

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 1 DALE CLOSE PINNER

Development: Demolition of existing garage. Erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension

LBH Ref Nos: **3601/APP/2022/2242**

Drawing Nos: PL - 02
 PL - 03
 PL - 04
 PL - 05
 PL - 06
 PL - 01

Date Plans Received: 13/07/2022 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 13/07/2022

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises of a semi-detached bungalow on Dale Close. The property is finished in white render and has hardstanding to the front.

The surrounding area is residential in nature. Number 39 Alandale Drive is to the South of the site. To the North of the site is Number 2 Dale Close.

The site is not within a Conservation Area nor an Area of Special Local Character. The site does not contain any Listed Buildings or TPOs. The site is within a Critical Drainage Area and a Surface Water Flood Zone.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

3601/APP/2021/4472 1 Dale Close Pinner

Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4 metres, for which the maximum height would be 3.20 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.90 metres

Decision Date: 10-01-2022 PRN

3601/APP/2021/4475 1 Dale Close Pinner

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer with Juliet balcony, 2 front roof lights, conversion of roof from hip to gable end with new gable end window and the removal of a flue (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision Date: 07-03-2022 Approved

3601/APP/2022/324 1 Dale Close Pinner

Demolition of existing garage. Erection of a single storey side and rear extension. Erection of an outbuilding at the rear end of the garden

Decision Date: 09-06-2022 **Approved**

Comment on Planning History

3601/APP/2022/324 - Approval

The application site has recently had an erection of a single storey side and rear extension and erection of an outbuilding at the rear end of the garden approved.

This application differs from these permissions with a front extension, enlarging the approved side extension towards the front of the property with a roof canopy porch. Furthermore, the side and rear extension is altered in shape and includes a boiler room accessed from the side of the property.

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

Three neighbouring properties and Northwood Hills Residents Association were consulted by letters dated 29-07-22. Due to a revised description the consultation period expired on 23-08-22. One representation has been received by the end of the consultation period.

Neighbour:

- Concerns regarding no party wall surveyor and report

Planning officer:

All material considerations will be discussed 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 D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

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) states that new 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 extensions to 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;

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

- 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 respect to front extensions:

- 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.

It is also important to note that the roof extension shown on the plans has been approved under a CLD application (ref: 3601/APP/2021/4475), but has not been built out. Given that it would join the proposed front and side extension it would no longer be permitted development and would require planning permission. Therefore, while the applicant has not proposed this as part of the application it should be considered given that it could not be lawfully built out in combination with the development proposed on this application (but is shown on the plans). Never hipped-to-gable roof extensions or large rear dormers are characteristic of the adjacent bungalows in the area and are contrary to local plan policy. However the scale of the rear roof extension is excessive and contrary to planning policy. The cumulative impact of the proposed roof extensions and the front/side/rear extensions by reason of size, scale, bulk, projection and design would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development that could not be considered to constitute subordinate addition to the existing dwellinghouse, failing to respect the architectural composition of the existing dwellinghouse resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of Dale Close.

The recent approval on planning application ref: 3601/APP/2022/324 is a material planning consideration. On this application the side and rear extension has been altered in shape and includes a boiler room accessed from the side of the property. In this respect, the principle of the amendments to the side/rear extension are acceptable, given there is no increase in floor space.

However, the addition of the front extension which extends across the approved side extension and front of the property is unacceptable. It is noted that the detached garage does not set a precedent for depth. As per Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) 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. Furthermore, front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused. The current approved plans allow for the recently approved side extension to appear subordinate, however the proposed front extension fails to comply with this policy and proportionally results in extensions that are not subordinate. This would harmfully fail to respect the proportions and appearance of the original dwelling, visual amenity of the street scene and character of the area.

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 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.

Number 39 Alandale Drive is to the South of the site. To the North of the site is Number 2

Dale Close.

Given that the side extension is on the south western wall and that No.2 have an existing rear extension, it is considered that the development would not adversely impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No.2, in terms of daylight/sunlight, outlook and overbearing effect.

The side extension is set away from the mutual boundary with Number 39 Alandale Drive by 0.9m, and would largely replace an existing garage. It is noted that there would be new side windows at ground floor level, however given the views would be of the mutual boundary treat is considered that the development would not adversely impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No.39, in terms of daylight/sunlight, outlook and overbearing effect.

Overall, it is considered that the extension would not adversely effect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), in this respect.

Outlook and Light:

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the proposed development, would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

External Amenity Space Provision:

A sufficient amount of private amenity space will be retained to meet the minimum standards set out in Table 5.3 (Private Outdoor Amenity Space Standards) of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020). The proposal, therefore, would not undermine the provision of external amenity space, in accordance with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

Parking and Highway Safety:

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals must comply with the parking standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1 in order to facilitate sustainable development and address issues relating to congestion and amenity.

The property has at least two off street car parking spaces. It is therefore in accordance with Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion:

The main body of the report demonstrates that the proposal does not comply with all of the relevant policies set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). It is therefore concluded, taking all matters into account including the personal circumstances of the applicant, that planning permission should be refused.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed front extension by reason of size, scale, bulk, projection and design would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development that could not be considered to constitute subordinate addition to the existing dwellinghouse and in combination with the proposed extensions, failing to respect the architectural composition of the existing dwellinghouse resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of Dale Close. The proposal would therefore be contrary to 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) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The cumulative impact of the proposed roof extensions and the front/side/rear extensions by reason of size, scale, bulk, projection and design would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development that could not be considered to constitute subordinate addition to the existing dwellinghouse, failing to respect the architectural composition of the existing dwellinghouse resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of Dale Close. The proposal would therefore be contrary to 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) 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
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

Contact Officer: Emilie Bateman

Telephone No: 01895 250230