

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.	ADVERTISMENT 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

Item No. **Report of the Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm**

Address: 1 CHILTERN ROAD EASTCOTE

Development: Erection of a first floor side extension. Single storey rear extension. Infill of gap between house and garage (retrospective)

LBH Ref Nos: 9383/APP/2023/477

Drawing Nos: Location Plan
20/2710/1
Site Plan
20/2710/2
20/2710/3
Design and Access Statement

Date Plans received:

Date(s) of Amendments(s):

Date Application valid

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application property comprises a detached property located on the northern side of Chiltern Road in Eastcote. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprising two-storey semi detached properties and detached bungalows.

There are no other heritage or policy designations on or nearby the site.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor side extension, single storey rear extension, and infill of gap between house and garage. The development is largely completed and this is a retrospective planning application.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

9383/APP/2020/3549

1 CHILTERN ROAD EASTCOTE

Single storey rear extension, raising of ridge height and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 2 x side dormers and ground floor infill extension.

Decision: 15-01-2021

Refused

Comment on Planning History

9383/APP/2020/3549 - Single storey rear extension, raising of ridge height and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 2 x side dormers and ground floor infill extension. Refused 21-01-21. Allowed on Appeal 21-05-21.

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

Eight neighbouring properties, Eastcote Residents Association and Eastcote Conservation Panel were consulted on 23.02.2023.

Neighbour Objections (2):

- Design is aesthetically out of character;
- Unless the structure does not exceed planning regulations then no objection;
- Significant increase in height from approved plans;
- Blocks light into property and garden due to significant increase in size and mass of higher roof structure;
- Dormers are now much higher in roof aspect;
- Windows fitted on dormers are now clear glazed; and
- No building control applications submitted.

Officer Comments: The above comments are noted and the impact of the design on the character of the area, and the residential amenity of neighbouring properties will be discussed in further detail below.

Eastcote Residents Association - No Comment

Eastcote Conservation Panel - No comment

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 D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
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.

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

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also required 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.

This application is a retrospective scheme from the previously application allowed on appeal (application reference:9383/APP/2020/3549). The overall footprint of the scheme is the same, as is the infill side extension and single storey rear extension. As such, there are no such objections to these aspects of the proposal.

This revised scheme differs from the previously approved scheme for the following reasons:

- Approved scheme include part-hipped roof to front and rear measuring maximum ridge height of 7.7m;
- Revised scheme proposes full gable to front and rear measuring maximum ridge height of 8.44m;
- Dormer on eastern elevation increased in depth and height;
- Approved scheme proposes one dormer on western elevation with pitched roof; and
- Revised scheme proposes two flat roof dormers on western elevation.

In considering the principle of the extension in the previous scheme at Appeal the Inspector noted the following:

"I acknowledge that the area of the additional storey is substantial and would be achieved by raising the walls of the bungalow. However, the main eaves of the raised roof, at around first-floor cill height, would be relatively low, and

its ridge would be lower than No 3. Together with part-hips at the front and back, and the very modest size of the two dormers in its side slopes, and despite the volume within, the form of the raising would negate any

appearance of bulkiness. The overall mass of the house would be in balance with its footprint and its plot, whose distinctive lateral gaps it would retain."

In considering the part-hipped roof, the Inspector noted the following:

"I appreciate that the part-hipped roof form is not a characteristic architectural feature in the pattern of development in this street. However, in the context of surrounding roofs which include hipped or gabled forms with

ends in render, brickwork, or tile-hung, a part-hip would not appear out of place. Though the part-hip may be a new roof form in the street, it would not appear incoherent with its roofscape."

Conversely, for this application it appears that the eaves have been raised by 350mm, moreover by virtue of the increase in ridge height and introduction of a sharp pitched roof the proposed development is now higher than the ridge of No. 3 by approximately 20mm (ridge of No. 3 approximately 8.14m). This increase is further exasperated by virtue of the application site already sitting on higher ground than No. 3.

It is clear from the Appeal Decision that the proposal was allowed on the basis of the low eaves, ridge sitting lower than No. 3, modest dormers and part-hips roof. The revised scheme has ultimately failed to comply with the main reasons in which the application was allowed. The additional dormer on the western elevation and introduction of flat roof on western dormers is noted, however by virtue of the increase in height of approximately 0.6m of the dormer on the eastern elevation and pitched roof, it creates an awkward and unbalanced appearance from the street scene. The approved dormers were modest in scale and identical in terms of height and roof type; which appeared symmetrical and an overall benefit to the scheme.

Whilst the part-hipped roofs were not a characteristic of the area, they were allowed on the basis that they would not appear incoherent with its roof scape. The proposed gabled roofs, and especially considering the slightly crooked roof slope would appear entirely out of character within the street scene and with the gable-end with no hipped elements reducing the appearance of mass, the extensions are notably disproportionate to the scale of the original dwelling and visually dominant within the street scene. Almost every property within Chiltern Road feature hipped roofs, with the exception of a feature gable to the front of No. 14. The proposed roof form with its sharp pitched roof and slightly wonky gable end would appear entirely out of character within the street scene and would appear at odds with the immediate surrounding area. The first floor fenestration on the front elevation also appears odd within the larger faced wall by virtue of the increase in ridge height. The proposed development fails to harmonise with the local context taking into account the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures, surrounding rooflines and architectural composition. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policy DMHD 1 and Policy DMHD 11.

Overall, it is considered that this revised scheme would result in a further substantive increase in bulk and mass than the previously approved scheme. It is not considered that the alterations could be considered to constitute subordinate additions to the existing dwellinghouse. The proposal would also constitute an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development when viewed from Chiltern Close, with particular reference to the various roof profiles that have been adopted. It is considered that the proposed development would not relate to the prevalent character of the built environment at Chiltern Close.

The proposed development, by reason of the cumulative size, scale, bulk and design ,with particular reference to increase in eaves and ridge and variation of side dormers, would result in incongruous additions and alterations, which would would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and 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) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

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.

It is noted that no concerns were raised in terms of the previous scheme in relation to residential amenity due to the degree of separation to the rear and the separation to the west. Whilst the increase in eaves and ridge height is noted, it is unlikely that this aspect in itself would amount to an unacceptable degree of overshadowing or loss of light that would amount to a reason for refusal. It is acknowledged that the windows on the side elevation are not obscurely glazed, however had this application been recommended for refusal, a condition could have been secured to ensure the windows were obscurely glazed.

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, with enough space for two 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 application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the cumulative size, scale, bulk and design, with particular reference to increase in eaves and ridge, variation of side dormers and misaligned full gable-ends, would result in incongruous additions and alterations, which would fail to harmonise

with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, and would be visually obtrusive and detrimental to the character, appearance and 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) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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.

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 D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

Contact Officer:	Niamh McMenamin	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	--------------