Residents Services

APP. REF. NO: 22598/APP/2014/570

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 then 10 dewlling 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 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 42A WOOD LANE RUISLIP

Development: Part two storey, part first floor side extension involving demolition of existing detached garage

LBH Ref Nos: **22598/APP/2014/570**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan to Scale 1:1250
1
2
3
5
Photographs

Date Plans Received: 19/02/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 26/03/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the north side of Wood Lane opposite the junction with Chichester Avenue in in Ruislip. It comprises an attractive two storey detached house with a detached garage to the front that is connected to the garage for No. 42 Wood Lane, the attached property to the east of the application dwelling. Evidence appears to indicate that these properties were once a single dwelling that has been divided in to two. The property has a forward facing hipped roof over the two storey element to the east and a single storey entrance connection to a further single storey element with pyramidal roof design. There is gravel hardstanding to the front of the garage providing off street parking for two vehicles within the front curtilage of the application property plus an attractive lawn and mature planting. There is a well established hedge along the front boundary. To the rear of the property is a soft landscaped garden. The street scene is residential in character and appearance.

The application site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and a developed area as identified in policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning consent for the erection of a two storey side extension to the west of the existing entrance connection. The extension would be built adjacent to and above the current single storey element.

The two storey extension would have a depth of 7.65m and a width of 4.75m. It would have a maximum ridge height of 8.0m to match the existing dwelling. The eaves and angle of the roof slope would also match that of the existing property. The proposed extension would include a sitting room at ground floor level and three new bedrooms plus en-suite at first floor level. Internal alterations also show a kitchen is proposed, essentially creating an independent unit with seperate access within a shared entrance hall.

It is also proposed to demolish the existing garage in order to provide additional parking space.

Materials proposed will match the existing dwelling.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

22598/76/1034 42a Wood Lane Ruislip

Householder development - residential extension(P)

Decision Date: 10-09-1976 Approved

22598/B/84/0959 42a Wood Lane Ruislip

Householder development - residential extension(P)

Decision Date: 13-07-1984 Approved

Comment on Planning History

None relevant to the proposal

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 30th April 2014

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

4 neighbouring properties and the Ruislip Residents Association were consulted by letter on the 23/03/14 and a site notice was posted on the 09/04/14. One letter of objection was received that states:

I own 42 Wood Lane and the garage of my property which is on my deeds is attached to the garage for 42a Wood Lane which is to be demolished. I therefore need more information on what is going to happen if when demolishing the garage at 42a damage is caused to my garage. Also access to the garage for 42 Wood Lane is also on my deeds. I need something written into the plans before they are passed to ensure that my garage and access to it will not be affected by these works.

Officer's Comments:
Concerns raised regarding damage to property and private access rights are not considered by this report as they are not material planning considerations and relate to private legal matters.

Ruislip Village Conservation Panel:

The plans submitted are very poor and lack detail. Also there is no 'Supporting Documentation'. We think that the original no 42 has been divided into 42 on the east side and 42A on the west. The property to be extended is no 42A. Currently there is a double front door to 42A. (that could easily be divided into two front doors for two separate dwellings). To the left (west side) of front door there is currently an interior door visible from the front door from the entrance hall into a single storey annex/sitting room. NOTE - the plans do not show the before/after scenarios for the whole of no 42A. The plans just show the proposed two storey extension to the west side of no 42a that includes a large kitchen and sitting room, and stairs up to first floor with two bedrooms and bathrooms. Without the layout of the whole of the existing no 42a the purpose of the extension is not clear. Supporting documentation is needed for clarification. If there is to be a kitchen in the extension, is it to replace a kitchen in the exisitng east side of the property?. Unlikely!, it does seem to be the intention to convert the west side of the front door into another two

bedroom house. This 'two storey extension' does seem to over dominate the existing 42A/42? The parking is left vague? The reason for demolishing the garage for no 42A (not 42) is not clear. By effectively building another house on the side does potentially suggest more parking spaces should be provided, and there are no plans for this. There are also issues regarding access to the parking & garage for residents at 42 next door. Who owns what bits of land here? Without more details it is difficult to comment. IF the extension is to create another dwelling then it should be clarified in the plans and the new dwelling should be called no.42b? Would this be subject to another planning application? Given that no 42 adjoins no 42A the effect of this planning application upon nos 42A AND 42 should be taken into consideration. The Conservation Officers's views should also be considered.

