

TOWN PLANNING APPEAL BY

MR AND MRS SILVER

AGAINST

THE REFUSAL BY LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON COUNCIL OF AN
APPLICATION FOR A TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION (FRONTING CORDINGLEY
ROAD) AND A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

AT

7 CORDINGLEY ROAD, RUISLIP, MIDDLESEX, HA4 7HH

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

Prepared by Blackwood Architects Ltd, 1-2 Castle Close, Castle Street, Aylesbury HP20 2RG

FEBRUARY 2021

REFERENCES:

Local Planning Authority: 55533/APP/2020/3387

CONTENTS:

1. SCOPE OF THE WRITTEN STATEMENT & BACKGROUND TO THE CASE	3
2. PRINCIPAL PLANNING ISSUES	4
3. SITE DESCRIPTION	6
4. THE APPLICATION – THE SUBJECT OF THE APPEAL	9
5. LOCAL POLICY CONTEXT & ASSESSMENT.....	10
6. CONCLUSION	14
7. LIST OF APPENDICES	16

1. SCOPE OF THE WRITTEN STATEMENT & BACKGROUND TO THE CASE

- 1.1 This Planning Appeal is made by Blackwood Architects (“the Agents”) on behalf of Mr and Mrs Silver (“the Applicants”) against the refusal of application 5533/APP/2020/3387 (“the Appeal Application”) by London Borough of Hillingdon Council (“the LPA”) of an application for a two storey front extension (fronting Cordingley Road) and a single storey rear extension at 7 Cordingley Road, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 7HH (“the Application Site”).
- 1.2 The Appeal Application was received by the LPA on 20th October 2020. The Appeal Application evolves from the Applicant’s desire to create additional family living space and additional bedroom space at their family home, by utilising the un-used space between their property and Cordingley Road.
- 1.3 A previous application for a similar development was submitted to the LPA in July 2020 (ref: 5533/APP/2020/2180). This previous application also proposed a two storey front extension and a single storey rear extension and included the addition of an off-street car parking space with an electric vehicle charger. The previous application was refused consent for 2 reasons which are summarised below:
 1. The 2 storey (front) extension would appear as an unduly prominent and inharmonious addition to the front elevation of the existing property, and would appear as an incongruous feature within the street scene along Cordingley Road, with the introduction of a cat slide roof form and a façade which lacks appropriate detail, particularly at ground floor level.
 2. The proposed parking bay fails to accord with the Council’s Policy guidance in that a crossover will only be approved when a standard parking bay at 90 degrees to the highway can be accommodated on the front garden or forecourt.
- 1.4 Following the previous planning refusal, the design proposals were amended to address the reasons for refusal: The 2 storey front extension was redesigned with the cat slide roof removed, and a new front gable form added to improve the appearance of this elevation and importantly to match with other existing front gables on Cordingley Road. The proposed parking bay was also removed.

The Appeal Application was submitted with these amended designs.
- 1.5 Following submission of the Appeal Application the Agents contacted the allocated LPA planning officer by email on 17th November 2020 requesting that any comments

or concerns regarding the Appeal Application be relayed to them in a timely manner, so that amendments could be made if appropriate.

- 1.6 On 15th December 2020 the Agents emailed the case officer to confirm that they had not received any comments and therefore assumed that planning consent would be granted. The case officer replied advising that a report had been prepared recommending refusal and this was now with the case officer's manager. The agents responded to ask if the case officer had made a site visit prior to assessing the proposals.
- 1.7 On 16th December 2020 the Agents again emailed the case officer to ask if a site visit had been made. On 17th December the case officer replied to confirm that a site visit had NOT been made and the LPA planning officer had relied on site photographs to assess the application (see Appendix A).
- 1.8 On 18th December 2020 the LPA issued a Refusal of Planning Permission Notice for this Appeal Application.
- 1.9 This statement sets out to show how the proposed development meets the requirements and aims of the national and local planning policies relevant to this site, and addresses the specific concerns raised by the LPA in their planning refusal notice. Moreover, the design of the proposed extensions to the property are precisely what the Hillingdon Local Plan Policies were seeking to achieve with good quality design that was relevant to the existing building and the surrounding street scene.

