

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 6. Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Application has not been supported independently by a person/s | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 10. Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Householder application in the Green Belt | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 15. Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development | <input type="checkbox"/> |

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 18. ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. APPROVAL OF DETAILS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. WORKS TO TREES | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. OTHER (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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 27 CHARVILLE LANE WEST HILLINGDON

Development: Single storey rear/side extension to include 1 x rear roof lantern and porch to front

LBH Ref Nos: **15206/APP/2014/140**

Drawing Nos: 204
205
Location Plan (1:1250)

Date Plans Received: 16/01/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 16/01/2014

Date Application Valid: 27/01/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application comprises of a detached two storey dwelling located on the northern side of Charville Lane West, which is located within the Developed Area as identified within the Hillingdon Local Plan. The property is constructed on red brick under a plain tiled hipped roof. A single garage with a catslide roof is located to east alongside the boundary with number 29. The property has a forward projecting bay window and porch with a flat roof. The front garden is laid to hardstanding providing off street parking for 2 cars and also a raised flower bed. The rear garden is flat and enclosed.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear/side extension to include 1 x rear roof lantern and porch to front. The extension would project 2.4m to the rear of the original dwelling and wrap around the side elevation with a bay window to the front. The extension is proposed to have a false pitched roof to the front measuring 4.13m in height, dropping down to a flat roof to the rear, measuring 3m in height. The extension to the side would accommodate what appears to be a self-contained granny annexe, containing a living room, kitchen, bedroom and en-suite bathroom. part of the rear extension would provide an extension to the existing kitchen/living room. The proposal would also include the insertion of a kitchen window in the flank elevation of the host dwelling facing the side boundary of Number 25 and two roof lanterns. A porch/canopy is also proposed to extent from the side extension across the entire frontage of the host dwelling (above the existing bay window and porch). The canopy would measure 3.2m in height, rising to 4.13 above the side/rear extension.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

There is no recent planning history of relevance to this application.

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

4 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 29.1.14. A site notice was also displayed which expired on 28.2.14. No responses have been 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:

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

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.

BE38 Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.

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

LPP 3.5 (2011) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden and car parking provision.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design. Furthermore policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) resist any development which would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or would fail to safeguard the design of existing and adjoining sites.

Paragraph 3.3 of the HDAS states that single storey rear extensions proposed on semi-detached houses with a plot measuring 5m wide or more should be no more than 3.6m deep. Likewise paragraph 3.7 states that such extensions should be no more than 3m in height (with a flat roof). This is to ensure that the extension appears subordinate to the main house.

Both in terms of its height and depth, the rear element of the proposed extension would accord with the above criteria and therefore would appear subordinate to the main property. In terms of side extension, the HDAS guidance requires extensions to be no more than two thirds the width of the dwelling to ensure that it appears subordinate to the

host dwelling.

The side element replaces an existing garage. Whilst the height of the side extension would exceed the 3.4m height advised within the HDAS Guidance, it is considered that this would be acceptable, given the character and height of the catslide roofs above many garages within the immediate locality. However, concerns are raised in respect of the proposed front porch/canopy which extends from the proposed side extension across the entire width of the host dwelling. Paragraph 8.1 of the HDAS guidance states that The Council is very explicit with regard to its position on front extensions. Front extensions that extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused. Front extensions are eye catching and change the face of the building.

They do not only affect the character and appearance of the building itself, but also the street scene. There are no other examples of extensions across the entire frontage of the properties within the immediate locality and it is considered that the proposal would result in an incongruous addition to this property which would detract from its character and appearance within the street scene, given the uniformity between buildings on this side of the street. As such the proposal is considered unacceptable in respect of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the advice contained within the HDAS Guidance "Residential extensions".

Compliance with the height and depth restrictions of the side/rear extension means that it would not harm the amenity of nearby residents through loss of daylight. The proposed development would not have any windows on the side elevations which would prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to adjoining occupiers. A new window would be inserted in the flank wall of the host dwelling to serve the kitchen. The window would overlook the flank wall of the garage of Number 25 and would not result in a loss of privacy. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development in compliance with Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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 5.3 of the London Plan (2011).

In terms of the garden area at least 100m² of rear private garden should be retained to provide adequate amenity space for a four bedroom dwelling. The resultant amenity space would be approximately 95m² which results in a small shortfall of the paragraph 3.13 HDAS requirement. However this shortfall is not considered to be sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission.

The proposal would result in the loss of a parking space within the existing garage. However two parking spaces are currently provided within the frontage and the proposal would therefore comply with the Council's parking standards and Policy AM14.

It is noted that much of the proposed extension would be used as a self-contained granny annexe. Whilst a separate dwelling in this location could not be supported, the principle of an annexe, which is used as ancillary accommodation is deemed acceptable. The accommodation is closely linked to the main house and can only be accessed internally. If the application were considered acceptable in all other respects, a condition could be imposed to ensure that no additional doors could be erected within the extension to ensure that the accommodation would not be segregated from the main dwelling in the future.

However the application remains unacceptable on visual amenity grounds and the application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Having regard to the scale, bulk and design of the proposed front porch/canopy across the entire width of the host dwelling the proposal would result in an incongruous addition which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building, the street scene, and would harm the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore 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 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents 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:

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

guidance.

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.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

Telephone No: 01895 250230