

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. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm 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 Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm**Address** 41 HIGHFIELD DRIVE ICKENHAM**Development:** Single storey rear extension, a first floor rear extension infilling the area to the side of the existing first floor rear addition, a roof extension with two rear dormers to provide additional second floor living accommodation and a two storey front extension.**LBH Ref Nos:** **30871/APP/2022/1516****Drawing Nos:** Location plan
C02
C01
C04
C03
Design and access statement
39515
39515/2
39515/3
Planning Statement**Date Plans Received:** 09/05/2022**Date(s) of Amendment(s):****Date Application Valid:** 13/06/2022**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 of site features hard and soft landscaping with provision for approximately 2-3 cars. The application site features an existing two-storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential and is varied in terms of form, proportion and appearance.

There are no heritage or policy constraints on the site.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension, a first floor rear extension infilling the area to the side of the existing first floor rear addition, a roof extension with two rear dormers to provide additional second floor living accommodation and a two storey front extension.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

30871/APP/2001/2555 41 Highfield Drive Ickenham

ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS AND A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Decision Date: 27-02-2002

Refused

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

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

Six neighbouring properties, and Ickenham Residents Association were consulted on 20.06.2022. No comments were received at the time of determination.

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

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

NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

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:

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) 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. Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that alterations and extension of dwellings should not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

With regard to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

- 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.

In terms of front extension, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

- i) 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;
- ii) porches should be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building; pastiche features will not be supported; and
- iii) notwithstanding the above, at least 25% of the front garden must be retained.

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 application site features an existing two-storey side and rear extension, a single storey rear extension and an existing conservatory. The existing single storey rear elements measure a depth of 3.16 and a length of 12.3m. The proposed single storey rear extension measures a depth of 3.4m, and a length of 12.8m with a mono-pitched roof of 3.6m. The application proposes a first floor rear extension measuring a depth of 3m, and a length of 9.4m. The proposed two-storey front extension would measure a depth of 1.45, a length of 3.6m and would feature a pitched roof measuring a height of 7.4m.

The depth of the original host dwelling measures approximately 7.46, the resulting depth of the proposed property would measure 14.64m. Collectively, the extensions protrude approximately 7m from the original rear building line, this is considered wholly excessive. It is considered that the result of the cumulative extensions over time and the proposed extension would overwhelm the original property and would not appear as subservient additions. It is noted that a number of dwellings along Highfield Drive have been extended, however the proposed design, form, and height of the proposed dwelling would appear excessively large within the context of the plot, relationship with neighbouring properties and the street scene. The proposed extensions would deteriorate any original architectural composition of the original dwelling and overwhelm the site.

In line with the roof conversion, the application proposed to raise the eaves by 0.8m, raise ridge by 0.35m and includes the addition of two rear dormers. The proposed dormers would measure a 1.75m high and a length of 2.1m. The proposed roof conversion would result in a large crown roof with a skylight that may or may not be harmfully visible from mid-view points. The proposed roof form would appear disproportionate and top heavy on the subject dwelling, and visually incongruous with the other dwellings on the street. It is noted that crown roofs are present in the surrounding area, however not as large as that proposed and in combination with the extensions to the rear, front, and roof enlargement, would collectively fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area.

Questions are also raised as to the accuracy of the proposed street scene elevations given that the road is gently sloped resulting in the existing eaves and ridge heights of the neighbouring dwellings being different to that depicted on the submitted drawings. Consequently the proposed roof extensions and raising of the eaves and ridge height would have an even greater harmful impact on the visual amenity of the street scene, particularly in being much taller than 43 Highfield Road and disproportionate when compared to No. 39 Highfield Drive.

In light of the above, the design of the proposal fails 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).

Residential Amenity:

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure, amongst other matters, that: ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

No. 39 and No. 43 Highfield Drive are the principal properties that need to be considered in terms of residential amenity.

No. 39 Highfield Drive is a two-storey detached property located to the north of the property. The neighbouring property has been extended over time. The single storey element will extend approximately 3.87m from the rear building wall of the neighbouring property. Whilst the first floor rear extension would sit adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 39, there are no windows on the side elevation of No. 39 which would be adversely impacted by virtue of overlooking or overshadowing.

No. 43 Highfield Drive is located to the south of the site and comprises a two-storey detached dwelling. The existing two-storey side and rear extension sits adjacent to the boundary shared with No. 42. It is noted that there are no habitable windows facing the application site. The existing two-storey extension extends approximately 3.8m from the rear building wall of No. 42. The proposed two-storey extension and single storey extensions would sit 7.45m from the rear building line of No. 42.

The dwellings run along the common boundary and therefore any rear projection would have more of an impact as the property is right on the boundary. The rearward projection would be excessively deep (referenced in design concerns) and would impact the occupier's of No. 43 in terms of rear windows and immediate garden area. The depth of the extensions from the rear wall of No. 43 would result in an unacceptable impact, resulting in an overbearing nature, loss of outlook, sense of enclosure, overdominance and a visual impact. In this regard, the proposed development fails to comply with the policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11.

The replacement windows on the front, rear and side of the property would have a mutual level of impact in terms of overlooking/privacy and the upper floor side elevation windows could be conditioned to be obscure-glazed and partially fixed shut. The rear dormers, given their roof siting and proportionate nature would not cause undue overlooking concerns.

Taking the above into consideration, the proposal by reason of its size, siting, scale, mass, bulk and design would be detrimental to the residential amenity of No. 43 Highfield Drive in terms of overdominance, outlook, sense of enclosure, visual intrusion, some loss of daylight/sunlight, and overbearing impact. Therefore, the proposal would fail to comply with the requirements of Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

External Amenity Space Provision:

The proposed development would retain sufficient rear garden space. This would be in accordance with the minimum private amenity space standards set out in Table 5.3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). As such, it is considered that the proposal would not undermine the provision of external amenity space for the existing occupiers at the site, in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Parking and Highway Safety:

The site benefits from hardstanding outside the front of the property for two - three cars. It is therefore compliant with the recommended parking standards set out in Table 1 of Appendix C, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to significantly exacerbate the pressure for street parking or prejudice highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with the overarching objectives of policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion:

The proposal would be unacceptable on the following grounds:

1. Character and appearance
2. Neighbouring amenity impact on No. 43 Highfield Drive.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by reason of its size, siting, scale, mass, bulk and design would result in an incongruous and overly dominant form of development which fails to respect the design of the original house, or read as subordinate to and relate to the established site context. The proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance to the host dwelling, streetscene and surrounding area and would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies, Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of its size, siting, scale, mass, bulk and design would be detrimental to the residential amenity of No. 43 Highfield Drive in terms of overdominance, outlook, sense of enclosure, visual intrusion, some loss of daylight/sunlight, and overbearing impact. Therefore, the proposal would fail to comply with the requirements of Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

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:

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
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
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

Contact Officer: Niamh McMenamin

Telephone No: 01895 250230