It will also show that the planning refusal decision was based on an incorrect assessment of the site and street scene by the LPA planning officer, who did not visit the site prior to writing a report recommending planning refusal and relied instead on the case officer's comments from the previous planning refusal.

2. PRINCIPAL PLANNING ISSUES

- 2.1 The decision notice from the LPA contains the following single reason for refusal:
 - 1) *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).

- 2.2 In the planning officer's report it was noted that the planning application was similar in character to the previous planning application, but with the proposed off-street parking space removed and the two storey front elevation amended to remove the cat slide roof element.
- 2.3 The report assessed the proposed 'single storey' rear extension against the requirements of planning policy DMHD 1 and concluded that this element of the design was acceptable. The case officer's report also noted that the rear extension "*would not breach a 45 degree angle to the centre of the nearest habitable room or include any side windows and no side windows are proposed*" however these parts of policy DMHD 1 only relate to 'two storey' rear extensions and are therefore not relevant to this application.

It is relevant to note that exactly the same error had occurred on the previous planning application where a different case officer's report had referenced the single storey rear extension against the requirements for two storey rear extensions (see Appendix B).

- 2.4 When assessing the proposed front extension the planning officer's report referenced the following policies:
Hillingdon Local Plan : Part One Strategic Policy BE1
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Development Management Policies DMHB11 and DMHD 1
- 2.5 Development Management Policy DMHB 12 'Streets and Public Realm' was not referenced in the planning officer's report, although this policy was quoted as a reason for refusal in the LPA decision notice.
- 2.6 The report confirmed that the Appeal Application had been reviewed by the Highway Authority who were satisfied that the proposals would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress and would not raise highway safety concerns.
- 2.7 The planning officer's report considered the proposed habitable rooms and those that are altered by the new extensions to be acceptable in terms of maintaining an adequate outlook and in terms of natural light.
- 2.8 The report also confirmed that the proposed development would retain an adequate garden space for the property.

- 2.9 No comments or concerns were raised by adjoining owners or neighbours regarding the proposals.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 3.1 Cordingley Road was first developed shortly after WW2 to provide married quarters for servicemen and women stationed at nearby RAF Northolt. Early accommodation took the form of simple terraces of 4 dwellings, these are characterised by the older style properties with even numbers on the east side of Cordingley Road with white painted render external walls and slate roofs. The first 2 original terraces, which face a private car park adjacent to the Application Site, have simple flat fronted elevations while the remaining original terraces are more articulated with forward projecting bays and front gables facing the road.

7 Cordingley Road is on the opposite side of the road from the first of the more articulated terrace properties with projecting bays and front gables.



View of Cordingley Road showing the original terraces to the east side of the road

- 3.2 The Application Site forms part of a terrace of 4 properties that are set at 90 degrees to Cordingley Road.

This development was built some years later than the other original properties on Cordingley Road and in a very different style with brick facades, flat roof porches, concrete gutters and concrete tiled roof. There are other properties nearby on

Lysander Road and Blenheim Crescent that were built at the same as 7 Cordingley Road and these all have similar materials and building forms.

The terrace of 4 properties which include the Application Site are very plain in design with limited features. It is set back from the building line of adjacent properties on Cordingley Road and does not blend well with the original terrace properties on the east side of Cordingley Road.

- 3.3 The front (east) elevation of the property at 7 Cordingley Road (ie facing Cordingley Road) is heavily screened from view by a tall evergreen hedge which also screens the rear garden. The Application Site is also set down from the adjacent road level by 1 metres so it is much less prominent than other buildings which front on to Cordingley Road. There is a narrow pedestrian access alongside the Application Site which serves the properties behind 7 Cordingley Road. The access path includes steps up to Cordingley Road.

As a result of the hedge, the building set back and the difference in levels only the upper storey of 7 Cordingley Road is visible from the road behind the hedge.

