

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. Director of Residents Services 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 Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces**

Address 11 WALNUT WAY RUISLIP

Development: Single storey side/rear/front extension and single storey front extension involving conversion of garage to habitable use and raising of roof and installation of 2 x side dormers to allow for additional habitable use

LBH Ref Nos: **10279/APP/2014/723**

Drawing Nos: 107 Sheet 1 of 1
 102 Sheet 2 of 6 Rev. A
 001 Sheet 1 of 1
 101 Sheet 1 of 1
 101 Sheet 1 of 6
 103 Sheet 3 of 6
 104 Sheet 4 of 6
 105 Sheet 5 of 6
 106 Sheet 6 of 6
 Planning Design and Access Statement

Date Plans Received: 04/03/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 10/03/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a detached bungalow with an attached garage located on the northern side of Walnut Way. There is front hardstanding for the parking of 1no vehicle and rear garden amenity on a rectangular shaped plot. The area is predominately residential in character and appearance, comprising a mix of two storey semi-detached dwellinghouses and detached bungalows.

The site is situated within a Developed Area as identified in the policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey side, rear & front extension and a single storey front extension, which will involve the conversion of the garage to habitable use and raising and extension of the main roof and installation of 2 side dormers to increase the habitable space.

The single storey side element of the proposal would maintain the same width of 3.5m as the garage and would extend 2.5 metres forward of the principal elevation to the same front building line as the existing front projection. The extension would have an overall depth of 15.2m and would include a single storey rear extension which would extend 3.6m past the rear elevation of the dwelling to the width of the property. The single storey rear element would have a flat roof measuring 2.85m in height. The front section of the extension would have a gable end with a height of 4.05m.

The roof of the dwelling would be extended over the side extension and increase in height by approximately 1.5m. The existing side dormers would also be enlarged and relocated

in the roofslope.

At ground floor the proposal would create an enlarged kitchen / diner to the rear and 2no. downstairs bedrooms. At first floor 2no. larger side dormer windows (facing no.9 Walnut Way) would extend the 2no. bedrooms and provide a larger bathroom.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

There is no planning history associated with the application site.

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

5 near neighbours and South Ruislip Residents Association were consulted and site notice displayed on 22 March 2014 giving 21 days to make their representations. No comments were received.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

LPP 3.5 (2011) Quality and design of housing developments

OE1 Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.

BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.

BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.

BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.

BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the impact on the character and appearance of the original dwellinghouse and surrounding area, impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and provision of

acceptable residential amenity and parking for the application property.

With regard to the character and appearance of the original dwellinghouse in the rear environment, the rear element of the proposal would have a depth of 3.6m. In order to achieve a subordinate appearance and minimise visual intrusiveness received by neighbouring properties, HDAS-EXT guidance para 3.4 states that an extension up to 4m deep is acceptable, with regard to a detached dwellinghouse. The depth of this element is therefore compliant with said guidance.

The single storey side element would have a width of 3.5m, compared with a width of 7.8m of the original dwellinghouse. HDAS-EXT guidance paragraph 4.5 states that the width of the extension should be considerably less than that of the main house and be between half and two-thirds of the original house width order to maintain a subordinate appearance. This element is compliant with said guidance. As such, noted that this area has already been developed, its impact is minimal from a demonstrable viewpoint. The overall side to rear extension would have a flat roof, which would have a height of 2.8m. HDAS-EXT guidance states that a single storey extension with a flat roof should not exceed 3m in height of which this proposal duly complies in this regard.

With regard to the single storey front extension, this element would create a new entrance to the dwellinghouse. It is proposed to have a width of 3.5m and would project 2.5m from the front elevation of the main house, which would match the furthestmost point of the dwellinghouse. This is compliant with HDAS-EXT guidance paragraph 4.6, which states that the front wall of the extension can be inline with the front wall of the original dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the roof would be pitched with a height of 2.3m to the eaves and 4m to the ridge. The proposed height would exceed HDAS-EXT guidance, stating that a pitched roof should not exceed 3.4m. However, the proposed height can be justified as it would replicate the pitched height on the opposing side of the dwellinghouse. It would therefore serve to balance the appearance of the principal elevation and compliment the appearance of the dwellinghouse. Also it is noted that the extension would be built up to the same building line as the neighbouring dwelling, so the additional forward projection would be acceptable in this regard. Moreover, this pitch would not exceed the height of the secondary pitch at No.9 Walnut Way and would thus have minimal impact on the character of the streetscene.

Turning to the proposed side dormers and roof enlargement. The Council's design guidance requires dwellings to maintain a 1m distance separation to side boundary lines for all first floor extensions. This distance separation is required to be increased to 1.5m when the ground floor is built up to the side boundary line. The proposed roof extension and dormers would create the effect of a second storey, which would be only 0.8 metres from the boundary line. Therefore, the development would result in an unacceptable closing of the open space to the side of the dwelling, having an unacceptable impact on the streetscene.

In terms of the appearance of the dormer, it is important that the proportions remains secondary to the size and scale of the roof form and does not unsettle its design unsympathetically. HDAS-EXT guidance paragraph 7.8 states that the dormer should be set above the eaves by 0.5m. The proposed dormers would not comply with set in guidelines from the eaves of the main roof, as there would only be a 0.2m set in. Furthermore, the dormer windows have a significant visual prominence on the streetscene which would create an unfavourable design in the roof form. As such, the design and proportion are both obtrusive and unsympathetic to the original dwellinghouse and the streetscene contrary to part 2 policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: UDP Saved Policies (2012) in this regard.

It is noted that the increase in the height of the dwelling would be acceptable as it would act as a transitional height between the bungalow and two storey property.

In terms of the impact on the neighbouring dwellings. The single storey rear extension would have a depth of 3.6 metres but would extend 4.14 metres past the rear elevation of No.9. At this depth along the shared boundary line, the proposed development is considered to cause unacceptable harm to the occupiers of this neighbouring property in terms of loss of light, loss of outlook and sense of dominance. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 & BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

The proposed development would alter the dormer windows in the side elevation of the property, however, the outlook would largely remain the same and would cause no significant harm to the neighbouring occupiers in terms of overlooking.

The development would not extend closer to the boundary shared with No.13 Walnut Way and would cause no significant harm to the residential amenity of the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the development, would have an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan saved policies (2012) and Policy 3.5 the London Plan (2011).

Paragraph 4.9 in the HDAS-EXT states sufficient garden space should be retained 100sqm as a consequence of an extension. The overall proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms at the dwellinghouse and approximately 200sqm of amenity space would remain thus would satisfy said guidance and BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: UDP Saved Policies (2012) in this regard.

The proposed development would result in the loss of the garage and potentially the existing parking space within the site. The applicant has provided a block plan to show two parking spaces being retained. However, the depth of the front garden area does not appear to be accurate, as it does not accord with the depths shown on the original block plan, location plan or Council's GIS system. Therefore, the proposed development is likely to result in the loss of both existing off-street parking spaces, contrary to Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

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

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed side dormer window and roof extensions, by reason of their position, size, scale, bulk design and proximity to the side boundary line would result in discordant and intrusive features that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the original property, the visual amenity of the streetscene and the character and appearance of the wider area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed single storey rear extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, depth, height and proximity to the shared boundary line would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 9 Walnut Way, by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies. On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development (which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

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 (July 2011) and national

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.

guidance.

- | | |
|------|--|
| BE23 | Requires the provision of adequate amenity space. |
| BE24 | Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours. |

Contact Officer: Scott Hackner

Telephone No: 01895 250230