Development Management

OTHER (please specify)

APP REF No. 12766/APP/2024/1224

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			The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of
1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received		Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds		Case Officer:
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action		
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings		Signature:
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)		
REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL Date:			
6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards		
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	$\overline{\Box}$	
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s		A delegated decision is appropriate and
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)		the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT informative's are satisfactory.			
10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of		
	less than 0.5 ha		Team Manager:
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt		
COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT		Signature:	
12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less		0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000
	than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses		Date:
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			The decision notice for this application can be issued.
15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)		can be issued.
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)		
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development		Director / Member of Senior
CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS			Management Team:
18.	ADVERTISMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)		
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION		Signature:
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS		
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION		Date:
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION		3.5
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS		
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where		NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS
	the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval		SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM
25.	WORKS TO TREES		Name of the second

Item No. Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control

Address: 32 ICKENHAM ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Erection of a two storey rear extension, part single part two storey front

extension, first floor side extension and installation of rooflights. (Description

amended)

LBH Ref Nos: 12766/APP/2024/1224

Drawing Nos: 24011-REP-001 - Rev 1

24011-FSS-001 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-001 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-002 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-007 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-008 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-009 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-010 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-005 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-006 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-004 - Rev 1 24011-PLA-003 - Rev 1

Date Plans received: 08-05-24 Date(s) of Amendments(s):

Date Application valid 08-05-24

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a substantial two storey detached property located on the North side of Ickenham Road. The dwelling has a rendered finish and benefits from a single storey front extension and a two storey side extension with integral garage. The property is set back from the highway by approximately 9 m and has a paved carriage driveway with some soft landscaping and parking space for two to three vehicles and an enclosed private amenity space to the rear.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance generally comprising two storey detached houses. Number 30 Ickenham Road is located to the east of the application site and Number 32a is located to the west. The application site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan.

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 2 of 11

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey rear extension, single storey front extension, first floor front extension, first floor side extension and installation of rooflights. The dimensions for the proposal are listed below (based on submitted plans):

Single storey front extension:

Width - 4.17m Depth - 1.20m

Maximum Height - 3.18m

First floor front extension:

Width - 3.89m Depth - 1.20m

Maximum Height - 4.20m

Two storey rear extension:

Width - 8.20m Depth - 4.00m

Maximum Height - 6.70m

First floor side extension:

Width - 3.36m Depth - 4.19m

Maximum Height - 3.37m

The materials will be matching or similar to those of the existing house.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

12766/APP/2023/2182 32 ICKENHAM ROAD RUISLIP

Erection of part single storey, part double storey side, rear and front extensions incorporating roof alterations and conversion of loft space to habitable room with two rear dormer windows with amendments to fenestration (revised description)

Decision: 27-09-2023 Refused

12766/APP/2020/1144 32 ICKENHAM ROAD RUISLIP

First floor side/rear extension and alterations to roof to include raising ridge height

Decision: 28-05-2020 Refused

12766/APP/2005/1227 32 ICKENHAM ROAD RUISLIP

ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY PART FRONT EXTENSION, AND TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND CONSERVATORY)

Decision: 17-06-2005 Approved

12766/B/96/1913 32 ICKENHAM ROAD RUISLIP

Erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension and construction of a new vehicular

access to form an in/out driveway

Decision: 16-04-1997 Approved

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 3 of 11

Comment on Planning History

Relevant planning history is listed above.

The previous application 12766/APP/2023/2182 (Erection of part single storey, part double storey side, rear and front extensions incorporating roof alterations and conversion of loft space to habitable room with two rear dormer windows with amendments to fenestration) was refused on 27-09-23 for the following reasons:

'The cumulative impacts of the existing and proposed extensions by reason of their combined and excessive scale, bulk, width, size, design and siting would result in an unsympathetic and incongruous over development of the site which would fail to read as subordinate to the host property, harming the original design and appearance of the host property and failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 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).'

The current application aims to address these refusal reasons.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 19th June 2024

3. Comments on Public Consultations

8 neighbouring properties, Ruislip Residents Association and Hillingdon Council's Conservation Officer were consulted on 14-05-24. The consultation period expired on 05-06-24. A site notice was displayed near the site from 15-05-24 till 07-06-24 and a press notice was advertised in the local new paper running from 29-05-24 till 19-06-24.

At the end of the consultation period the following comments were received:

One neighbouring objection with concerns over:

- 1 Privacy, especially overlooking into rear garden.
- 2 Non residential use of the property.
- 3 Construction traffic.
- 4 Encroachment on boundary.

Planning Officer comments:

- 1 Potential impacts on neighbouring amenity will be discussed in the main body of the report.
- 2 Regarding non-residential use of the property, this would require planning permission and does not form part of the application submitted for consideration. Any breach of planning would require investigation but the Planning Enforcement Team.
- 3 Whilst is it agreed that construction practices should be considerate, it is noted that they are subject to legislation outside of the planning process.
- 4 Encroachment is usually dealt with under the Party Wall Act 1996 and is the responsibility of the applicant.

Conservation Officer:

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 4 of 11

- The first floor side extension should be set in further to maintain the clear gaps between the dwellinghouses, preventing a terracing effect.
- Concern over the massing of the front extension and the impact this would have on the appearance of the property within the conservation area.

