

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	19 HIGHFIELD DRIVE ICKENHAM	
Development:	Part single, part two storey side/rear extension (following demolition of side garage); roof alterations to include new crown/pitched roof with two rear dormers and new front, side, rear windows and rooflights	
LBH Ref Nos:	76019/APP/2021/2705	
Drawing Nos:	PA-01 - Block Plan PA-01 - Proposed Street View PA-01 A - Existing Plans, Site Location and Block Plan Design and Access Statement PA-01 A - Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	
Date Plans Received:	08/07/2021	Date(s) of Amendment(s):
Date Application Valid:	30/07/2021	

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling located on the eastern side of Highfield Drive within a predominantly residential setting. The frontage is balanced in hard and soft landscaping with parking to the front. There are mature trees in the front garden although none of which are protected by a Tree Protection Order (TPO).

The properties across the context tend to vary in their form, proportion and appearance, especially this part of Highfield Drive, most of which are bungalows. No.17 is a detached bungalow. The host dwelling has a smaller footprint when compared to the surrounding properties.

The land levels appear relatively flat across the site.

The properties to the rear along Harvil Road have a Tree Protection Order - TPO 620. There are no heritage or policy constraints on site.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for:

- Demolition of single storey side garage towards the side of no.21;
- Two-storey side extension towards the side of no.21 retaining an approx. 1m gap to the boundary;
- Demolition of rear projecting gable and construction of a part single; part two-storey side/rear extension;
- Removal of existing roof and replacement with new pitched/crown roof;
- Two rear dormers;
- New and replacement front, side and rear windows and doors including entrance; and
- Front and side rooflights.

During the course of the application, the following amendments were sought:

- Confirmation of works currently being undertaken at no.17
- Provision of a proposed streetscene drawing
- Set two-storey side element from no.21 by a minimum of 1m (ground and first floor level).

Given the amendments were purely for clarification and reduction in massing, public re-consultation was not necessary.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Planning History

76019/PRC/2020/231 - Two storey side and rear extensions, garage conversion, rear dormer and front/side facing roof lights and raising of main roof ridge - Pre-application Closed (holding objection) 06/01/2021

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

8 neighbouring properties and the Ickenham Residents Association (IRA) were consulted by letter dated 18/08/2021.

1 letter of objection was received raising the following concerns:

1. We were told 1m gap would be retained between proposed extension and boundary. Doesn't seem to be there. If gap is not there, concerns of loss of light are raised.

Officer comments: This is discussed in the main body of the report. Amendments have been sought to set in the side/rear extension (ground and first floor level) from the side boundary of no.21 and consider the potential impact.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

BE39 Protection of trees and woodland - tree preservation orders

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

LPP G7 (2021) Trees and woodlands

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also required that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

With regard to side extensions, Policy DM HD 1 requires:

- 1) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property;
- 2) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded;
- 3) garages should reflect the size guidelines set out in Appendix C Parking standards;
- 4) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary or in the case of properties in the Copse Wood and Gatehill Estates, at least 1.5 metres, but more if on a wider than average plot, in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses;
- 5) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation;
- 6) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported; and vii) in Conservation Areas, single storey side extensions may be required to be set back.

With regards to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 states that:

- 1) 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;
- 2) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- 3) 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;
- 4) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet;
- 5) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;
- 6) 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;

- 7) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house;
- 8) 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
- 9) full width two storey rear extensions are not considered acceptable in designated areas or as extensions to Listed Buildings or Locally Listed Buildings.

With regard to roof extensions, Policy DMHD 1 requires:

- 1) 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;
- 2) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;
- 3) raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported;
- 4) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling; and
- 5) in Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character and on Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, roof extensions should take the form of traditional 'dormer' windows, on the rear elevation, to harmonise with the existing building. The highest point of the dormer should be kept well within the back roof slope, away from the ridge, eaves or valleys, whilst each window should match the proportions, size and glazing pattern of the first floor windows.

The proposal would demolish the side garage towards no.21 and replace it with a two-storey side extension that would be approx. 1m from the side boundary. This would retain the existing part stepped front building line and would act as an enlargement of the existing front projecting gabled element of the dwelling.

Excluding the existing side garage, the host dwelling is currently 'L-shaped' in its footprint at both ground and first floor level. The proposal would partly demolish the existing two-storey rear projection and construct a part single; part two-storey side/rear extension (would connect onto the two-storey side element proposed facing no.21).