The existing east elevation facing Cordingley Road is very plain and simple with a brick façade that is more akin to a side return elevation than a front elevation with 3 small windows at 1st floor and 2 doors at ground floor level which are not visible from the road.



View of Cordingley Road with the Application Site to the left

- 3.5 Contrary to the description in the case officer's report the Application Site is not a corner site and it is not in a prominent position. The corner site between Cordingley

Road and Lysander Road is occupied by a large private car park which is owned by the Ministry of Defence and has no public access. The car park has vehicle access from Cordingley Road and is raised above the ground level of the Application Site. There is a grass verge with mature trees between the car park and Cordingley Road which provides a limited screen for the car park.

The south elevation which is more visible from the road is also relatively plain and featureless with a brick façade and 2 windows.



View of Cordingley Road with the Application Site to the left & original terraces to the right



Corner between Cordingley Rd and Lysander Rd with the Application Site to the left

- 3.6 With reference to the existing 'street scene' the main element of interest here is the rhythm of the front gables and projecting bays on the original terrace buildings which face the Application Site. The Application Site property makes a negative or at best a neutral contribution to the existing street scene.



View of Cordingley Road with the Application Site to the right & original terraces to the left

4. THE APPLICATION – THE SUBJECT OF THE APPEAL

- 4.1 The Application evolves from the Applicant's desire to create additional family living space and additional bedroom space at their home, by utilising the un-used space between their property and Cordingley Road.
- 4.2 The design proposals include a single storey rear extension to the rear (north) of the property to provide improved kitchen and family living space at ground floor level with good access to the adjacent rear garden.
- 4.3 A two storey addition is also proposed to the front (east) of the property and facing Cordingley Road. This extension covers part but not all of the existing façade with a new front gable. The gable includes a central window with 3 casements and a brick

slot in the gable apex, and has been carefully designed to match and compliment the gables and 1st floor windows on the original terrace buildings opposite.

- 4.4 At ground floor level the new extension has a single door and window providing access and light to a new utility and kitchen respectively and to improve on the existing façade which is mostly brickwork. The ground floor elements will be largely hidden from view by the adjacent evergreen boundary hedge and also due to the difference in levels with Cordingley Road.
- 4.5 A porch canopy has also been added above the existing front door to better define the entry to the house and provide shelter by the front door. This low roof canopy will also echo and compliment the ground floor projecting bays on the original terraces opposite.



View of Cordingley Road with photomontage of the Application Proposal

- 4.3 The front of the new two storey extension has been designed to align with the front of the adjacent buildings on Cordingley Road as shown on the Block Plan. By maintaining the current building line, the proposed front extension will not impact adversely on the existing street scene.

5. LOCAL POLICY CONTEXT & ASSESSMENT

- 5.1 In Paragraph 7 of the Revised National Planning Policy Framework ("the NPPF"), it states that *The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very basic level, the objective of sustainable*

development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

The proposals will meet these criteria because it provides improved living spaces at both ground and first floor level and this is achieved in part by using the otherwise unused space along the front of the property. The proposal also takes this opportunity to improve the external aesthetic of the house, in particular the street scene elevation, so that the dwelling appears more sympathetic and in keeping with the character of the neighbouring properties.

- 5.2 The LPA decision notice states the proposals are contrary to Policies 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). These policies are addressed below as follows:

- 5.3 **Policy BE1:** This policy concerns improving and maintaining the quality of the built environment. It sets out ways that new developments should achieve this by providing high quality designs that 'conserve and enhance local distinctiveness, contributes to a sense of place and are appropriate to the identity and context of the area'.

The proposals adhere to this policy because they have been designed to remain 'in keeping' with the existing building with matching materials to the new walls, roofs, windows and doors, but also to 'enhance the property design characteristics' by marrying in with the more interesting design forms and fenestration of the original terrace properties that sit directly opposite on Cordingley Road.

