

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 15 SHARPS LANE RUISLIP

Development: Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 1 front rooflight

LBH Ref Nos: **23160/APP/2020/2106**

Drawing Nos: 4308/02
Location Plan (1:1250)
4308/01 Rev. A
Design and Access Statement

Date Plans Received: 08/07/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 08/07/2020

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises of a semi detached dwelling situated on the southern side of Sharps Lane. The property is constructed from buff coloured brick finish and tiled gable roof form which steeply project forward to the front at either end of the semi detached pair. The building is off its time however it has been designed in a manner which is in keeping with the surrounding suburban aesthetic. The rear garden is flat and frontage is covered in hardstanding which provides space to park approximately 2 vehicles, and is partly enclosed by a low level white rendered wall. The application site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This application proposes the conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and front rooflight, and alterations to side elevation

1.3 Relevant Planning History

23160/APP/2013/3877 15 Sharps Lane Ruislip

Conversion of garage into habitable space involving alterations to front elevation, installation of rooflight to front and installation of white u-PVC windows in the principal elevation (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision Date: 19-02-2014 Approved

23160/APP/2019/3333 15 Sharps Lane Ruislip

Conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and front rooflight, and alterations to side elevation.

Decision Date: 04-12-2019 Refused

23160/APP/2020/2510 15 Sharps Lane Ruislip

Single storey rear extension

Decision Date:

Comment on Planning History

23160/APP/2013/3877 - Conversion of garage into habitable space involving alterations to front elevation, installation of rooflight to front and installation of white u-PVC windows in the principal elevation (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development) Granted 19/2/2014

23160/APP/2019/3333 - Conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and front roof light, and alterations to side elevation. - Refused 4/12/019 for the following reason: -

The roof alterations/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 semi-detached dwelling, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of host dwelling and the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1, HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 12th August 2020

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

5 neighbouring properties and the local residents association were consulted by letter dated 13/7/2020 and a press notice was published in the local paper. The consultation periods expired on 3/8/2020 and 12/8/2020 respectively. No local response.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE

Conservation & Urban Design Officer:

Summary of comments: Objections - less than substantial harm - amendments required

Historic Environment Designation(s) - Ruislip Village Conservation Area (RVCA)

Assessment - background/significance

The existing property is a mid-20th century semi-detached dwelling located within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The property forms part of the Metroland development of Ruislip, influenced by the railway.

The pair of properties are characterised by their buff coloured brick finish and tiled gable roof form which steeply project forward to the front at either end of the semi detached pair. The building is off its time however it has been designed in a manner which is in keeping with the surrounding suburban aesthetic.

A similar proposal was previously refused (ref: 23160/APP/2019/3333).

Assessment - impact

As per previous comments, the proposed large box dormer to the rear roof slope would be considered in principle unacceptable. It would result in a substantial built mass at roof level which would fail to remain subordinate to the main dwelling. The stepped nature of dormer does little to reduce the overall bulk of the dormer. Box dormers of this scale and style are not as established feature within the conservation area and it would set an unwelcome precedent.

Taking into account the character and style of the host dwelling there is scope for dormer to the rear. However it would need to be designed as a secondary, subservient feature. The proposed dormer would be of the same width and height as the recently refused scheme. The dormer would need to be substantially reduced in size. In order to appear as a secondary feature to the roof the width would need to be no wider than the windows at first floor. Ideally it should be proportionately smaller. It is strongly recommended the dormer is amended to a shed dormer form with a sloping tiled roof.

The side cheeks of the dormer should be finished to match the existing dwelling or with hung tiles to match the roof.

A statutory duty is placed upon the decision maker, under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the preservation and/or enhancement of the conservation area. There would be concerns that the proposed development would fail to do either in this instance. Nevertheless, the development in this instance would result in less than substantial harm to the conservation area. In any instance paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) would need to be taken into account.

Conclusion: Objections - less than substantial harm - amendments required

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

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 7.4 (2016) Local character

LPP 7.8 (2016) Heritage assets and archaeology

NPPF- 16 NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

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. There is no impact on parking provision as a result of this development.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design.

Policy DMHB 4: Conservation Areas of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all new development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, within a Conservation Area or on its fringes, will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. In order to achieve this, the Council will: A) Require proposals for new development, including any signage or advertisement, to be of a high quality contextual design. Proposals should exploit opportunities to restore any lost features and/or introduce new ones that would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all development, including extensions and alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design including harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures. Policy DMHB 11 continues by stating that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 (E) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that 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; ii) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;

A1.20 The design of roof extensions should not create a dominant 'top heavy' appearance out of proportion with the rest of the building. It should be lower than the height of the main ridge and sit well above the eaves and away from the roof's hips and valleys. As a guide, new roof extensions should not cover more than a third of the main roof.

A1.21 A dormer window should be no larger in size than those on the first floor and comprise an individual window and roof. This is preferable to a roof extension and will be required in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character. Only rear roof extensions and rear dormer windows will be considered acceptable.

The proposed rear dormer would be set down from the main roof ridge, set up from the eaves (1000mm) and in from the roof sides. Although it is acknowledged that the dormer would be approximately 4.4m in width, which would equate to two thirds of the average width of the original roof at 6.6m, the resulting bulk and scale of the dormer would cover more than a third of the main roof slope. It would result in a substantial built mass at roof level which would fail to remain subordinate to the main dwelling. The stepped nature of

dormer does little to reduce the overall bulk of the dormer. Box dormers of this scale and style are not as established feature within the conservation area and it would set an unwelcome precedent.

Consequently, the proposed rear dormer window, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip 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 DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and the NPPF.

Impact on residential amenity

Policy DMHD 1 states that alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved

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.

The proposed loft conversion and rear dormer is not considered to harm the living condition of the neighbouring properties by reason of its design, scale and siting within the plot boundaries.

Furthermore, it is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the roof 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 DMHD 1 section A (vi) states that sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. The property benefits from a good sized rear garden and would not be affected by the proposed development.

The current parking provision would not be affected by the development.

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed rear dormer window, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip 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 DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and the NPPF.

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.

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:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 7.4	(2016) Local character
LPP 7.8	(2016) Heritage assets and archaeology
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Diane Verona

Telephone No: 01895 250230