The existing dwelling has an approx. 140sqm internal area with the proposed extensions adding an additional 65sqm of built form. Given the area of built form to be added and the larger properties of the context, it is considered, on balance, that the proposal would constitute householder extensions to the host dwelling. However, the main consideration as part of this section is how the building would appear within the context of the plot, relationship with the adjacent properties along Highfield Drive, the character and appearance of the context and impact from a visual amenity point of view from the street scene.

The starting point is realising and understanding the plot and proportionately integrating any form of development to ensure the extensions do not appear dominant, excessive or bulky. Policy DM HD1 (as above), lists out the ways to ensure extensions appear less harmful.

The existing roof form of the dwelling is varied in that the front elevation has a part

mansard style (first floor level) with the roof towards no.17 being gabled end and hipped towards the side of no.21. The proposal would remove the majority of the roof and result in a large two storey dwelling.

Looking at aerial imagery of other dwellings within this street it is evident that there are examples of dwellings with a similarly large footprint. Therefore notwithstanding any impacts on neighbouring amenity, a larger dwelling similar to the proposed footprint would be acceptable in principle. However, due to the proposed design, form, height and setbacks the dwelling would appear excessively large within the context of the plot, relationship with neighbouring properties and the street scene.

Whilst noting that no.21 runs along the boundary of the host site, other large properties within the street do have wider gaps between the boundaries, maintaining more spacious separation distances which in essence helps break up the built form and allows the detached properties to comfortably sit next to each other within the street scene.

In respect to the proposed height a street scene elevation was requested by officers to see if the dwelling would maintain a comfortable relationship with other the adjacent dwellings and a suitable visual transition from the adjacent bungalow to the two storey dwellings. Whilst it can clearly be seen that the eaves height of the dwelling would be similar to no.21, the overall height of the dwelling would be higher than no.21 and considerably larger than no.17. This would result in the dwelling appearing overly bulky, large, dominating, incongruous and disproportionate within the street scene and visually overbearing in relation to the bungalow.

In combination with the excessive height the extensions would involve a large, tall and bulky crown roof. This roof form would appear disproportionate and top heavy on the subject dwelling, and visually incongruous with the other dwellings within the street.

Furthermore, the proposed front gabled element would almost cover half the width of the total dwelling which would be too bulky and excessive. While front gable features are evident within the street none of them are as wide or as large as that proposed. This would result in a very disproportionate and incoherent set of additions to the dwelling.

Materials would be similar to the existing dwelling and a compliance condition would have been attached to ensure that the materials are of a similar appearance to the materials on the existing dwelling. The associated windows and doors including rooflights would be acceptable.

The proposed development due to the combined impact of design, siting, height, proportions and scale would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would have a detrimental visual relationship with the adjacent dwellings, and consequently harm the visual amenities of the street scene and the character of the area.

As such, it is considered that the design of the proposal, would fail to comply with the requirements of Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHD 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Neighbouring Amenity Impact:

The host dwelling is adjacent to no.17 (north) which is a detached bungalow and no.21 (south) Highfield Drive which is a large two-storey dwelling. To the rear (east) are the properties along Harvil Drive although there is an approx. 90m building to building

separation, and therefore these properties are unlikely to be affected.

A Block Plan (PA-01) has been submitted which shows the existing and proposed dwelling (following extensions) in the context of the area. This shows 45 degree compliance from the closest rear facing (upper level) habitable windows of both adjacent properties. A proposed street scene (PA-01) drawing has also been provided following request by officers.

In terms of no.17, the bungalow is relatively deep and set closely to the common boundary of the host dwelling. No part of the proposed extensions to the dwelling would extend beyond the rear of the adjacent dwelling.

It should be noted that the submitted site photos received 24/09/2021 shows that no.17 has removed the entire roof although unclear what is being planned. However, building control records show a like-for-like replacement roof is being proposed and this has been confirmed by the applicant. It is noted that the side dormer facing the host dwelling had two obscured glazed windows. It appears they served a bathroom and secondary bedroom window with the primary outlook from the rear dormer of no.17. The applicant was requested to investigate what these side dormer windows served to which the applicant wrote back on 07/01/2022 (with confirmation by the resident at no.17) that the windows were frosted/opaque and were to the house bathroom and landing area. These were confirmed to not be primary habitable rooms, and therefore there would not be any undue impact on these windows from the proposed extensions.