- 5.4 **Policy DMHB 11: Design of New Development** This policy also seeks to ensure that new development is designed to the highest standard and incorporates principles of good design in terms of scale, established street patterns, building lines, architectural composition and materials etc. It also seeks to ensure that new development does not adversely impact on daylight, open space, heritage assets, landscape and trees.

Again the proposed extensions have been designed sympathetically to acknowledge both the existing building and neighbouring properties in terms of materials, forms, style, street pattern and heights and are therefore in compliance with this policy. Moreover, the planning officer's report confirms that there is adequate outlook and

light to the proposed habitable rooms and the retained garden amenity space is also adequate and no trees or heritage assets are affected by the proposals.

- 5.4 **Policy DMHB 12: Streets and Public Realm** This policy is cited in the refusal notice as a reason for refusal, but it is not noted in the case officer's report. The policy itself seeks to ensure that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area and accessible and it promotes ways to achieve this by enhanced landscape and safe pedestrian areas in the 'public realm'.

The residential development proposed will not have any impact on the adjacent public spaces so the proposals are not in conflict at all with this policy.

- 5.5 **Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings** This detailed policy includes specific requirements for all residential alterations and extensions plus more specific requirements for single storey rear extensions and front extensions.

The case officer's report concludes that the single storey rear extension is acceptable in terms of this policy so I will summarise the general requirements and the front extension requirements to illustrate how the design proposals will meet these:

A) All alterations and extensions:

- i) There is no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.

This is achieved with a design that includes matching materials from the host property and design elements from the existing street scene.

- ii) A satisfactory relationship with adjacent buildings is achieved.

By respecting existing building lines

- iii) New extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height

They are subordinate in height, width and depth.

- iv) New extensions respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials

They are of matching materials.

- v) No unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring properties.

There is no loss of outlook for neighbours.

- vi) Adequate garden space is retained

Adequate garden space is retained as confirmed in the case officer's report.

vii) Adequate off-street parking is retained

Not applicable.

viii) Trees hedges and other landscape features are retained.

They are retained.

D) Front extensions:

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

The front gabled extension is subordinate to the host property and has been designed to match the scale of front gables on other properties fronting Cordingley Road. Given the hedge screening and the set down of the property from the road the new front extension will be minor. The overall appearance of the house will be improved and the addition will not dominate the street.

ii) Porches should be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building.

The new front porch canopy is subordinate and individually designed to suit the property and reflect the bays on the properties opposite.

iii) At least 25% of the front garden must be retained.

With the design proposals less than 1/3 of the front garden is replaced by the new extension so at least 66% of the front garden is retained.

- 5.6 The LPA's assessment that our proposals would be contrary to the Hillingdon Local Plan Policies is not supported by our analysis of the proposed designs.

Taken as a whole, the relevant planning policies are designed to support good quality design which carefully considers and responds to both the host building and the surrounding street scene and this is exactly how the extensions to 7 Cordingley Road have been considered and designed.

- 5.9 The case officer has confirmed that no site visit was made to the property in their assessment of the design proposals. As a result the existing property has been wrongly considered as a prominent corner site.

- 5.10 In writing their report on the Appeal Application, the LPA planning officer has clearly copied much of the information from the case officer's report on the previous

application, rather than carefully assessing the amended designs. Examples of this word-for-word copying include the incorrect assessment of the single storey rear extension:

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.

And with reference to the two storey front extension:

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 not 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 and (sic) appear as an incongruous feature within the context of the street scene along Cordingley Road.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The Application Proposal is a carefully designed addition to the existing property which takes account of both the host building and the wider street scene and adjacent properties. It does this by matching with existing materials from the host building and marrying in with the more attractive building forms on the more articulated terraced buildings opposite to create a positive addition to the property and the broader street scene. As such the design proposals accord with the policies and the aims of the Hillingdon Local Plan.
- 6.2 Contrary to the LPA's assessment, the Application Site is not prominent but instead is screened by a tall evergreen hedge and set down 1 metre below the level of the adjacent highway. It is also not on a corner site as it lies between a private MOD car park and other properties on Cordingley Road. The case officer that assessed the planning application did not visit the site and has therefore not considered these design proposals *in the context of the actual site*.
- 6.3 In writing their planning report, the case officer has relied on a previous planning officer's report, which was assessing a different design proposal.

