

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 19 LAWN AVENUE WEST DRAYTON

Development: Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension

LBH Ref Nos: **75358/APP/2020/4075**

Drawing Nos: ART/DEC2020/DSE19LA/EL (Existing and Proposed Roof Plan)
ART/DEC2020/DSE19LA/SPLP
ART/DEC2020/DSE19LA/PL
ART/DEC2020/DSE19LA/PE
Flood Risk Assessment
Supporting Statement
ART/DEC2020/DSE19LA/EL (Existing Ground and First Floor Plans)
ART/DEC2020/DSE19LA/EE

Date Plans Received: 08/12/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 08/12/2020

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site relates to a two storey detached dwellinghouse located on the south side of Lawn Avenue. The application property is setback from the adjacent highway with front garden laid in hardstanding with a vehicular access off Lawn Avenue. To the rear is an enclosed garden. The application site is bordered by residential properties. The immediate neighbouring properties at 17 & 21 are located east and south-west side respectively. The application site lies within the Garden City, West Drayton Area of Special Local Character.

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

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising a mixture of traditional two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings.

Appellant Comments ("AC"): Lawn Avenue and the surrounding area is of mixed architectural styles with 2 storey and bungalow dwellings which have been variously extended to rear and side. There are different styles of front and rear dormers in the varied street scene with a cocktail of roof styles and layout. Hence there is no unique defined character to the road notwithstanding siting in the West Drayton Area of Special Local Character.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is seeking planning permission for the erection of a single storey side/rear infill wraparound extension; part first floor rear extension and a side dormer with four rooflights along the side roofslope.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

75358/APP/2020/1923 19 Lawn Avenue West Drayton

Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension

Decision Date: 14-08-2020 Refused

75358/APP/2020/228 19 Lawn Avenue West Drayton

Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension

Decision Date:

09-04-2020 Refused

75358/APP/2020/3066 19 Lawn Avenue West Drayton

Singe storey side extension and part single storey, part two storey rear extension

Decision Date: 23-11-2020 Approved

Comment on Planning History

75358/APP/2020/228: Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension Refusal

75358/APP/2020/3066: Two storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension. Approval

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement ExpiryDate:- Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

6 neighbouring properties were consulted via letters on 16-12-20 and expired on 09-01-21. One representation was received in support of the application.

Conservation Officer:

Summary of comments: Objection

Historic Environment Designation(s)

· Garden City, West Drayton Area of Special Local Character (ASLC) - non-designated heritage asset

Assessment - background/ significance

The existing property is a detached, simply detailed dwelling dating from the mid- 20th century. It is characterised by its painted rendered exterior and shallow gable ended roof. There is a double heighted, gable end, square bay to the front. To the side is a detached single storey garage.

In terms of its built form the property is little altered, maintaining an ample gap between the No 21 to the west.

The ASLC is predominantly characterised by bungalow or chalet style dwellings, with a few two storey house interspersed along street scene. Whilst the existing building is somewhat an anomaly within the area, the property does quietly contribute to the ASLC.

AC: This characterisation would appear to contradict the street scene description at 1.1 above. If the existing building is an anomaly within the area it suggests it is out of character for the area the Appellant is entitled to ask what is attempted to be preserved and why a modest side dormer extension would materially harm that contribution to the ASLC.

The property has benefitted from permission for a single storey side addition and a part single storey, part two-storey rear extension (ref:75358/APP/2020/3066).

Assessment - impact

As existing, No 19 somewhat relates to the dwellings to the east of the site in terms of height however to the west the street scene is defined by bungalows. The existing gap provides some relief between the two-storey built form and low-rise nature of the bungalows.

AC: But to the East there is significant number of mainly bungalows and chalet bungalows as well and there is no uniformity of height either. The catslide roof design allows for the retention of a sufficient gap to number 21 with the dormers positioned at a relatively lower level so as to mitigate any impact. Moreover sufficient 1600 mm setback has been allowed to the boundary.

It is duly noted that the property has benefitted from approval for a side addition at ground floor. The proposed development would go further by adding a built mass at first floor. Whilst in isolation the cat-slide roof design would limit the bulk of the addition, the effect would be entirely diminished by the proposed side box-dormer. The dormer would extend for the full length of the existing dwelling and approved depth of the first-floor rear extension. It would be considered an incongruous, unacceptable addition. It would fail to relate to the character and style of the existing property and wider ASLC. It would appear as a poorly

integrated built element and reduce the existing gap between the neighbouring site.

AC: The Appellant disputes this and says it would be otiose to have a sympathetic cat-slide roof addition without the creation of some internal useable space by way of a respectful side dormer addition which would not be an incongruous addition.

The approved scheme would already more than double the original footprint of the dwelling. There would be significant condition further development would fail to remain adequately subordinate to the original property.

The proposed development would be considered harmful to the character and appearance of the ASLC. The development would be contrary to Policy DMHD 1 E(v) within Hillingdon's Local Plan Part 2 (adopted January 2020)

AC: As the LPA has observed as a given, the existing dwelling is an anomaly in terms of character and style of the area and the addition therefore would not cause material harm as suggested.

5. Conclusion: Objection

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
PT1.EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 5	Areas of Special Local Character
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 5.12	(2016) Flood risk management
LPP 7.8	(2016) Heritage assets and archaeology
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

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 spaces 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 DMHD1 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

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.