There are ground floor side windows of no.17 facing the host site to which are obscure glazed, serving non-habitable purposes or secondary to the wider habitable rooms. As such, it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would not be directly detrimental to the occupiers of the adjacent bungalow of no.17. The current works undertaken to the roof, would not impact the assessment of this application as both pre-existing and existing (current) considerations have been considered.

With regards to no.21, the two-storey dwelling has a rectangular footprint with a single storey rear extension towards the side of no.23. The existing two-storey rear gabled projection of the host dwelling aligns with the main rear elevation of no.21 (not single storey rear extension). The proposed extensions, in terms of rearward projection, would be approx. 4.4m deeper than no.21 at ground level and approx. 2.4m at first floor level. The proposed extension would maintain an approx. 1m to the common boundary to which the adjacent dwelling runs along the boundary of. There are no primary habitable side windows of no.21 (flank wall). However, there are rear facing habitable windows of no.21 to which the proposed Block Plan (at first floor level) shows 45 degree compliance (on the cusp). Whilst on balance, the proposed rearward projection could be seen as acceptable from a daylight/sunlight perspective (although a daylight/sunlight report has not been submitted), there are concerns that neighbouring occupiers would be adversely impacted with respect to outlook, visual intrusion and overbearing impact from this rear elevation and garden.

The adjacent dwelling runs along the common boundary and therefore any rear projection would have more of an impact as the property is right on the boundary. The proposed rearward projection, notably at ground level of approx. 4.4m would be excessively deep (further referenced in the design concerns) and would impact the occupiers of no.21 from the rear window and immediate garden area. Furthermore, whilst the first floor rear element would be set back by approx. 2m from the tip of the ground floor, the cumulative impact of the rearward projection would be detrimental, especially from ground level to the occupiers of no.21 where there would be a part single storey and part two storey flank

wall. There would be a sense of overbearing impact, loss of outlook, sense of enclosure, overdominance and visual impact.

The replacement and new side/rear including front windows would have a mutual level of impact in terms of overlooking/privacy. The rear dormers, given their roof siting and proportionate nature (roof dormers only) would not cause undue overlooking concerns.

The assessment has revealed that the land levels appear relatively flat. No patio or hardstanding is proposed to the rear. Concerns of overlooking would not be raised.

A compliance condition would have been attached to ensure that the first floor window in the side elevation of the extensions facing no.17 Highfield Drive hereby permitted shall be glazed with permanently obscured glass to at least scale 4 on the Pilkington scale and be non-opening below a height of 1.8 metres taken from internal finished floor level for so long as the development remains in existence.

No concerns would be raised to the occupiers to the rear along Harvil Road.

As such, the proposal, by reason of the rearward projection would be detrimental to the residential amenity of adjacent occupiers of no.21 Highfield Drive in terms of terms of overdominance, outlook, sense of enclosure, visual intrusion, some loss of daylight/sunlight and overbearing impact. Therefore, the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Standards of Accommodation:

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.

It should be noted that each bedroom of the 5 bed dwelling would have an en-suite. Whilst this might give an impression of a future Housing in Multiple Occupation proposal, this would require planning permission and in any event has not been considered as part of this scheme. Whilst the quantum of en-suite bathrooms is excessive, it would not be sufficient to refuse the application on this ground.

The proposal would retain over 100sqm of private amenity space as required by Policy DM HB 18 of the Local Plan.

Highways and Parking:

No concerns would be raised.

Flood Risk Impact:

No concerns would be raised.

Trees, Ecology and Landscaping:

No concerns would be raised.

Conclusion:

The proposal would be unacceptable on the following grounds:

1. Character and appearance
2. Neighbouring amenity impact by way of the rearward projection to the occupiers of no.21 Highfield Drive

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extensions, by reason of their combined siting, design, height, scale and proportions would result in a visually incongruous and dominant dwelling that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would have an adverse visual relationship with the properties along Highfield Drive, and would therefore harm the visual amenities of the street scene and character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2020), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extensions, in particular the excessive rearward projection, by virtue of its siting and scale would give rise to unacceptable loss of outlook, overbearing impact, visual intrusion and sense of enclosure to the occupiers at 21 Highfield Drive, resulting in harm to residential amenity. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

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 (2021). 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

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
BE39	Protection of trees and woodland - tree preservation orders
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

Contact Officer: Jimill Patel

Telephone No: 01895 250230