

## 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds                | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action                                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings                                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)                                                          | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

- |                                                                    |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 6. Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received          | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Application has not been supported independently by a person/s  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)                | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

- |                                                                                      |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 10. Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Householder application in the Green Belt                                        | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use                                                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

- |                                                                 |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 15. Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development          | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

- |                                                                                                                 |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 18. ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)                                                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION                                                                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS                                                                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION                                                                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION                                                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. APPROVAL OF DETAILS                                                                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. WORKS TO TREES                                                                                              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. OTHER (please specify)                                                                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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**                      27 FURZEHAM ROAD WEST DRAYTON

**Development:**              Erection of single storey rear and side extension

**LBH Ref Nos:**              **71589/APP/2022/475**

**Drawing Nos:**              ZAAVIA/27FR/403 A  
                                       ZAAVIA/27FR/405 A  
                                       Location Plan - 27 Furzeham Rd - Dated 15/2/22  
                                       ZAAVIA/27FR/407 A  
                                       ZAAVIA/27FR/401 A  
                                       ZAAVIA/27FR/404 A  
                                       ZAAVIA/27FR/406 A  
                                       ZAAVIA/27FR/402 A

**Date Plans Received:**      15/02/2022                      **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

**Date Application Valid:**    28/02/2022

## **1. CONSIDERATIONS**

### **1.1 Site and Locality**

The application property comprises an attractive, bay fronted, Victorian semi-detached property located on the northern side of Furzeham Road. The property benefits from a good sized side/rear garden. The more modern development in Ruffle Close is located to the east and properties on this close have views towards the application site. The property has been extended by a modest mono-pitched single storey rear extension to the rear of the outrigger. The property does not benefit from on site parking. The land to the east of the site is covered by TPO 564, however, there are no protected trees nearby.

### **1.2 Proposed Scheme**

The proposed scheme seeks planning permission for the the erection of a single storey side and rear extension.

### **1.3 Relevant Planning History**

71589/APP/2020/2931      27 Furzeham Road West Drayton

Two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension

**Decision Date:**    03-12-2020                      Refused

71589/APP/2021/3098      27 Furzeham Road West Drayton

Erection of single storey rear/side extension

**Decision Date:**    08-02-2022                      Approved

### **Comment on Planning History**

Please see above for relevant planning history associated with the site. Importantly, a side and rear extension was previously approved following revisions during the course of the application. The current proposal returns to the original design, with a larger footprint and revised design.

## **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**

7 neighbouring occupiers/owners were consulted on 1/03/22 for 21 days. No comments were received in this time.

Landscape Officer:

This site is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached house located on the north side at the end of a residential cul-de sac. The plot frontage is wider than average for the area and splays out wider on the northern boundary. According to the aerial photographs there are no trees or other significant landscape features on the site which might constrain development on the site. there is a boundary hedge along the east boundary which, according to Google Streetview, appears to be situated on adjacent land. The east boundary is adjacent to the area covered by TPO 564, however, there are no protected trees close to the site.

This submission follows the refusal of application ref. 71589/APP/2020/2931. No trees will be affected by the proposed (large) side extension which has a staggered footprint close to the side boundary which backs onto the rear garden of 24 Ruffles Close. If the application is recommended for approval, landscape conditions should be imposed to ensure that the development contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

No objection subject to condition RES9 (parts 1,2 and 5).

Officer response: The Landscape Officers comments are noted, however given that the application is for a side and rear extension, not a new build or extension and sub division as per previous applications, it would not be appropriate to require the pre commencement conditions suggested.

## **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:

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

## **5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES**

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and locality, the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden and car parking provision.

## Character and Appearance

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, 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, rooflines, 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.

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 rear extensions Policy DMHD 1 requires:

- i) 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; ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- iii) 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;
- iv) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet; v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;
- vi) 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;
- vii) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house;
- viii) 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
- ix) 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 side extensions Policy DMHD 1 requires:

- i) 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;

iii) garages should reflect the size guidelines set out in Appendix C Parking standards; iv) 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;

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; and vii) in Conservation Areas, single storey side extensions may be required to be set back.

For side extension, it should not exceed half the width of the original property.

