

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 CORDINGLEY ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Two storey front extension and single storey rear extension

LBH Ref Nos: **55533/APP/2020/3387**

Drawing Nos: SER/01A
SER/02
SER/03A
SER/04A
SER/05
SER/06A
Design and Access Statement
SER - 08
SER/07

Date Plans Received: 20/10/2020

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 23/10/2020

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the east side of Cordingley Road, Ruislip, and comprises an end of terraced property on a corner site.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising predominantly two storey terraced style properties.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey front extension and single storey rear extension.

This planning application is similar in character to a previous planning application however a proposed off-street parking space has been removed and the elevation facing Cordingley Road has been amended to remove a catslide roof element.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

55533/APP/2000/1906 7 Cordingley Road Ruislip

RETENTION OF A 1.77 METRE HIGH FEATHER EDGE BOARDED FENCE

Decision Date: 29-01-2001 Refused

55533/APP/2020/2180 7 Cordingley Road Ruislip

Two storey front extension (fronting Cordingley Road), single storey rear extension and addition of car parking space and a electric vehicle charger.

Decision Date: 28-09-2020 Refused

Comment on Planning History

55533/APP/2020/2180 - Two storey front extension (fronting Cordingley Road), single

storey rear extension and addition of car parking space and a electric vehicle charger was recently refused for the following reasons:

1. The two storey extension would appear as an unduly prominent and inharmonious addition on the front elevation of the existing property, and would appear as an incongruous feature within the context of the street scene along Cordingley Road, with the introduction of cat slide roof form and a facade which lacks appropriate detail, particularly at ground floor level. It is considered that the extension would be harmful to the architectural composition of the existing property and the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

2. As presented, the parking element of the proposal fails to accord with the Council's 'Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover' (DVFC) 2019 Policy guidance in that a crossover will only be approved where a standard car parking space (2.4m wide x 4.8m deep) at 90 degrees to the highway can be accommodated on the front garden/ forecourt of an application site. In addition a vehicle must be able to leave the space at a right angle to the kerb. As such, the use of the proposed parking space would result in vehicular and pedestrian conflict on the adjoining public footway, prejudicial to conditions of general highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

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

Highways Officer:

Background

The site is located within a residential catchment in Ruislip. The address is to remain in a single tenure with the creation of habitable areas within front and rear building extensions. A recent application for extensions and an off-street parking space for this address (55533/APP/2020/2180) was refused on several grounds including policy non-compliant on-plot parking provision.

Parking Provision

Local Plan: Part 2 - Policy DMT 6 requires that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the Council's adopted parking standards unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

However, these standards are not directly applicable to residential properties which are to be extended with (or without) an increase in the number of habitable rooms on the strict proviso that the address is not converted to multiple housing units and remains in single tenure. Hence there is no specific requirement to provide additional on-plot parking provisions for this proposal. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed extensions are not expected to materially alter the parking scenario at this address.

Conclusion

The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are satisfied that the proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any measurable highway safety concerns, in accordance with Local Plan: Part 2 Development Plan Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies 6.3 and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016).

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

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and locality the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden and car parking provision.

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 Hillingdon 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 extension of dwellings would 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.

With regard to rear extensions Policy DMHD 1 requires:

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; ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;

iii) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level;

iv) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet; v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;

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 and should not contain windows or other openings that overlook other houses at a distance of less than 21 metres;

vii) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house;

viii) pitched roofs on extensions should be of a similar pitch and materials to that of the original roof and subordinate to it in design. Large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported; and

ix) full width two storey rear extensions are not considered acceptable in designated areas or as extensions to Listed Buildings or Locally Listed Buildings.

With regard to front extensions Policy DMHD 1 requires:

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;

ii) 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; and

iii) notwithstanding the above, at least 25% of the front garden must be retained.

The rear single storey extension would not breach a 45 degree angle to the centre of the nearest habitable room and no side windows are proposed. In the absence of any harm to residential amenities the minor excess in height compared to policy is not considered to be material or result in sufficient harm to justify a refusal of planning permission.

The proposal differs from that previously considered unacceptable by the Council by the removal of the catslide roof. The two storey extension is to the front of the property but being on a corner plot, there is a 'return' building line along Cordingley Road which the extension does respect, being set back by approximately 3 metres from the front boundary. However, it is considered that on such a corner site, the extension would appear as an unduly prominent and inharmonious addition on the front elevation of the existing property and appear as an incongruous feature within the context of the street scene along Cordingley Road. It is considered that the extension would be harmful to the composition of the existing property and the street scene and local area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

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).

In terms of the garden area the development would fulfill the Part 2 Policy DMHD 1 appendix A, Part A) vi), which states that for Alterations and extensions to residential dwellings; adequate garden space is retained.

The Highways Officer is satisfied that the proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any measurable highway safety concerns, in accordance with Local Plan: Part 2 Development Plan Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies 6.3 and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016).

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey front extension, by reason of its siting in this visually prominent position, size, scale and bulk would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the existing and adjoining dwellings 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) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

INFORMATIVES

- 1 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

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

Telephone No: 01895 250230