

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 50 RODNEY GARDENS EASTCOTE PINNER

Development: Porch to front, single storey conservatory to rear, glazed canopy and conversion of garage to habitable use with rooflights and alterations to fenestration from diamond lead to Georgian lead glazing.

LBH Ref Nos: **45146/APP/2020/3755**

Drawing Nos: S01
S02 Rev. A
C01 Rev. A
Drawing List
S03 Rev. A
C02
C03
C04
C05

Date Plans Received: 16/11/2020 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 08/12/2020

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a detached chalet style bungalow situated on a corner plot on the north eastern side of Rodney Gardens at the junction with Dovecot Close. The dwelling has distinctive mottled brick walls and a tiled, hipped roof. It currently benefits from a flat roofed extension to the southern elevation, a staggered depth crown roofed extension to the rear, with a further glazed veranda beyond. The veranda has been erected since the approval of the rear extension in June 2017 but does not have planning consent. The front garden is predominantly laid to hardstanding with a carriage driveway and provides parking for providing at least 2 cars. There is an enclosed rear garden providing private amenity space..

The area is residential in character and appearance comprising a mix of one and two storey detached properties of varying design. The site lies within the Eastcote Park Conservation Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning consent for the erection of a porch to the front, a single storey conservatory to rear and the conversion of the detached garage at the rear to habitable use with rooflights and alterations to fenestration from diamond lead to Georgian lead glazing. The proposal has also been submitted for an extension to the existing glazed canopy to the rear. However it is noted that no planning consent has been obtained for the existing canopy which has been erected within the last 4 years. The canopy as a whole is therefore also considered as part of this application.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

45146/APP/2014/3626 50 Rodney Gardens Eastcote Pinner

Single storey rear extension, involving alterations to side (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision Date: 24-12-2014 Refused

45146/APP/2016/2858 50 Rodney Gardens Eastcote Pinner

Retention of single storey rear extension in a modified form involving removal of fascia to rear elevation; alterations to roof to form a crown roof with parapet to rear; and works to brickwork to match the finish of existing dwelling.

Decision Date: 10-10-2016 Refused

45146/APP/2016/711 50 Rodney Gardens Eastcote Pinner

Alteration to existing single storey rear extension to remove projecting fascia and reducing eaves (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision Date: 17-06-2016 Refused

45146/APP/2017/1639 50 Rodney Gardens Eastcote Pinner

Removal of fascia to rear elevation; alterations to single storey rear extension including pitched roof with crown; new brickwork to match existing; retention of extension once altered.

Decision Date: 20-06-2017 Approved

45146/APP/2017/2788 50 Rodney Gardens Eastcote Pinner

Details pursuant to Condition 3 (Material Samples) of planning permission Ref: 45146/APP/2017/1639 (Removal of fascia to rear elevation; alterations to single storey rear extension including pitched roof with crown; new brickwork to match existing; retention of extension once altered)

Decision Date: 27-09-2017 Approved

45146/PRC/2016/189 50 Rodney Gardens Eastcote Pinner

Alterations to existing single storey rear extension

Decision Date: 14-09-2017 PRM

Comment on Planning History

A certificate of lawfulness application was submitted in 2014 for the rear extension. This was refused as it did not comply with PD rights. A further CLD application was submitted after an extension had been built and this was also refused as it did not comply with the requirements of Class A. A subsequent Householder application was submitted to regularise the development. This was refused and dismissed at appeal. A part retrospective planning consent for the rear extension, making suitable amendments to the extension was approved in June 2017.

There is no planning history relating to the garage or the art studio. However images from google street view and previous officer site photographs show the garage has been present since July 2008. It is also noted that there was a large greenhouse on site at that time, which appears to have had 3 of the side walls enclosed with wood cladding at some point between October 2014 and August 2016.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 21st January 2021

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

3 neighbouring properties and Eastcote Village Conservation Panel were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 3 January 2021. One response was received raising the following issues:

- A Heritage/DAS has not been submitted with the application which is required for a Conservation Area
- The proposed porch will extend beyond the original building line and will be detrimental to the street scene and conservation area
- The conservatory or glass box is an attempt to regain the same size extension that was refused at appeal. The drawings show this as an extension to the bedroom and not a conservatory
- The submission does not give any details of the Georgiana leaded windows
- There does not appear to have been any planning history for the 2 outbuildings, which are shown as an art studio and the converted garage to a pottery
- Are these going to be used for commercial projects. Will access be required for the general public
- Together these buildings take up most of the available garden area
- Both have pitched roofs. The EPECA Management Plan states changes to garages to habitable use should be resisted
- The access to the garage is via Dovecote Close, which is very narrow and totally unsuitable for on street parking
- With the services needed to supply both the pottery studio and the sauna, this building could easily become a separate dwelling

Ruislip, Northwood & Eastcote Local History Society

Firstly the property is located within the Eastcote Park Conservation Area and therefore a Heritage Design and Access statement should have been submitted. Secondly the proposals do not respect its position within a sensitive conservation area. The canopy will be obtrusive and totally out of keeping with the other nearby properties. The 'glass box' conservatory looks too large and over dominant and not in sympathy with the arts and crafts style of most of the area. It gives an office feel to an area of vernacular architecture. The extension to the front porch will be detrimental to the street scene as it will extend beyond the building line. It will be out of kilter with the adjoining property. Thirdly the conversion of the garage into a pottery studio and the mention of another outbuilding as an art studio all indicate an overdevelopment of the site. The estate was designated a conservation area in recognition of its attractive domestic garden suburb features. This development would severely compromise those characteristics and have a negative impact on the area. We therefore request that this application be refused.

Trees/Landscaping

The site lies within the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area, a designation which affords protection to trees with a stem diameter of >75mm, when measured at 1.5metres above ground level - such as the cedar tree at the end of the back garden. There is an oak tree in the back garden / north boundary which is also protected by TPO 355, T44 on the schedule. COMMENT The plans and information submitted with this application only indicate the approximate location of the oak, without any accurate representation or assessment. While the proposed work (footprint of the buildings) may not directly affect the trees, a tree report to BS5837:2012 is required to define the RPA (root protection area) of the trees, identify construction constraints, make an arboricultural impact assessment and consider the safeguards required to protect the trees. The report should also consider the indirect impacts associated with the construction operations and long term juxtaposition of the trees and buildings. RECOMMENDATION This application

should be refused unless a satisfactory tree report is submitted. In the absence of a tree report, the applicant has failed to safeguard protected trees or make provision for their long term protection.

Conservation and Urban Design

The existing property is a 1930's detached bungalow located within the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area (EPECA). The pattern of development and similar style and appearance of the buildings positively contributes to the street scene and significance of the EPECA. The homogenous design is an important characteristic of the area.

The bungalow relates to the original development of the area. It is an attractive dwelling generally in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene. The bungalow is characterised by its well defined hipped, plain tiles roof and London multi-stock brick elevations. It features a projecting element to the front with small gable above the tiles roof. The original recessed garage has been converted to habitable use as part of the main dwelling. The site benefits from a number of ancillary buildings to the rear including a garage accessed off Dovecote Close.

The property has a notable planning history. The rear extension was approved following negotiations and compromises from a conservation perspective. This is highly visible from the street scene and was constructed on brick works that fails to adequately match the original property. Furthermore the crown roof form uncomfortably integrates itself into the existing building and flat roof over the converted garage.

An existing canopy structure appears to have been added to the rear of the building. It is enclosed along the boundary with no. 48 Rodney Gardens and projects approximately 3.8m from the existing rear elevation. It is defined as an external living space resulting in an excessively deep structure to the rear of the bungalow. It is considered a detracting feature to the building.

The proposed glazed box is inappropriate, increasing the built form to a level of the previous refusal. Glazed additions are not a feature within the conservation area and the proposal result in a piecemeal collection of inappropriate structure to the rear of the property. The proposed porch is in principle unacceptable and the alterations to the windows have not been justified.

The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the conservation area. Heritage assets can be experienced from public and private spaces, all of which form part of how the historic environment is experienced. From a conservation perspective, the development would fail to preserve or provide an enhancement to the conservation area.

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 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 7.8	(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 and parking provision for the application property.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design.

