

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 51 ICKENHAM ROAD RUISLIP

Development: First floor rear extension with habitable roofspace to include 2 x rear rooflights.

LBH Ref Nos: **24650/APP/2021/59**

Drawing Nos: 51ickenhamroad/2014/07 Rev. B
 51ickenhamroad/2014/01
 CIL Form
 Covering Letter (05/01/2021)
 51ickenhamroad/2014/02
 51ickenhamroad/2014/03 Rev. A
 51ickenhamroad/2014/05
 51ickenhamroad/2014/05 Rev. A
 51ickenhamroad/2014/06
 51ickenhamroad/2014/08

Date Plans Received: 07/01/2021 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 07/01/2021

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two-storey detached property situated on the southern side of Ickenham Road, where it curves round to the south and opposite the junction with Church Avenue. This is a substantial house dating from the inter war period and is well detailed and articulated, with a steep pitched roofline, a projecting gable to the front and two characteristic gable elements to the rear at roof level. Originally the property most likely featured two cat slide roof elements at either end, however the property has been altered and extended in the past which included a side extension removing one of the cat slide roof elements. Other alterations include a dormer to the front and side and a substantial rear extension. The front elevation remains relatively unaltered and contributes to the street scene.

The wider street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising individually design detached dwellings. The application site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is for the erection of a first floor rear extension with habitable roofspace to include 2 x rear rooflights.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

24650/APP/2000/754 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION WITH EXTENSION TO ROOF ABOVE, CONVERSION OF ROOF SPACE TO HABITABLE ROOMS, EXTENSION TO ROOF AT REAR TO FORM TWO NEW GABLES AND ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR REAR

BALCONY/TERRACE

Decision Date: 25-09-2000 Approved

24650/APP/2001/1586 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

INSTALLATION OF A FRONT DORMER WINDOW

Decision Date: 22-08-2001 Approved

24650/APP/2002/2377 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Decision Date: 14-11-2002 Approved

24650/APP/2013/1551 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

Demolition of existing conservatory, erection of single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, single storey side/front extension, side dormer and conversion of garage to habitable use

Decision Date: 20-08-2013 Refused

24650/APP/2013/3335 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

Single storey side extensions, single storey rear extension and conversion of existing integral garage and part first floor roofspace to habitable use to include 1 side rooflight, involving demolition of existing conservatory

Decision Date: 27-01-2014 Approved

24650/APP/2014/1498 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

Single storey front extension, single storey side extension, single storey rear extension and installation of dormer to side at first floor level

Decision Date: 30-06-2014 Approved

24650/APP/2014/3416 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

Single storey side extension, single storey rear extension and installation of dormer to side at first floor level, external wall insulation and single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as a store

Decision Date: 18-11-2014 Approved

24650/APP/2015/954 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

Two storey side extension, single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as a store and replacement of windows

Decision Date: 14-05-2015 Refused

24650/APP/2018/117 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

Single storey side extension, first floor rear extension and extension to the roof with two rear roof lights to create additional habitable roof space

Decision Date: 05-03-2018 Refused

24650/APP/2018/1479 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

First floor rear extension and extension to the roof to create additional habitable space

Decision Date: 22-06-2018 Refused

24650/PRC/2017/41 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

Single/double front/side/rear extension

Decision Date: 06-07-2017 OBJ

24650/PRC/2020/210 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip

First floor rear extension and extension to roof to create additional habitable space

Decision Date: 17-12-2020 OBJ

Comment on Planning History

There have been a number of previous applications on this site, most recently in 2018, when approval was granted at appeal for a first floor rear extension and extension to the roof to create additional habitable space.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 10th February 2021

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

5 neighbours and the Ruislip Residents Association were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 2 February 2021. 2 responses were received raising the following issues:

- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Overdominant and overbearing
- Loss of light and visual intrusion
- Proportions of the windows need to be re-examined
- Loss of landscaping that was previously on the boundary has already resulted in a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties
- Noise and disruption to neighbouring occupiers
- Overdevelopment

Officer response: Disruption during construction is transitory in nature and insufficient reason to refuse a proposal in its own right.

Ruislip Village Conservation Panel - No response

Conservation and Urban Design - This is a substantial detached inter-war house located in an exposed elevated position (at a road junction) within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area - a heritage asset. The existing building is well detailed and articulated with a steep pitched roofline, dormer windows and an interesting building plan. Although it has been substantially extended to the rear, the front facade remains unaltered and contributes to the streetscene. It therefore has significance within the conservation area both individually and as part of a planned estate.

