

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 5 ALBERT ROAD HAYES

Development: Erection of a two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and loft dormer conversion to include a hip to gable, rear dormer and 3 x front rooflights.

LBH Ref Nos: **29834/APP/2022/792**

Drawing Nos: MSM001 - Existing Drawings
 Location Plan
 Design and Access Statement
 MSM002 - Proposed Drawings

Date Plans Received: 08/03/2022 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 08/03/2022

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the corner of Albert Road with North Hyde Road and comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof. A community centre is sited to the north east.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and loft dormer conversion to include a hip to gable, rear dormer and 3 x front rooflights.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

29834/APP/2021/3754 5 Albert Road Hayes

Construction of a two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and loft dormer conversion to include a hip to gable, rear dormer, side gable end window and 3 x front rooflights.

Decision Date: 01-12-2021 Refused

29834/APP/2021/4343 5 Albert Road Hayes

Erection of a single storey rear outbuilding

Decision Date: 24-01-2022 Approved

29834/C/91/1052 5 Albert Road Hayes

Erection of a detached garden shed (Application for determination under Section 64 of the Act)

Decision Date: 02-08-1991 Refused

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above. It is noted that planning application reference 29834/APP/2021/3754 for the erection of a two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and loft dormer conversion to include a hip to gable, rear dormer, side gable end window and 3 x front rooflights was refused for the following

reasons:

1. The two storey side extension, by virtue of its siting in this visually prominent position, size, scale and design, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy D3 of the London plan (2021).

2. The roof alteration/extensions, by reason of the hip to gable end roof design and the size, scale, bulk, and design of the rear dormer window would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local plan - Part Two (2020) and Policy D3 of the London plan (2021).

Officer note: The scheme differs from that previously refused in that the first floor side extension is set back from the front elevation allowing for a reduced ridge height to the side and bedroom 4 has been reduced in width.

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

3 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 22.3.22. Multiple objections have been received from one address, raising the following summarised concerns:

1. Large extension built up to the boundary;
2. Loss of residential amenity - overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing;
3. No setback for the side extension, contrary to Hillingdon residential guide 2009;
4. The bulk created by the extensions, are not subordinate to the host property, resulting in over development;
5. The reduction in scale of the extensions from those previously refused is not sufficient;
6. The dormer element of the design integrates very poorly, creating an incongruous feature.

Planning Officer Comment: The material issues raised above are addressed in the main body of the report.

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:

DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm

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.

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 adverse impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

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

With regard to rear extensions Policy DMHD1 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 DMHD1 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.

With regard to roof extensions Policy DMHD1 requires:

i) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line;

ii) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;

iii) raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline 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; and

v) 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 fails to comply with the requirements of Policy DMHD 1 for a number of reasons. The proposed side extension, whilst not exceeding half the width of the original dwelling, is not set back 1m from the front wall of the property at both levels and is set alongside the side boundary. With the alterations to the roof, to include a hip to gable end, the proposed side extension would fail to appear as a subordinate addition. The side extension and alterations to the roof would unbalance this pair of semis and result in a

highly prominent incongruous addition to the street scene which could not be supported. The addition of the rear extension at first floor level and large rear box dormer which would dominate the rear roofslope further adds to the massing and cumulatively would engulf and subsume the original dwelling.

Concerns have been raised in a representation that the proposal would harm residential amenity in respect to loss of light/overshadowing, overlooking/loss of privacy. Whilst the extensions would result in a significant increase in bulk, the submitted plans confirm that the 45 degree line would not be breached from the first floor windows at number 7 in respect of the first floor extension, and the relationship with the ground floor element of the extensions would be similar to the existing arrangement. In view of these factors, it is not considered that the proposals would have an undue impact with respect to outlook, overbearing or overshadowing/loss of light. Due to the nature of the proposed dormer extension, this would also not have a significant adverse effect in relation to neighbouring outlook, or light levels.

The views from the rear dormer and extension would be similar in relationship with number 7 to that of the existing first floor windows and as such, are not considered to result in an undue loss of privacy that would justify a refusal of planning permission.

To the rear of the application site, number 24 North Hyde Road would not be considered to be adversely affected due to the adequate separation distance.

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 Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

In terms of the garden area, the development would fulfill the Part 2 Policy DMHD1 appendix A, Part A) vi), which states that for Alterations and extensions to residential dwellings; adequate garden space is retained.

The proposal would result in a reduction of space available for off street parking. As such, it is noted that for the previous refused application, the Highway Officer recommended that if planning permission were to be granted, a legal agreement should be secured to prevent the residents from applying for a parking permit. This is in order to prevent the proposed development from giving rise to parking stress.

The application fails to address the previous reasons for refusal and as such, is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The two storey side extension, by virtue of its siting in this visually prominent position, size, scale and design, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy D3 of the London plan (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The roof alteration/extensions, by reason of the hip to gable end roof design and the size, scale, bulk, and design of the rear dormer window would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local plan - Part Two (2020) and Policy D3 of the London plan (2021).

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.

We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

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:

DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP D8 (2021) Public realm

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

Telephone No: 01895 250230