- 6.4 The Application Proposal has no negative impact on the existing surroundings and greatly improves the residential amenity for 7 Cordingley Road with new family living accommodation and new bedroom accommodation.
- 6.5 It is therefore requested that planning permission is granted for the Application Proposal.

7. LIST OF APPENDICES

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Appendix A. | Email from the case officer, acknowledging that a site visit had not been made |
| Appendix B. | Extract from the case officer's report on the previous planning application |

Appendix A –

BLACKWOOD ARCHITECTS

From: Nicola Taplin <NTaplin@Hillingdon.Gov.UK>
Sent: 18 December 2020 10:01
To: BLACKWOOD ARCHITECTS
Subject: Re: Application for 7 Cordingley Road, Ruislip, MIDDLESEX. HA4 7HH

Dear Sir

Thank you for the photographs. I can confirm, in light of current Covid restrictions, I have not visited the site. I do however have a comprehensive set of photographs to enable me to make a judgement on the visual impact of the application. I have placed a copy of your email and additional photograph on the file for the planning managers consideration when determining the application. I regret that this additional information does not persuade me that the visual impact would be acceptable,

regards

Nicola

Nicola Taplin MRTPI

Planning Officer
Resident Services
London Borough of Hillingdon
3N, Civic Centre, Uxbridge, UB81UW

Tel: 01895 250230

Please note that the comments made in this email represent an officer opinion and cannot be seen to prejudice the Local planning Authority's formal determination in relation to any application or planning matter.

From: BLACKWOOD ARCHITECTS <office@blackwood-architects.co.uk>
Sent: 17 December 2020 16:40
To: Nicola Taplin <NTaplin@Hillingdon.Gov.UK>
Cc: rphilips@hillingsdon.gov.uk <rphilips@hillingsdon.gov.uk>
Subject: Application for 7 Cordingley Road, Ruislip, MIDDLESEX. HA4 7HH

Dear Nicola

I have still not had a response from you regarding your site visit. As I expect that you have not visited the site I have taken this opportunity to provide a further image for this application to provide a clearer understanding of the existing streetscape and how our proposed development will reflect and enhance it.

The illustration shows the existing property which is set back from Cordingley Road and largely hidden behind a tall hedge. The existing property makes little or no contribution to the existing streetscape.

The photomontage image shows how this view of the street would look with the proposed alterations to No 7. As you will see the front extension now aligns with the adjacent property and also provides a better elevation to the street. The proposed front gable complements the side gable of the existing house, and also reflects the succession of gables in the facing properties.

I trust that this image will give you a clearer understanding of the existing streetscape and also how our proposals could enhance the streetscape of Cordingley Road.

With regards

Nick Wood

BLACKWOOD ARCHITECTS

Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement.

Appendix B –

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

LBH Ref Nos: **55533/APP/2020/2180**

Drawing Nos: SER/01
SER/02
SER/03
SER/04
SER/05
SER/06
Design and Access Statement

Date Plans Received: 15/07/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 03/08/2020

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 of two storey terraced style properties.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The case officer did agree an amended description of development with the agent as being a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and addition of car parking space and a electric vehicular charger. However, on review, as this 'side' elevation fronts Cordingley Road and contains the main entrance into the property, it is considered that this is more correctly described as the front elevation of the property and the description of development has been changed accordingly.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

None

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

2 Neighbouring properties were notified on 05/08/2020, together with the Ruislip Residents' Association. One response has been received, advising that they have no objection in principle but raise the concern that the ground floor extension extends onto

his property beyond the centre line of the party wall, onto land which is not in the ownership of the applicants.

Officer comment

The plans do not show any encroachment onto the neighbours property (only the side footpath).

Highways - Appraisal

There is no 'in-principle' highway related objection to the proposed building extensions. However the proposed on-plot parking space situated parallel to Cordingley Road would require a new carriageway crossing which prompts the following comments.

