

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 13 FOXDELL NORTHWOOD

Development: Erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, part garage extension, removal and replacement of existing hipped roof with new hipped crown roof. 1 rear dormer window, 3 front roof lights, 1 side rooflight and new external openings to ground and first floors.

LBH Ref Nos: **72654/APP/2021/3320**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan
 Covering Letter & design and access statement
 1091-P-1
 1091-P-2A

Date Plans Received: 01/09/2021 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 18/02/2022

Date Application Valid: 01/09/2021

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling house located on the south side of Foxdell at the south western end of the cul-de-sac. The property has a brick finish set beneath a hipped tiles roof. The frontage is set back over 9m from the highway and is laid to lawn with a paved drive way serving the garage to the front of the property. There is an enclosed landscaped garden to the rear.

The surrounding area is residential in character comprising predominantly detached dwellings with pitched ridge lines.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, part garage extension, removal and replacement of existing hipped roof with new hipped crown roof. 1 rear dormer window, 3 front roof lights, 1 side rooflight and new external openings to ground and first floors.

It should be noted that during the process of the application the submitted plans have been amended. The new plans show a crown roof with false pitch and 1 rear dormer.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

72654/APP/2020/1835 13 Foxdell Northwood

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and conversion of both sides of roof from hip to gable end (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision Date: 11-08-2020 Refused

72654/APP/2020/3132 13 Foxdell Northwood

Two storey side extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 rear dormers, 5 front rooflights and and conversion of both sides of roof from hip to gable end and conversion of garage to habitable use

Decision Date: 03-12-2020

Refused

Comment on Planning History

The sites planning history is set out in section 1.3 of the report.

It should be noted that planning permission was refused for 'Two storey side extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 rear dormers, 5 front rooflights and conversion of both sides of roof from hip to gable end and conversion of garage to habitable use' under planning application No.72654/APP/2020/3132. The Council's decision was appealed and the subsequent appeal (APP/R5510/D/21/3269679) was dismissed for the reasons outlined below:

'Whilst the side extension proposed is modest in itself, the construction of gable walls to enable the proposed roof conversion would result in a sizeable addition to No 13. Together they would appear disproportionate and unsympathetic and add considerably to the bulk and scale of the dwelling. The gable walls would result in a mass of built form which would be dominant in the street scene. In addition, the introduction of a number of roof lights within an extended roofscape would be an incongruous addition drawing the eye and resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area when viewed in the context of the cul-de-sac.

The appellant's agent has cited three other extensions to properties on Foxdell in support of the proposal. Whilst I observed these properties on site I am not aware of the full circumstances surrounding any of these developments. Although the extension at No 5 Foxdell has increased its size, it still retains a hipped roof which reflects the design of the original dwelling. It is also in a more secluded location with extensive screening on site. As such I do not consider that it significantly detracts from the character and appearance of the area. No 1 Foxdell is of a different design, on a corner plot and on higher ground to the appeal proposal, and as such it does not represent a direct parallel. In any event, the existence of these developments does not justify development which would otherwise be harmful.

Particular attention has been drawn to the gable end development at the neighbouring property at No 11 Foxdell, constructed under permitted development allowances. Whilst the introduction of the two gables either side has changed the character of the property it is an isolated example of such development within the street scene and as such does not change the overall character and appearance of the cul-de-sac. Moreover, it differs from the proposal before me in that the two gables were formed from the original property, not as extended. I note also from my site visit that the gable walls have a tile hanging finish which mitigates their impact. I acknowledge that there would be some benefit in ensuring symmetry in roof forms and height between neighbouring properties at this end of the cul-de-sac, but the alterations at No 11 do not diminish the harmful effect on the streetscene that the proposal before me would have. As such the developments to which I have been referred only merit limited weight and do not lead me to a different view in this case.

I therefore conclude that the development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 13 and the area. As such the development is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), and Policies DMHD1, DMHD11 and DMHD12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) which together require development to be of a high quality design to harmonise with the local context, for extensions to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and be well integrated with no adverse cumulative impact on the character of the area. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy

Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.'

This scheme differs from the appeal scheme in that:

- a single flat roof rear dormer is proposed oppose to 3 gable ended dormers
- a large crown roof with false front pitch is proposed
- less rooflights are proposed
- rear Juliet balconies are proposed
- no hip to gable roof extensions are proposed
- a front elevation bay window is proposed
- a single storey side extension is proposed
- fenestration changes (new openings are proposed)

The schemes are considered to be fundamentally different and an assessment of this applications acceptability has been carried out below.

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

6 neighbouring properties and the local residents associations were consulted by letter dated 30/09/21. The consultation period expired on 21/10/2021.

No responses were received from the consulted properties. Nor were responses received from Dene Road Residents Association or and Northwood Residents Association.

CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Landscaping Officer:

This site is occupied by a two-storey detached house, with an integral garage located in the south-west corner of a residential cul-de-sac. According to the aerial photographs, in the back garden there is a tree situated on the west boundary and on the rear boundary, south-east corner. The back garden is significantly lower, and accessed via steps, than the front garden and finished floor levels of the house. There are no trees protected by TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site. COMMENT Recent submissions include application ref. 72654/APP/2020/3132, which was refused. The existing site plan by DDA confirms the location, identity and approximate height of existing trees which are on, or close to, the site. Significant features include a large ash tree in the south-east corner and a high (5 metre) laurel hedge along the rear boundary. The development proposal is largely within the existing footprint of the building and the proposed layout plan confirms that no existing vegetation will be affected by the proposals. RECOMMENDATION No objection and no need for landscape conditions.

Officer Response: The above comments are noted. All comments received during the consultation period have been taken into consideration in the determination of the application. An assessment of the applications acceptability has been carried out below.