Officer's Comments:
The potential creation of an independent residential unit is taken into consideration within the body of this report, as are the Conservation and Urban Design Officers comments.

Internal Consultees:

Conservation and Urban Design:

This site forms half of a substantial property which was once detached having an 'L' shaped plan-form and falls within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (a heritage asset). It also forms part of the inter-War development of the area. Although now subdivided, the two properties still read as one within the streetscene. It follows the 'Garden Suburb' tradition - introduced to the area in 1909 by Kings College and reflected in the layout and designs of the properties throughout the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. In the 'Olde Worlde' style, it retains many period finishes and features including its general plan-form, windows, doors, attractive brickwork, tall chimneys and red tiles. The immediate area is characterised by similar detached properties, constructed back from the main road with large gardens and planting, and visual gaps between them, reflecting the GS tradition, having a semi-rural character. It therefore has significance within the conservation area both individually and being part of a planned estate.

These observations and its significance is confirmed by the Ruislip Village Conservation Area Appraisal (July 2010) which states that 'The majority of the houses are brick built, using both yellow stock and red bricks, although there are some with painted roughcast elevations. Common features are tall chimneys, steeply pitched tiled roofs, half hipped and prominent gables often tile hung, or with dark stained waney edged timber boarding.' 42a is therefore a significant building within the conservation area and makes a positive contribution to the streetscene.

COMMENTS: The scheme proposes to partially demolish an existing pitched roofed addition to the side of the main entrance and rebuild it/incorporate it to form a two bedroomed cottage.

The proposal is unacceptable. Whilst I appreciate that the design of the proposed extension replicates the style and form of the existing property, the new half-hipped gable will compete with the original gable. Presently, when viewed from Wood Lane, it is clear the present arrangement is an entrance structure. The proposal, by replicating the gable on the main house, will provide a rival extension that will draw attention to itself and spoil the original design of the property. It will appear as if the host property has grown a sprawling addition.

Furthermore, it would add substantial bulk to the existing property and would therefore not

be a subordinate addition. As such, it does not follow the guidance in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions, in particular, para. 5.6 which states 'The Council will therefore consider proposals for two storey side extensions in terms of their setting and with particular reference to the character and quality of the overall street scene.' It is disproportionate in size to the existing dwelling and would unacceptably dominate the front facade to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling. For the same reasons, it would appear as an incongruous addition in the streetscene. This would not preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area. I mindful of one of the NPPF's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and seeking to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

CONCLUSION: Refuse. The proposal will not sustain the significance of the heritage asset.

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:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
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.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
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.
BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2011) Housing Choice
LDF-AH	Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area and Conservation Area and the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable residential amenity and the provision of off-street parking.

Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the Conservation Area. Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Local Plan seek to ensure that development must harmonise with the character of the surrounding properties and street scene, and in particular the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Policy BE19 further requires that development should complement and improve the amenity of the residential area.

Section 5.0 of the Hillingdon Design and Accesibility Statement: Residential Extensions has a number of requirements for two storey side extensions, such as in order to prevent harm to the visual amenity of a site and its wider setting, proposed two storey side extensions must be no more than two thirds the width of the original house and the ground and first floor should be set back 1.0m from the main front building line. The roof of any two storey side extension is also recommended to follow the design of the existing roof in terms of hipped or gable. The extended section of the roof should also be set below the existing ridgeline on semi-detached properties.

The proposed two storey side extension would fail to conform with this guidance, however more significant with regards to this application is the impact of the proposal on the existing dwelling and the Conservation Area. Concerns are also raised regarding the creation of a separate dwelling which are discussed later.