Policy DMHB 5 states that, new development within Areas of Special Local Character should reflect the character of the area and its original layout. Alterations should respect the established scale, building lines, height, design and materials of the area. B) Extensions to dwellings should be subservient to, and respect the architectural style of the original buildings and allow sufficient space for appropriate landscaping, particularly between, and in front of, buildings.

The proposed development would involve a side/rear wrap extension with rooflights within the ground floor rear and side extension following the removal of the existing garage; part first floor rear extension and erection of a flat roofed dormer to the side elevation within the first floor area. The proposal sees the retention of the front facing gable with incorporation of a flat roofed dormer to the side elevation within the first floor area, setback from the front elevation and ridge height set below the original ridge height. The ground floor side/rear extension will have a flat roof. The substantial full width rear extension on both ground & first floor would add a considerable amount of bulk to the original dwelling, with the extensions wrapping around the original building and becoming the dominant elements. The proposed side dormer would give appearance of a first floor side extension by reason of its design in terms of depth and width size. The proposed development will result in a significant alterations to the property, materially changing its appearance. The resultant property will be of a greater overall depth and width.

AC: It is to be noted that neighbouring number 21 already has a sizeable existing double storey rear extension. Similarly number 17 has a two storey rear extension. The two storey rear extension element at the appeal site is setback from the building line framed by the 2 neighbouring rear extensions and hence it would not be incongruent in appearance; moreover it would not be visible from the public realm.

The existing gap provides some relief between the two-storey built form and low-rise nature of the bungalows. It is duly noted that the property has benefited from approval for a side addition at ground floor. The proposed development would go further by adding a built

mass at first floor. Whilst in isolation the cat-slide roof design would limit the bulk of the addition, the effect would be entirely diminished by the proposed side box-dormer. The dormer would extend for the full length of the existing dwelling and approved depth of the first-floor rear extension. It would be considered an incongruous, unacceptable addition. It would fail to relate to the character and style of the existing property and wider ASLC. It would appear as a poorly integrated built element and reduce the existing gap between the neighbouring site.

AC: The cat-slide roof design is a response to the characteristics of the site and the neighbouring dwelling to retain perception of a gap at a higher level; however as a compromise it would allow for the creation of additional internal space by way of a side dormer whose depth would not be discernible in the street scene.

The cumulative scale of the development proposed would not appear subservient to the host dwelling and would result in an elongated and flat roofed side dormer within the flank elevation, which would not be in character with the existing property or the area in general. Given the spacing between properties and the height of the adjoining property, the side dormer roof design would be very visible. Whilst the houses in this road show a great variety of shapes, sizes and roof forms, the proposed scheme would appear unacceptable within the street scene, as it would fail to appear less subservient to the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would fail to harmonise with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development, considering the scale, mass and bulk of adjacent properties.

AC: Given the anomalous existing property and the wider street scene with mixed character, height levels, roof sizes and formations etc, the Appellant begs to differ. Furthermore, the visible part of the side dormer is minimal and it is subservient and subsumed within the cat-slide roof design. It is to be note that neighbouring number 17 has three front facing dormers as does number 15 while number 21 has two protruding chimneys from its roof.

The proposal, therefore, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, width and design would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus 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 Garden City, West Drayton Area of Special Local Character. 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 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 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 DMHD1 section B states that all new development must ensure satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers;

The applicant has proposed to erect a single storey side infill wrap-around extension and first floor rear extension following the demolition of the existing garage. The application site is adjoined by two properties at No.17 and 21 Lawn Avenue with separated boundaries. The proposed extension would not extend beyond the two adjoining properties as both properties have benefited from two storey rear extensions. The proposed rooflights within the side dormer would be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m.

Taking into account the location, size, scale and relationship of the proposal with neighbouring properties, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring residential amenity in terms of loss of natural light, overshadowing, overbearing.

Whilst there are proposed windows along the flank elevations of the two storey extensions facing adjoining properties, it is not considered to harm the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy given that these windows are all obscure glaze and non-opening below 1.7m.

Overall, the proposal would have a satisfactory relationship with adjacent properties and accord the above 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).

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.

The proposal by reason of the front garden space laid in hardstanding would provide up to two off-street parking spaces served by existing vehicular access. Therefore, the proposal would not have a negative impact on the highway and pedestrian safety, and comply with Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies: January 2020.

POLICY DMEI 9 states that development proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3a will be required to demonstrate that there are no suitable sites available in areas of lower flood risk. Where no appropriate sites are available, development should be located on the areas of lowest flood risk within the site. Flood defences should provide protection for the lifetime of the development. Finished floor levels should reflect the Environment Agency's latest guidance on climate change. B) Development proposals in these areas will be required to submit an appropriate level Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to demonstrate that the development is resilient to all sources of flooding.

The application site lies within Flood Zone 2. The Flood Risk Officer has not made any comment on the current application, however there previous comment on the similar application (75358/APP/2020/1923) is considered applicable in this instance. Flood Risk Officer was consulted on the previous application (75358/APP/2020/1923) and concluded that based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, the development would be resilient to all sources of flooding. As such, the submitted a FRA Report demonstrate that the development would be resilient to all sources of flooding.

The proposal, therefore, is considered compliant to the above policies and advice within NPPF. Approval recommended subject to conditions.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design 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 Garden City, West Drayton Area of Special Local Character. 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 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 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
PT1.EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 5	Areas of Special Local Character
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 5.12	(2016) Flood risk management
LPP 7.8	(2016) Heritage assets and archaeology
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Batatunde Aregbesola

Telephone No: 01895 250230