

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 236 WOODLANDS AVENUE RUISLIP

Development: Retention of hip to gable loft and single storey rear extension as constructed, rear dormer and front porch.

LBH Ref Nos: **9248/APP/2022/2237**

Drawing Nos: P04
P03
P01
P05
P06
P02

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 is a two-storey semi detached dwellinghouse located on the Northern side of Woodlands Avenue. The site surroundings are predominantly similarly characterised to the application site with two-storey semi detached dwellinghouses. The application site is not a listed building or located within a conservation area, however it is in a critical drainage area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the retention of hip to gable loft and single storey rear extension as constructed, rear dormer and front porch.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

9248/APP/2021/3999 236 Woodlands Avenue Ruislip

Erection of a single storey rear extension and demolition of existing conservatory and garage

Decision Date: 11-02-2022 Approved

Comment on Planning History

9248/APP/2021/3999 Erection of a single storey rear extension and demolition of existing conservatory and garage. Approved

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

Neighbours and the residents association were consulted by letter dated 25-07-22. A site notice was displayed 26-07-22. 2 letters of objection were received from neighbours citing

the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment, not sympathetic to the street scene, external materials do not fit in, imitation grey slate tiles out of keeping with surrounding properties.
- Top-heavy appearance, does not sit away from the hip i.e. converts a hip roof into a gable, uses Welsh slate roof tiles - materials contrary in texture, colour and palette to the previous and neighbouring roof tile materials.

Eastcote Residents Association - objection:

We submit that this application does not meet the requirements of a permitted development application for the conversion of roof space to habitable accommodation.

The roof detail does not provide for a standard inset gable end. We understand that the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions and all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling.

You will see from the photographs attached, the roof extension creates a top-heavy and uses Welsh slate roof tiles - materials contrary in texture, colour and palette to the previous and neighbouring roof tile materials.

In addition, the necessary building works to put it in place appear to have already been carried out without any previous official LBH PD rights having been granted. A prior LBH approval does not appear either currently, or previously, in relation to applications for this site.

If we are correct in our interpretation of the drawings submitted and the lack of any previous approval in this regard, we ask that the permitted development be refused and Enforcement be asked to investigate.

Officer comments:

The matters raised above relating to materials, character and appearance are discussed 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:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D1 (2021) London's form, character and capacity for growth

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application dwelling, provision of sufficient off-street parking and drainage.

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) 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 -

A) 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.

With regard to roof extensions, Policy DMHD 1 states:

- 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.

With regards to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 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;
- 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;
- v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;

With regards to front extensions, Policy DMHD 1 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.

Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) states 'Development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings. It should improve an area's visual or physical connection with natural features. In areas of poor or ill-defined character, development should build on the positive elements that can contribute to establish an enhanced character for the future function of the area.'

From the planning history, it appears the single storey rear extension was approved under application ref: 9248/APP/2021/3999. It is also noted that during that time, construction works had begun for the roof dormer and hip to gable adjustment, which were shown on the existing plans submitted with the 2021 application, however these elements did not form part of the proposal description for the approved 2021 scheme which was solely for the single storey rear extension. There is no record in the planning history for a certificate of lawful development for roof alterations and a rear dormer, therefore the cumulative impact of the scheme overall is required to be considered in this application.

The approved plans of the 2021 scheme were annotated showing the exterior walls finished in render to match the existing. The application form states the proposed materials are Pebbledash which appears to be incorrect as the exterior has been rendered and painted white throughout.

The application form does not provide any details of the new tiles or the roof covering of the single storey rear extension. The roof covering has however been changed from a red/brown plain clay tile to a dark grey tile with a slate appearance. In addition the windows have also been replaced with dark grey upvc frames.

The new exterior materials do not correspond with the pebbledash and red/brown plain tile exterior of the original dwelling and represents a material change from the approved plans. The original materials are certainly characteristic of the street scene unlike the new materials which stand in stark contrast to the character and appearance of the area where it can be seen that every property within eyeshot has red/brown plain tiles.

Whilst it is noted there are neighbours along Woodlands Avenue that have white painted pebbledash render, the exterior walls of the application dwelling have been rendered in what appears to be a smooth finish and painted white throughout.

From the application form, the works have commenced on 16/08/2021, however have not been completed. It is noted the 'approved' elevation drawings now contain annotations relating to the roof alterations and the volume calculation of the rear dormer. There is a text box noting the loft constructed under permitted development. Another text box notes exterior materials shall match the existing dwelling. The 'approved' drawing now also features a front elevation showing the hip to gable adjustment, which wasn't previously shown.