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

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Polices:

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 11 Design of New Development
DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF4 -23 NPPF4 23 - Decision making

NPPF12 -23 NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

NPPF16 -23 NPPF16 23 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the conservation area, 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.

More specifically to this proposal, Policies HE1, DMHB 1 and DMHB 4 are relevant given that the site forms part of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. These two policies relate specifically to heritage assets and conservation areas, seeking to avoid harm to heritage assets and ensure the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Considerable importance and weight has been attached to and special attention has been paid to

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 5 of 11

the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended.

Other development management policies including 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 regards to side extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states 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 regards to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (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;
- 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.

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 6 of 11

With regards to front extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) 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.

The application proposes a two storey rear extension which would measure 4m deep, inline with Policy DMHD 1. The rear extension would also be outside of the 45 degree sight lines from neighbouring windows, have a pitched roof design and not extend the full width of the rear elevation of the property, inline with policy DMHD 1. A design concern is the size of the proposed obscure windows, these are usually small sized windows leading into shower rooms, with the ones proposed resembling regular room windows visually impacting the appearance of the building. However windows are a minor consideration in design terms and therefore, when considering the two storey rear extension in isolation, it appears to comply with the relevant planning policy.

The proposed roof lights would be in compliance with policy and would not adversely impact the character and appearance of the property being common place on residential properties and present on neighbouring properties.

In addition, the proposal would alter the existing single storey side extension with the addition of a first floor side extension, nearly double the width of the original dwelling (based on the original property plans from 1956), contrary to Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020). The side extension would set back from the front elevation by around 3.30m and set back from the closest neighbouring boundary by around 1.00m, complying with the requirements of policy DMHD 1. However the the built form would encroach closer to the neighbouring dwelling and would have a enclosing impact on the street by the loss of the existing ample gap. This issue was raised by the conservation officer as causing less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area, which could not be out weighed by public benefit. Therefore, on balance the first floor side extension is considered to be contrary to the objectives set out in policy DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 which require extensions to be sympathetic to the host property, surrounding neighbouring properties and designated heritage assets such as conservation areas.

The combination of the first floor front extension and the single storey front extension would create a bulky addition to the front of elevation which would be contrary to the objectives of policy DMHD1 and would a negative impact upon the character and appearance of the property within the conservation area. Based on observations and planning history of neighbouring properties there does not seem to be other examples of large from extensions within the locality.

In conclusion, although the two storey rear extension appears to comply with policy DMHD 1, officers still consider that the scale of proposed extensions as a collective are excessive when compared to the original dwelling and contrary to planning policy. The cumulative impact by reason of size, scale, bulk and design would result in an unsympathetic, 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 less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area and Ruislip Village Conservation Area, with no public benefits to outweigh the harm identified, all contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 1, DHMB 4, DHMB 11 and DHMB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 7 of 11

Development Management Policies (2020)

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 30 Ickenham Road is located to the east of the application site and Number 32a is located to the west.

No 30 Ickenham Road lies to the East of the subject site and would not be adversely affected by the first floor side or the front extensions due their siting and the front of this property being angled away and set back from the application property. The two storey rear extension would not breach the 45 degree sight lines of sight nor would the depth lead to negative impact son the amenities of this neighbouring property, with sufficient gap left. The first floor windows facing this property would be obscure glazed with openings 1.7m up from the floor.

The proposed first floor side extension would be set in from the side boundary by 1m and no windows are proposed in the south facing flank elevations towards No. 32A Ickenham Road. The first floor rear extension would comply with the 45 degree line of sight when measured from the centre of the nearest first floor window in the rear elevation of this neighbouring property. It is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of this neighbouring property.

Therefore it is considered that there would not be any loss of amenity or overlooking to these adjacent properties.

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:

Although the proposal would lead to the removal of the garage, the property has hardstanding at the front of the property, and could accommodate at least two cars, in accordance with Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion:

Although the design and access statement explains that this proposal aims to address the concerns raised in the previous refusal (ref. 12766/APP/2023/2182), the cumulative impact of all the extensions proposed and previous would still lead to an unacceptable final appearance of the property in the context of the locality and conservation area. The main body of the report

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 8 of 11

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 that planning permission should be refused.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Reason for Refusal - Design and Harm to Conservation Area

The cumulative impacts of the existing and proposed extensions by reason of their combined and excessive scale, bulk, width, size, design and siting would result in an unsympathetic and incongruous over development of the site which would fail to read as subordinate to the host property, harming the original design and appearance of the host property and failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 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 (2023).

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 Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan (2021) and national guidance.
- 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.

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB Design of New Development

11

DMHB Streets and Public Realm

12

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 9 of 11

DMHB Private Outdoor Amenity Space

18

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF4 - NPPF4 23 - Decision making

23

NPPF12 NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

-23

NPPF16 NPPF16 23 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

-23

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 Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) 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 Polices

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Polices:

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 11 Design of New Development
DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF4 -23 NPPF4 23 - Decision making

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 10 of 11

NPPF12 -23 NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

NPPF16 -23 NPPF16 23 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Samuel Patten Telephone No: 01895 250230

OREPHHD (ODB 2022) 11 of 11