The proposed development would form a wrap around extension, with the addition of a side and rear extension. The existing rear extension would be demolished as part of the proposal.

The side extension would be set back by a metre and built 2.6 metres wide, with a depth of 11.25 metres. There would be a secondary set back of 3m from the initial side extension of 1.5m wide creating a staggered appearance and footprint which widens to follow the splayed side boundary. This results in a side extension much wider than half the width of the house and a rear extension which subsumes the original rear elevation. The height of the extension would also exceed the prescribed measurements set out in Policy DMHD1 at 3.5 metres, the eaves being at 2.9 metres. The roof form would not match that of the existing dwelling, as it would have a large crown roof, due to its widening footprint. The extension would also result in two different roofs facing the main streetscene, with different slopes of varying degrees which do not relate to one another.

The rear extension would be 3.25 metres in depth and match the height of the side element at a maximum height of 3.5 metres. The rear extension would extend beyond the existing dwellinghouse in width, to adjoin the side extension, with a total width of 7.8 metres, considerable when considered against the original building footprint and subsequently considered disproportionate.

The proposal is not in compliance with the measurements set out in Policy DMHD1, the proposed additions would not appear as subservient to the main dwelling house and would be a harmful addition to the host dwelling and street scene. The extensions engulf the rear elevation fail to read as subordinate. The extensions would be visible from a number of private viewpoints and would relate poorly to the pair at the rear.

The impact on the front is also unacceptable, harming the character and appearance of the building, pair and streetscene. The widening footprint, inconsistent roof treatment and overall poor design fails to comply with DMHB 11 as it does not consider the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures nor the architectural composition of the house and its attached neighbour. In relation to Policy DMHD 1 the property fails in terms of size would be uncomfortable, large and excessive in relation to the host property and pair.

It is considered that it would not meet the overarching aims of Policies DMHD1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020) and have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the building, streetscene and wider area.

#### Neighbouring Amenity

The principle property to consider the impact on is 25 Furzesham Road. The bulk of the side extension would be obscured by the existing building lines and the existing closet

wing projection to the rear. The element of the proposal which would impact the neighbouring occupier is the proposed rear extension.

No 25 benefits from an existing rear extension on the boundary with the application site. Given the modest depth at 3.25 metres, resulting in a 1 metre deeper projection from the rear elevation of No 25, as well as the modest eaves height, it is considered that there it is considered that it would not negatively impact the residential amenity of the occupiers at No 25 Furzeham Road complying with the aims of Policy DMHB 11.

To the East of the site are the properties at Ruffle Close, with Nos 23 and 24 being the closest. Given the distance between those properties and the application site (855cm as a minimum), it is considered that no undue harm would be caused to these occupiers through the proposed additions. The roof form also pitches away which reduces the impact. They would however, have views across to the awkward footprint, particularly given the height.

14 and 15 Lantern Way would be unaffected in amenity terms, but would also be able to see the awkward built form and arrangement from upper rear windows.

It is therefore considered, the application proposal would be compliant with policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Highways:

The proposal would not alter the existing parking provision, or facilitate any extra bedrooms on site. It is therefore considered that the existing parking situation would not be exacerbated by the proposal, complying with Policy DMT6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020).

Private Amenity Space:

The proposal would retain in excess of 300 square metres of private amenity space, which would meet the requirements set out in Table 5.3 and Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020).

## CONCLUSION

This application is recommended for refusal given the unbalanced appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties, resulting in harm to the character of the dwelling and surrounding area.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

**REFUSAL for the following reasons:**

### 1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed side and rear extension, by virtue of its footprint, bulk, width, design and size would represent a disproportionate addition which fails to respect the architectural integrity of the host property and pair, resulting in visual harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, all contrary to policies in the development plan including policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

## INFORMATIVES

### 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:

|         |                                                     |
|---------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| DMT 2   | Highways Impacts                                    |
| DMT 6   | Vehicle Parking                                     |
| DMHB 11 | Design of New Development                           |
| DMHB 12 | Streets and Public Realm                            |
| DMHB 14 | Trees and Landscaping                               |
| DMHD 1  | Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings |

**Contact Officer:** Zara Raza

**Telephone No:** 01895 250230