The Council's 'Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover' (DVFC) 2019 Policy guidance is very clear 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 the application site. In addition a vehicle must be able to leave the space at right angle to the kerb. Parallel parking to the carriageway shall not be permitted"

As presented, the parking element of the proposal clearly fails to qualify with the Council's crossing policy (with specific reference to the underlined) and should therefore be refused on the basis of non-conformity with the Council's DVFC policy.

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 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

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, provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property and the availability of parking

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)
West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan - Consolidated With Alterations (2016)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

Emerging Planning Policies

Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 states that 'Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- (a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- (b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- (c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

Draft London Plan (Intend to Publish Version, December 2019)

The GLA consulted upon a draft new London Plan between December 2017 and March 2018 with the intention of replacing the previous versions of the existing London Plan. The Plan was subject to examination hearings from February to May 2019, and a Consolidated Draft Plan with amendments was published in July 2019. The Panel of Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State issued their report and recommendations to the Mayor on 8th October.

The Mayor has considered the Inspectors' recommendations and, on the 19th December 2019, issued to the Secretary of State his intention to publish the London Plan along with a statement of reasons for any of the Inspectors' recommendations that the Mayor does not wish to accept.

Limited weight should be attached to draft London Plan policies that have not been accepted by the Mayor or that have only been accepted in part/with significant amendments. Greater weight may be attached to policies that were subject to the Inspector's recommendations and have since been accepted by the Mayor through the 'Intend to Publish' version of the Plan. The weight will then increase as unresolved issues are overcome through the completion of the outstanding statutory process. Greater weight may also be attached to policies, which have been found acceptable by the Panel (either expressly or by no comment being made).

Policy DMHB 11 requires all development to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design, including harmonising with the local context; use of high quality building materials and finishes; internal design and layout maximises sustainability and is adaptable; protects features of positive value and their settings and includes landscaping and tree planting. Proposals should also not impact upon the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjoining properties and open space, development does not prejudice the development of adjoining sites and appropriate provision is made for the storage of waste and recycling.

Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings states that alterations and extensions to dwellings should, inter alia, 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;
- ii) a satisfactory relationship is achieved with adjacent dwellings;
- iii) new extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height;
- iv) new extensions respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials.

In particular:-

B) Rear Extensions

- 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 Building.

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;
- 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 notwithstanding the above, at least 25% of the front garden must be retained.

The rear single storey extension will be 2 metres deep and 3.6 metres high with a pitched roof. The extension does 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.

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, with the introduction of cat slide roof form and a somewhat plain elevation, particularly at ground floor level with no fenestration. 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).

At first floor the rear facing window towards No. 9 Cordingley Road serves a bathroom and could be obscure glazed. No material loss of residential amenity is considered to arise.

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 amenity space the development will result in 4 bedrooms requiring 100 sq m private amenity space. Approximately 115 square metres is retained.

The proposal would deliver one off street parking space and an electric charging point.

There is no 'in-principle' highway related objection to the proposed building extensions. However the proposed on-plot parking space situated parallel to Cordingley Road would require a new carriageway crossing which prompts the following comments.

The Council's 'Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover' (DVFC) 2019 Policy guidance is very clear 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 the application site. In addition a vehicle must be able to leave the space at right angle to the kerb. Parallel parking to the carriageway shall not be permitted"

As presented, the parking element of the proposal clearly fails to qualify with the Council's crossing policy (with specific reference to the underlined) and therefore it is recommended that the application be refused on the basis of non-conformity with the Council's DVFC policy.

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).

The application is recommended for refusal

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

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 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

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).

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.

- 2** The applicant is advised that with any re-submission, appropriate notice would need to be served on all those who had an interest in all the land to which the application relates (it is noted that the current application site includes and involves landscaping work to a footpath which runs along the side of the property, adjacent to the car park and that from the application form, it is claimed that the applicant has sole rights to the land).

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 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking

Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster

Telephone No: 01895 250230