

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 41 ACACIA AVENUE HAYES

Development: Enlargement of roofspace to include a rear dormer and 2 front rooflights

LBH Ref Nos: **16106/APP/2020/3451**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan (1:1250)
 Block Plan (1:500)
 SLJCS/41 AA/2020-P3 Rev. A
 Flood Map for Planning
 SLJCS/41 AA/2020-P1 Rev. B
 SLJCS/41 AA/2020-P2 Rev.B

Date Plans Received: 25/10/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 09/11/2020

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey mid terrace dwelling situated on the east side of Acacia Avenue, Hayes. The property set back from the adjacent highway to accommodate two off road car parking spaces on the front forecourt. The rear garden is of an extensive depth and benefits from a detached outbuilding situated at the bottom.

The surrounding area is residential in character and is made up of two storey terrace buildings that are set back from the adjacent highway to accommodate front gardens or have been converted to off road parking areas.

The application site falls within the Hayes Village Conservation Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is seeking planning permission to convert the roofspace to habitable and incorporate a rear dormer and two rooflights to the front roofslope

1.3 Relevant Planning History

16106/B/90/0414 41 Acacia Avenue Hayes
 Erection of a single storey rear extension

Decision Date: 17-05-1990 Approved

Comment on Planning History

16106/B/90/0414: Erection of a single storey rear extension. Approval

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 16th December 2020

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

2 neighbouring properties and Hayes Conservation Area Advisory Panel were consulted via letter on 11-11-20. One representation was received with no objection on the proposal.

Conservation Officer:

Summary of comments: Objection - amendments recommended

Historic Environment Designation(s)

· Hayes Village Conservation Area (CA)

Assessment - background/ significance

The existing inter-war property is a mid-terrace dwelling. It forms part of a planned development with properties along the street of a similar style, character and appearance. Unfortunately, some of the alterations and modern window materials have degraded the appearance of the street.

The existing property is characterised by its double height square bay window to the front. It benefits from an infill porch addition at ground floor, with a detracting uPVC double door entrance. The main roof is a hipped and finished in a plain tile. As existing there are modern roof lights to the front and rear roof slopes. The property is externally finished in a pebble dash render.

Assessment - impact

The proposed large box dormer would be considered unacceptable. Full width box dormers are not evident within the conservation area. The proposed dormer would dominate the appearance of the roof to the rear of the property and wider terrace. It would be considered an overly large incongruous addition. As existing the terrace benefits from a relatively unaltered roofscape which can be fully appreciated from Addison Way to the north of the site. Whilst the road is not within the conservation area boundary it forms part of how the heritage asset is experienced alongside private views from neighbouring gardens.

If we are to consider a dormer addition to the rear of the existing property it would need to be substantially reduced in size and be designed to reflect the character and style of the existing building. A single centrally positioned dormer could be considered however the window opening would need to fill out the entire front elevation of the dormer avoiding any front facing cheeks. The side cheeks should be clad in hung tiles to match the roof tiles and if a pitch form is adopted the roof tiles would need to match the existing.

The positioning of the existing roof lights does not appear to be accurately positioned on the existing plans. The proposed two roof lights would litter the appearance of the front roof slope. A compromise could be met for one appropriately positioned conservation roof light, which should be set completely flush along the roof line or slightly recessed, allowing it to be a discreet feature along the roof.

The proposed development will result in less than substantial harm to the conservation area. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) would need to be applied in this instance.

Other matters

The submitted information fails to acknowledge that the site is located within a conservation area, failing to meet the minimum requirements of paragraph 189 of the

NPPF (2019).

It is noted that a dormer addition to the rear roof slope of No.49 is extant. However, after reviewing Council records, the existing development does not appear to benefit from Planning Permission.

Conclusion: Objection - Less than substantial harm - amendments recommended

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 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 7.8 (2016) Heritage assets and archaeology

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

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

Impact on character and appearance

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 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.

Paragraph A1.20 of the states:

"The design of roof extensions should not create a dominant 'top heavy' appearance out of proportion with the rest of the building. It should be lower than the height of the main ridge and sit well above the eaves and away from the roof's hips and valleys. As a guide, new roof extensions should not cover more than a third of the main roof."

Policy DMHD 1 section E) states: i) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line; ii) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable"

The council aims to enhance Conservation Areas through its own initiatives and by providing encouragement and advice to owners who may wish to alter or improve their properties. The following will be particularly important: extensions or alterations should not be out of scale with the original house, and should respect the property's original design; the original plan of the house should be respected, and there should be a relationship with the original form of the house; materials and detailing should match the existing property (e.g. existing features, window shapes and sizes, brick arches and eaves details); · boundary treatment should be in keeping with the street scene;

Paragraph 185 of NPPF states that "In determining applications, local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation"

The proposed loft conversion would involve roof alteration to insert a flat roofed rear dormer, partly visible from the street behind the property along Addison Way. Policy DMHD 1 is quite clear in stating that "the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable.

The rear dormer would cover more than two thirds the average width of the original roof and the ridge height would match the ridge tiles of the existing roof. The proposed roof extensions would not appear subservient to the scale of the existing roof, as it would cover the entire roof face of the existing roof and less than substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line would be retained. Furthermore, the proposed changes to the roof, both the dormer and the roof lights, are considered incongruous in the context of the row of terrace buildings and as such fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. This terrace's roofscape is as yet uninterrupted by such features, this is so for most of the terraces in the area. It is felt that allowing a change in the roofscape at this property, No.41 Acacia Avenue would lead to a piecemeal erosion of the defining roofscapes created by the form of these terraces.

As such, the proposed roof alteration/extensions, by reason of the size, scale, bulk, and design of the rear dormer window would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original terrace dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the terrace houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the Conservation Area and the surrounding area.

The roof extension is therefore considered to have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the existing dwelling and the visual amenity and setting of the conservation area, and is contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHD 1 of the Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), and NPPF.

Impact on residential amenity

Policy DMHD 1 states that alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to

ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

The application property is bordered by residential properties. The proposed loft conversion would be contained within the curtilage of the application site and not extend or overhang to the adjoining property.

Taking into account the design, location, scale, siting and relationship of the proposed development with adjoining property, it is not considered that the proposed development would harm the amenity of the adjoining property in terms of loss of light or outlook.

There are no openings proposed along its flank elevation facing the adjoining property, therefore it is not considered to significantly harm the residential amenity of the adjoining neighbour in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy. Therefore, the proposal involving loft conversion, is not considered to harm the living condition of the neighbouring properties by reason of their design, scale and siting within the plot boundaries.

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.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed rear dormer window, by reason of its, size, scale, bulk and design would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the small terrace of houses of which it forms a part and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Hayes Village Conservation Area. 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 4, 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 National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

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

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
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