In terms of the impact of the extension on the existing dwelling and the Conservation Area, the extension should be designed so as to appear subservient to the existing property. However the proposed development is of such a scale as to fail in this regard. The single storey entrance section that will remain between the existing two storey house and the proposed two storey extension will encourage this perception that the extension fails to be a subordinate addition. The Council's Conservation and Design Officer has raised strong objections to the proposal based on both its impact on the existing dwelling and its impact on the Conservation Area. As such the development does not follow the guidance in the HDAS: Residential Extensions, in particular, para. 5.6 which states 'The Council will therefore consider proposals for two storey side extensions in terms of their setting and with particular reference to the character and quality of the overall street scene.' The Councils Conservation and Urban Design Officer goes on to state 'It is disproportionate in size to the existing dwelling and would unacceptably dominate the front facade to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling. For the same reasons, it would appear as an incongruous addition in the streetscene.'

As a result the proposal is deemed to fail to be in compliance with Policy BE1 of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies, and policies BE4, BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) plus HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The proposed development would create an indendent living accomodation with a shared access hall. Such a development would require full planning consent as opposed to a being applied for through a householder application such as the current application. However the acceptability of an independent unit can be considered within this report. Policy H7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan relates to the subdivision of residential properties and states that:
The local planning authority will regard the conversion of residential properties into more

units as acceptable in principle provided this can be achieved without causing demonstrable harm to the residential amenities or character of the area or the amenity of adjoining occupiers and the following criteria are met:-
(i) it can be demonstrated that adequate sound insulation is provided;
(ii) car parking to the standards adopted by the local planning authority can be provided within the curtilage of the site and can be accommodated without significant detriment to the street scene;
(iii) all units are self contained with exclusive use of sanitary and kitchen facilities and with individual entrances, and internal staircases are provided to serve units above ground floor level; and
(iv) adequate amenity space is provided for the benefit of residents of the proposed development.

The proposed development is considered to fail to accord with points (ii) and (iv) of Policy H7. No details are provided as to how parking would be provided for the new unit that was independent of the existing dwelling. No information is provided that details what amenity provision would be provided for both the existing property and the proposed independent unit. In addition no information is provided regarding proposed bin/recycling storage or secure and sheltered cycle storage. Also insufficient evidence has been provided detailing how the independent unit would conform with lifetime homes standards. As such the proposed development fails to accord with Policies 3.5 and 3.8 of the London Plan (2011) Policies AM14, H7 and BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) and the adopted suplementary planning document 'Accessible Hillingdon' (May 2013).

Due to the 2.2m separation distance between the extension and the shared boundary to the west and the location of the neighbouring property off this boundary, plus the design of the scheme with a steep angled pitched roof, the proposal would result in no significant loss of light or loss of outlook to the neighbouring dwellings and no significant harm would occur to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Therefore, the proposed development is considered to comply with Policies BE20 & BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposed scheme involves no side windows at first floor level that might overlook the adjacent property. However as an independent unit it is not clarified how overlooking between the two units from external amenity space would be prevented. As such the proposal is deemed to have an unacceptable impact on the privacy of existing and future occupiers in terms of overlooking and would fail to conform with Policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012).

The scheme would result in all proposed habitable rooms having an acceptable level of daylight and outlook creating appropriate living standards for future occupiers and would conform with Policy BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012).

Putting to one side the creation of an independent residential unit, the proposal would add three bedrooms to the property and guidance set out in the HDAS Residential Extensions requires properties with 4 or more bedrooms to provide a minimum of 100 sq. m. of rear garden area. As a result of the side extension in excess of 100m2 of private external amenity space would remain satisfying the requirements of policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) should the development be considered as an extension alone, however in this instance the development fails to accord with this policy due to the creation of the independent unit.

Taking the above into consideration, the application is recommended for Refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing property, the visual amenity of the street scene and the wider Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension, by reason of its internal layout, is considered capable of independent occupation from the main dwelling and is thus tantamount to a separate dwelling in a position where such a dwelling would not be acceptable. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H7, AM14, BE19, BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions and HDAS: Residential Layouts.

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:

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

guidance.

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.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
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.
BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2011) Housing Choice
LDF-AH	Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area

Contact Officer: Ed Laughton **Telephone No:** 01895 250230