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

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area and original building, impact on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings and the occupiers of the host dwelling and impact on highway safety and parking provision.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that all development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings 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; · building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns; · building lines and setbacks, roof lines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure; architectural composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views both from and to the site; and impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment. ii) ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes; iii) ensuring that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities; iv) protecting features of positive value within and adjacent to the site, including the safeguarding of heritage assets, designated and un-designated, and their settings; and v) landscaping and tree planting to protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that Planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that: i) there is no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area; ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; iii) new extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height; iv) new extensions respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials; vi) adequate garden space is retained; vii) adequate off-street parking is retained, as set out in Table 1: Parking Standards in Appendix C; viii) trees, hedges and other landscaping features are retained. The Policy also provides the following guidance for side, front and roof extensions.

'Side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property; ii) extensions to

corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded; iv) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses; v) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation; vi) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported.'

'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; iii) raising of a main roof above the existing ridge line of a house will generally not be supported; iv) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling; vi) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported. The highest point of any 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.'

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

The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by two storey detached dwellings, with pitched roofs, finished in brick. Each property is set back from the street allowing for off road parking and landscaping. Many properties in the road have been extended in subordinate and respectful manner which compliment the areas character. Whilst very uncommon, 1 or 2 small rear dormers exist on Foxdell Road. It is also noted that No.5 Foxdell Road has a crown roof. The crown of that property is small, sited in the corner of the cul-de-sac away from the street scene and is screened by trees on the turning head. This being the case, it has little impact on the prevailing character and appearance of the area (mentioned above).

The proposed two storey side extension would be approximately 1.4m wide and would not be set down from the ridge of the property, nor would it be set set back from the properties front elevation. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would fail to form a subordinate addition to the dwelling. Furthermore the pitched roof of the property would be replaced with a large false crown roof altering the architectural composition of the property and making it appear top heavy and bulky at roof level. Due to the bulky crown roof and insubordinate design of the two storey side extension the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Alone the dormer, single storey side extension, rear Juliet balconies and other minor works could be acceptable (subject to conditions), however when taken into consideration with the works mentioned above, they would cause further harm to the appearance of the existing dwelling by further altering its original architectural composition and overcomplicating its appearance.

In addition to the above, the Foxdell cul-de-sac is predominantly characterised by detached, two storey dwellings, with pitched roofs (as mentioned above). The new dwelling would therefore be out of character with the surrounding properties, making it appear unduly prominent and irregular, it would also disrupt the areas roofscape. The resulting dwelling would also appear uncharacteristically bulky at roof level, when

compared with neighbouring dwellings due to its wide ridge and crown roof. The uncharacteristic crown roof would be clearly visible from the street due to the prominent siting of the dwelling and the lack of landscaping surrounding the site. The proposed development is therefore considered to cause harm to the character and appearance of the Foxdell streetscene and surrounding area.

For the reasons mentioned above it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

Amenity

Policy DMHB 11 B) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. Policy DMHD 1 v) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Additional ground floor openings would look toward the sites boundaries where they would cause no overlooking or loss of privacy. Similarly the proposed rooflights would look into the sky, instead of toward neighbours. The proposed dormer would provide some overlooking views into neighbouring gardens, however those views would be similar to existing views provided from the properties first floor windows, the level of overlooking from the dormer would therefore be acceptable. Furthermore the neighbouring property has a dormer which would provide similar views to the proposed dormer, as such the level of overlooking afforded by the new dormer, would be common of this area. The dormer would therefore cause no harmful loss of privacy or overlooking.

Rear Juliet balconies would provide similar views to existing first floor windows at the property.

The proposed single storey side extension would be sited 20m from 5 Firs Walk, where it would have no impact on that neighbours amenities.

No. 11 Foxdell has a first floor side elevation window which would look toward the proposed two storey extension. The window serves a small ensuite (confirmed by approved drawings for 27122/APP/2012/1509) and is therefore not a habitable space. A loss of light or views from the side window is therefore unlikely to harm the amenities of No.11. Additionally the proposed two storey side extension would be set off of the boundary from No.11 and would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. It is therefore unlikely to cause any loss of views or light to the front and rear windows of No.11.

The bay window and fenestration alterations would provide similar views to existing windows on the property.

For the reasons mentioned above the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings.

Quality

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management

policies advises that 4+ bedroom dwelling house should be provided with a minimum of 100 sqm. The resulting dwelling would have private amenity space which exceed 100sqm, complying with the policy. The proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the proposed works, would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and existing and future residents would have more internal accommodation, improving their amenities. The proposal therefore complies with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy D6 of the London Plan.

Highways

The proposal includes no changes to the sites existing parking provisions or access arrangements and therefore is likely to have an acceptable impact on the local highways network.

Conclusion

The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling streetscene and surrounding area and is subsequently recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Due to its bulky, oversized and uncharacteristic crown roof, coupled with the prominent two storey side extension and variety of other minor extensions and fenestration alterations, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would fail to respect its original architectural composition, reading as an uncharacteristic and unduly prominent addition in the Foxdell streetscene. The proposed development is therefore considered to be harmful to the appearance of host dwelling and surrounding area, all contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), as well as paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021).

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 Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) 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.

DMHB 1 Design of New Development

DMHB 1 Streets and Public Realm
 DMHB 1 Private Outdoor Amenity Space
 DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
 DMT 6 Vehicle Parking
 LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
 LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards
 NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

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
 DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
 DMT 6 Vehicle Parking
 LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
 LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards
 NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

Contact Officer: Haydon Richardson

Telephone No: 01895 250230