The 'as built' drawings show the height of the single storey rear extension has been increased by 10cm; it also shows a new front porch with a pitched roof. The drawings also show the installation of solar panels on the flat roof of the single storey rear extension and

on the flat roof of the rear dormer with the solar panels projecting 25cm above the main ridge. The drawings also show the flat roof of the rear dormer is flush with the main ridge not set down below it. Whilst the drawings show the ridge height as being the same as the adjoining neighbour, it would appear the roof height has in fact been increased.

The roof form of the dwelling has been altered from a hipped roof to a gabled end on the west/ side elevation. Two rooflights have been inserted in the front roofslope. With only a 20cm gap to the side elevation and the shared boundary with the adjoining neighbour, the roof ridge not being set down from the main roof ridge, the overly large dormer dominates the rear roofslope and results in an incongruous addition to the streetscene. The width of the rear dormer would exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof and would not be considered subservient, contrary to criteria i) of Policy DMHD 1.

The visual prominence of the roof alterations/extension including the raising of the roof ridge is further worsened by the poor choice of exterior materials, the projecting solar panels and the altering of the roof form of the dwelling by converting its hipped roof profile to an uncharacteristic part gable on one side. The proposal would fail to accord with Policy DMHD 1 which is clear that new extensions should respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials and that poorly designed or overlarge roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable would not be supported.

Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) states that - Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

In this case, as discussed in the above, it is evident the proposal does not accord with the criteria of Policy DMHD 1 and therefore is contrary to Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

The roof alterations/extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, and design and the introduction of new exterior materials, projecting solar panels and raising of the roof ridge, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms a part of and harmful 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 DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local plan - Part Two (2020) and Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Neighbouring residential amenity:

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. The supporting text for this policy states that the Council will expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook.

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: i) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and ii) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

There are two neighbouring properties to the immediate west and east of the application site, Nos. 234 and 238 Woodlands Avenue. The immediate neighbouring properties are similarly characterised to the application site comprising two storey semi detached dwellinghouses.

As mentioned previously the dwelling to the east at No.238 Woodlands Avenue benefits from an existing generous gap between the application site. Whilst the proposed development would be a significant extension beyond the rear wall, it would have a buffer of approximately 2.75m between the property at No.238 Woodlands Avenue. Taking this into consideration this would greatly soften the visual dominance of the single storey extension and would be considered acceptable on balance.

In respect to the potential impacts on No. 234 Woodlands Avenue, the single storey extension along the Western boundary is staggered with a depth of 3.6m abutting the boundary and then introducing a wider setback from the western boundary for the remaining 2.4m. Whilst the extension is 10cm taller than the previous approval and is still cumulatively greater than the surrounding properties rear walls, it is not considered that this would give rise to detrimental impacts to the amenity of the surrounding neighbouring properties given the appropriate set backs which were secured throughout the course of the previous application.

The neighbours to the north on North View are located 70metres away and separated by the rail track. The rear dormer window is not considered to adversely impact on neighbour amenity.

The development proposal overall, is not considered to be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and would not result in undue overshadowing, overbearing, loss of light, loss of outlook or creating a sense of enclosure. In this regard, the proposal therefore accords with Policy DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Private amenity space:

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 an adequate garden.

In terms of the garden area the development would retain an adequate private garden space in accordance with Policy DMHD 1.

Living accommodation:

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) states that housing development should be of high quality design and provide adequately sized rooms.

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).

Car parking:

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that all development is in accordance with the car parking standards set out in Appendix C, Table 1 unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

Parking arrangements would be unchanged.

Drainage

The site lies in a Critical Drainage Area (CDA) identified in the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for Hillingdon. Therefore the water from the site entering the sewers should be minimised. In the event of an approval an informative would be attached with the following guidance:

- Water run off from any roof or hard paving associated with the development should be directed to a soakaway, or tank or made permeable. This includes any work to front gardens not part of the planning application, must be permeable or be collected and directed to a permeable area, or it would need an additional permission.
- A water butt should be incorporated.
- No drainage to support the extension should be connected to any existing surface water network, other than as an overflow.

Other matters:

A concrete slab has been erected at the rear of the single storey extension to form a raised patio area. This is not shown on the plans and does not form part of the application as it is not listed in the proposal description. It would appear however this raised patio area may result in overlooking of the adjoining neighbours rear garden.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, the application is recommended for refusal.

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The roof alterations/extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, design, raised roof ridge and the introduction of new exterior materials and solar panels that project above the main roof ridge, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms a part of and harmful 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 DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local plan - Part Two (2020), Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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** On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2021). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

- 3 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:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development
DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm
DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6 Vehicle Parking
LPP D1 (2021) London's form, character and capacity for growth
LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards
NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

Contact Officer: Christos Chrysanthou

Telephone No: 01895 250230