The principle of the proposed development would be similar to the allowed scheme, erecting a substantial built mass to the rear of the existing property. The proposed development however would include an incongruous mansard roof form between the existing gables. The proposal would significantly increase the bulk of the roof creating a boxy form. The mansard style of the roof would fail to relate to the original form of the existing property and mansard roofs are not a characteristic feature of the conservation area. The addition would disproportionately extend the existing property. The roof addition would have a similar impact to a standard box dormer extension. Such additions are not deemed acceptable in a conservation area. The proposed development would be

considered unacceptable from a conservation perspective and set an unwelcome precedent which would have a further detrimental impact on the conservation area.

Whilst public views of the site would be limited, views of the development would be highly visible from neighbouring properties, particularly to the rear of the application site. Private views from rear gardens and within the site itself also form part of how the heritage asset (conservation area) is experienced therefore it should not lessen the desire to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, just because they are not public views. The development would have a negative impact on neighbouring properties.

The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the conservation area, para. 196 of the NPPF would be relevant. Section 72 of the Planning (listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 would need to be considered in terms of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. From a historic environment perspective, it would fail to preserve or enhance in this instance.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 7.4 (2016) Local character

LPP 7.5 (2016) Public realm

LPP 7.8 (2016) Heritage assets and archaeology

NPPF- 12 NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places

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

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings and provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings and the public realm contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place.

Policy DMHB 11 of the 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.

DMHB 12 advises that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area and it should ensure public realm design takes account of the established townscape character and quality of the surrounding area.

DMHB 4 also advises new development within or on the fringes of conservation areas will be expected to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness.

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. Two storey rear extensions should not contravene a 45 degree line of sight from neighbouring windows and should not contain windows or other openings that overlook other houses at a distance of less than 21m.. Pitched roofs should be of a similar pitch and material to the original roof and subordinate in design. Large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported and full width two storey rear extensions are not considered acceptable in designated areas. Roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only and should be subservient to the scale of the existing roof.

The existing property is characterised by one front gable feature and two rear gable features. The rear gables are set above the roof slope with the eaves of the main roof slope extending down approximately 0.5 m below the side eaves of the gables, resulting in a much more distinctive feature. Previously consent was approved at appeal for a 3m deep first floor extension, spanning the central part of the main dwelling and incorporating the gables, with a pitched roof between matching that of the original property. In consideration of that proposal the Planning Inspector whilst noting the Conservation Officer's concerns advised that the design proposal would harmonise well with the existing dwelling, and would not be visible within the street scene. It would also respect the existing strong gable features on the rear elevation.

The current proposal is of the same width and depth and incorporates the same gable features, however the crown roof above is extended with a minimal pitch, forming a mansard style, which would fail to relate to the original form of the existing property. The Conservation Officer has raised strong concerns over the proposal advising the addition disproportionately extends the property and would be inappropriate de elopement within the conservation area. Whilst noting the Inspectors previous comments with regard to the visibility from the wider streetscene, whilst the public views of the site would be limited, views of the development would be highly visible from neighbouring properties. Private views from rear gardens and within the site itself also form part of how the heritage asset is experienced therefore it should not lessen the requirement to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore in terms of appearance the proposed mansard roof form would fail to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and the wider Conservation Area and is considered unacceptable. As such the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policies DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB12 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies

(2020).

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extensions would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

The submitted plans indicate that the proposed first floor extension measures 3 m in depth and is set away from the side boundaries by approximately 3 m to East with no. 49 and 9.5 m to the West with no. 53. The proposed extensions would not compromise a 45 degree line of sight from the neighbouring properties and given the degree of separation between the application site and adjacent dwellings the proposals would not result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook to the occupants of those properties. The nearest property to the rear is no. 50 Kingsend situated approximately 33.5 m away. The principle windows for the proposed extensions would face front and rear and would not result in any additional overlooking or loss of privacy to that already existing. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development.

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 Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Paragraph 5.13 of Residential Extensions. HDAS: Residential Extensions requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. The property benefits from a good sized rear garden and adequate garden space would be retained.

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

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, including the mansard roof detail, represents an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the character and appearance of the original dwelling and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB12 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2019).

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.

Standard Informatives

- 1** The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it

unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

- 2 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The spatial development strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 7.4	(2016) Local character
LPP 7.5	(2016) Public realm
LPP 7.8	(2016) Heritage assets and archaeology
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

Telephone No: 01895 250230