

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 134 LONG LANE HILLINGDON

Development: Part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension and porch to front

LBH Ref Nos: **74860/APP/2020/2461**

Drawing Nos: A101
 A102
 A103
 A104
 A105

Date Plans Received: 06/08/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 19/10/2020

Date Application Valid: 28/08/2020

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the east side of Long Lane. The application property is setback from the adjacent highway with front garden providing car parking spaces. To the rear is an enclosed garden and a side access. To the front is an existing vehicular access and a low level boundary fence.

The application site is not within a conservation area and no listed buildings are within close proximity.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is seeking planning permission for single storey front porch extension; single storey side/rear infill wraparound extension and part first floor rear and side extension.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

74860/APP/2019/1823 134 Long Lane Hillingdon

Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4 metres, for which the maximum height would be 3.9 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 metres

Decision Date: 22-07-2019 PRN

74860/APP/2019/3350 134 Long Lane Hillingdon

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and porch to front

Decision Date: 06-12-2019 Refused

74860/APP/2020/2165 134 Long Lane Hillingdon

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and porch to front

Decision Date: 29-09-2020 Approved

74860/PRC/2020/17 134 Long Lane Hillingdon

Two storey side and rear extension

Decision Date: 12-06-2020 OBJ

Comment on Planning History

74860/APP/2019/3350: Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and porch to front. Refused

74860/APP/2019/1823 - Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4 metres, for which the maximum height would be 3.9 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 metres. - Prior Approval N/Req

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 and Oak Farm Resident Association were consulted on 05-08-20. 3 representations were received against the proposal on the following grounds;

1. The proposal will be out character and appearance of the area.
2. Impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light and overshadowing.
3. The proposal will be less subservient and breaches established and common building lines

Highway comment. No objection

Flood and Water Management : No comment

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

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 consideration for this application are impact on the neighbouring property, impact on the appearance and character of the area and provision of acceptable residential amenity and parking space for the application property.

Impact on character and appearance

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 DMHD 1 states that 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; iii) new extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height;

Section B states that 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;

Section C states that (i) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property; iv) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary; and 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.

Section D (ii) states that porches should be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building; pastiche features will not be supported;

Policy DMHB 11 states that new development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including: i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures.

The local area is characterised by semi-detached houses separated by notable breaks between the buildings and pairs of houses. However, the gaps among the row of houses within the immediate vicinity have been closed up with side extension over the years. 134 Long Lane is a two storey semi-detached pair separated from the adjoining property at 136 Long Lane and setback from the neighbouring property at No.136.

The applicant has proposed to infill this gap with a two storey side extension along the shared boundary with the ground siting along the shared boundary & first floor element set off from the boundary by 1m and the ridge height set down from the original ridge height by 0.5m. The ground floor wraparound extension would have a 6m depth beyond the original rear elevation, protrude beyond the rear elevation of adjoining properties on both sides of the application site. The ground floor side infill extension will sit along the shared boundary closing the existing gap along this common boundary. The first floor rear extension would protrude beyond the rear elevation by 3.6m and will be set off from both adjoining boundaries such that 45 degree line of sight will not be severely impacted when taken from the nearest windows within the adjacent properties. The single storey front porch extension would have a floor area of 3 sqm and considered acceptable. Part of the proposal would be visible from the street scene, while the rest would be located towards the rear of the application site.

The proposed development will result in significant alterations to the property, materially changing its appearance. The resultant property will be of greater overall width and depth. Whilst the proposed first floor is set-off from the boundary, the ground floor side infill extension would not be setback from the side boundary closing up the existing gap appearing obtrusive within the street scene.

The proposal by reason of the ground floor side extension siting on the side boundary would close the existing gap along the boundary such that it will fail to respect the character of the existing building and fail to harmonise with the scale, form and proportions of the original building and adjacent buildings. As such, the proposal will have adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance and quality of the existing street or wider area. The proposal, therefore, would not accord with the above policies.

Impact on residential amenity

Policy DMHD1 section B states that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers; 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.

The application site is bordered by properties at No. 132 and 136 on the south and north respectively. The application property is setback from the building at No.136.

The property at No.132 would not be significantly affected by the proposed development, given that the rear extension would not break the 45 degree line of sight within the first floor rear element of the proposal and the ground floor rear extension will only protrude beyond the rear elevation by 2m. The proposal by reason of its design, scale, siting and boundary relationship is not considered to harm the amenity of this property in terms of loss of light, overbearing and loss of privacy.

The proposed ground floor side infill extension would sit alongside the shared boundary with No.136 with no separation distance and protrude beyond the rear elevation of the existing rear extension. The other element of the proposal comprising the first floor rear extensions would be set off from the boundary with a degree of separation to ensure the development does not tower over the rear garden of the adjacent property.

The proposed side/rear extension will undoubtedly be a noticeable addition from the rear windows of No.136, it is considered that it would be overbearing or cause a loss of light into the garden area of this property. The proposal by virtue of its design in terms of the depth of the ground floor side extension along the shared boundary in relation to adjoining property at No.136 is likely to cause significant loss to light penetrating into the adjoining property and loss of outlook as the proposed extension will overshadow the garden area within No.136.

Overall, it is considered that the development proposed would be detrimental to the residential amenity in terms of over-dominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would not be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

Furthermore, 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 proposal would not have negative impact on the highway and pedestrian safety, as no alteration is proposed to existing vehicular access. The application site would provide up to two off-street parking spaces within its front hardstanding area. The proposal would comply with policy DMT6 of the Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies

(2020).

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 sufficient private amenity space will be retained in accordance with the above policy.

Furthermore, paragraph 6.45 of the Adopted Local Plan states that in built up areas there is also the additional risk of flooding from surface water, due to rainwater falling onto impermeable surfaces which is the key flood risk identified for Hillingdon. Hillingdon's SWMP identifies Critical Drainage Areas in the Borough. In these areas strict control will be exercised to manage surface water.

The application site lies within critical drainage area, where householder development and minor extensions to commercial premises, are therefore required to contribute to a reduction in the rate of surface water runoff. This may include maximising areas of soft landscaping; ensuring all hard surfaces are permeable or drain into permeable features; and/or maximising areas of green roofs and walls. Given the location of the application site within a built area, it is unlikely that it will exacerbate the current surface water flood risk by reason of its design, scale and size of the development proposed.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development as it relates to the ground floor side/rear extension by reason of its design in terms of depth along the shared boundary with No.136 would result in closing the existing gap. It is considered that the development proposed would be detrimental to the residential amenity of adjoining neighbour in terms of over-dominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would not be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of the ground floor side extension closing up the existing gap and not be setback from the shared boundary, would fail to respect the character of the existing building and fail to harmonise with the scale, form and proportions of the original building and adjacent buildings. As such, the proposal will have adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance and quality of the existing street or wider area. The proposal, therefore, would not accord with Policy DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

INFORMATIVES

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

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Batatunde Aregbesola

Telephone No: 01895 250230