

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 an 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 the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	☐
25.	WORKS TO TREES	☐
26.	OTHER (please specify)	☐

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. 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 informative's 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 DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Development: Erection of a single storey rear extension

Drawing Nos: Block Location plan
Proposed Floor plan and elevations
Existing Floor plan and elevations.

Date Plans received: _____ **Date(s) of Amendments(s):** _____

Date Application valid

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site relates to a two-storey end-of-terrace residential property, on the East of Oak Avenue. The properties are characterised by terraced groups and pairs of semi-detached dwellings. There is an area of soft landscaping to the front of the group of properties within the site context.

The application site is not designated within a Conservation Area, nor an Area of Special Local Character. The site does not contain any Listed Buildings. There are no trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order within the site or on adjoining land.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension projecting 5.9m in depth for the entire width of the property at a height of 2.8m with a flat roof.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

77097/APP/2022/2558 13 OAK AVENUE WEST DRAYTON

Erection of a single storey extension to the rear

Decision: 10-10-2022 Refused

77097/APP/2022/2167 13 OAK AVENUE WEST DRAYTON

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer roof extension, 3 front roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision: 31-08-2022 Approved

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 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 metres

Decision: 08-04-2022

Prior Approval N/Req

Comment on Planning History

It should be noted that planning permission was recently refused for a single storey rear extension under application reference 77097/APP/2022/2558 for the following reason:

The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, design and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers on 15 Oak Avenue, by reason of overdominance, visual intrusion, sense of enclosure and loss of outlook. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Officer note: This extension projected 4m in depth alongside the boundary with Number 15, stepping out to 6m in depth at a distance of 2.9m off the boundary.

Prior approval was granted for 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 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 metres under 77097/APP/2022/613.

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

Seven neighbouring properties were consulted on the application by letter dated 05-12-22. The consultation period expired 28-12-22.

There has been no local response.

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

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space

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, reduction of space in 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.

B) Rear Extensions

- 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;
- v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;

The proposed rear extension would exceed policy guidance in Policy DMHD 1. It is noted the site benefits from a 4m extension under the prior approval process however, the proposed depth of 5.9 metres would be excessive and overly large. It is important to note here is no existing examples of any other rear extension to this depth to the rear of the properties on this side of Oak Avenue. That said, there are other outbuildings which disrupt the rear building line and could justify the disproportionate depth given its position to the rear.

Whilst large, exceed the depth noted in Policy DMHD 1, there is no objection on character and appearance grounds. Whilst in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One

Strategic (2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), on balance, other material considerations exist in this case.

Residential Amenity:

No. 11 and 15 are the principle properties that should be assessed in terms of the residential amenity impact as a result of the rear extension.

11 Oak Avenue:

There is no rear extension to this neighbouring dwelling. The neighbour and the site share a splayed boundary to which the rear extension would be placed and directed away from this neighbour. As such, there would not be an unduly detrimental impact on this neighbouring dwelling.

15 Oak Avenue:

There is no rear extension at this site, the resultant impact of the 5.9 metre extension on this neighbour would result in a harmful sense of enclosure and loss of outlook, particularly to the window on the rear elevation near the boundary line and the key external amenity space serving the rear of the property. As such, the proposal is considered to create a harmful impact to the amenity of this neighbouring dwelling. This is worsened by existing structures near the boundary on the other side, tunnelling no.15 in a harmful way.

With regard to light and overshadowing, on balance, no objection is raised. This is because of the east facing orientation of the properties. Overall, on balance, the loss of light would not be so harmful as to warrant a refusal in this case.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the No. 15 Oak Avenue in terms of loss of outlook and sense of enclosure in direct conflict with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020).

External Amenity Space Provision:

Table 5.3 of Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020) states that dwelling houses with 2-3 bedrooms should be provided with a minimum of 60 square metres of private external amenity space. The proposed plans shows over 200 square metres of rear garden space would be retained. The proposal would therefore 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 property will still retain its existing parking provisions and there is no change to this. Therefore, as parking spaces to the front are retained and not altered in any way, the proposal complies with the Councils Car Parking Standards in DMT 6 of the LPP2.

Conclusion:

It is considered that the proposal would not accord with the relevant policies set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). The development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building , but no

the streetscene and wider area. It would however, create an unduly detrimental impacts to the neighbouring property at No. 15 Oak Avenue. Taking all matters into account, on balance, planning permission should be refused given the revised scheme fails to adequately address the recent previous reason for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, design and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers on 15 Oak Avenue, by reason of overdominance, visual intrusion, sense of enclosure and loss of outlook. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

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 'Saved' UDP 2007, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service. This is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme, where the Officers Report identified issues to be addressed, which were reflected in the reasons for refusal, allowing the opportunity to address those issues within this submission.

Part 1 Policies

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin Telephone No: 01895 250230