front of the property in accordance with Policy DMT 6 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed side/rear/front extension, together with the hip-to-gable conversion and the raising of the height of the ridge, by reason of their siting in a visually prominent position, size, scale, bulk and design would represent an overbearing and incongruous form of development that would fail to appear as subordinate additions or 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), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The single storey front extension by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and depth would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 9 Windrush Close by reason of visual intrusion and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies

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. We have however 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.

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 14	Trees and Landscaping
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
LPP 7.4	(2016) Local character

Contact Officer: Diane Verona

Telephone No: 01895 250230