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. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

DMHB 4 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) 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 advises that a rear extension of 4m in depth with a flat roof not exceeding 3m or a pitched roof of 3.4m would be acceptable. Extensions to the front of the house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. It also required that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

The proposal includes the erection of a single storey glazed infill extension to the rear of the existing property. This measures 2.95m in depth, 3.05m in width set beneath a slight pitched roof of 2.6m in height. To the rear of the existing extension is proposed a glazed canopy of 3.8m in depth, 7.1m in width and 2.4m in height. This would give a combined depth of the rear extension to the original property of 7.95m. To the front of the dwelling it is proposed to further extend the porch, with an addition to the front of the existing porch. This would measure 1.1m in depth, 1.55m in width set beneath a flat roof of 2.75m in

height. The porches would have a combined depth of 2.4m, projecting 1.75m beyond the front wall of the original front projecting gable feature. To the rear of the garden it is also proposed to convert the garage to habitable use, retaining the garage door externally but infilling the opening internally and providing 4 new conservation rooflights to create a pottery studio and sauna.

The Conservation Officer has raised strong objections to the proposed development on the site. The rear extension would infill the existing set-back of the rear addition. The 2017 approved scheme altered the previously unauthorised structure to include the set back on the side closest to Dovecot Close. This limited its impact towards the scheme being deemed acceptable. The proposed built form would be a glass box, and whilst there would be some element of permeability, the glass structure would extend the footprint and built mass of the building to the same extent as the previously refused schemes. The glass structure would be highly visible from the street scene. As it would be associated to a bedroom it is inevitable the occupier would desire some element of privacy resulting in the glazing being obscured by blinds or curtains, contrary to its design concept. Glazed additions are not a feature within the conservation area and the proposal would introduce a highly visible, contrasting built element to the rear of the original bungalow. The provision of the canopy would also not be supported. It is considered to be an incongruous addition to the building.

The proposed porch extension would be considered in principle unacceptable. The built form would unacceptably project beyond the front building line of the original property and neighbouring property (no. 48) and such additions are not characteristic features within the conservation area.

The proposed alterations to the garage are relatively minor and would not significantly impact on the character and appearance of the area. It is noted that concerns have been raised that the conversion of the garage to habitable space could potentially allow it to become a separate unit, which would further intensify the occupation of the site in an inappropriate manner. This application can only consider the proposal as submitted and a condition could be included, if approved to ensure the use of the building is as detailed in the plans and for the personal use of the occupiers of the main dwelling.

The alterations to the window lead detailing would change the character of the property. Diamond lead detailing to the windows are a characteristic feature evident in the EPECA and the existing windows may relate to the original window style of the bungalow. The proposed alteration is not adequately justified.

Therefore in terms of appearance the rear and front extensions are considered unacceptable. They would fail to respect the character and appearance of the original property and the wider conservation area contrary to the requirements of Policies DMHB4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

The proposed infill extension would be situated on the northern side of the property and would be separated from the neighbouring dwelling (no. 48) by the existing extension. The existing/proposed canopy would project approximately 4.2m beyond the rear of the extension at no. 48, which would be in excess of policy guidance. However it is noted that no 48 is set at a higher land level and the height of the canopy does not appear to exceed 2m in height when viewed from the neighbouring property. Therefore it is not considered that the scale of the proposal would cause significant harm to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining property. The principle windows will face the rear garden of the application site. Therefore it is not considered the proposal would result in any additional overlooking or loss of privacy to that already in existence.

As such, the proposal would comply with the principles of Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Policy DMHD 1 (appendix A, Part A) vi), states that for alterations and extensions to residential dwellings; adequate garden space should be retained. The property benefits from a reasonable sized garden and adequate space will be retained in accordance with policy requirements.

The proposal would result in the loss of the garage and associated parking space, however a minimum of 2 parking spaces would be retained to the front of the dwelling in accordance with policy requirements.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed glazed infill extension by reason of its size, scale, position and design would introduce a highly visible, contrasting built element to the rear of the original bungalow, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Eastcote Park Estate 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).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed canopy extension by reason of its size, scale, position and design would be an incongruous addition to the rear of the extended bungalow, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Eastcote Park Estate 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).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed porch by reason of its size, scale, position and design would diminish the prominence of the original bay feature, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Eastcote Park Estate 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 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 1	Heritage Assets
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 7.8	(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