

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 135 LONG LANE HILLINGDON

Development: Two storey side extension, single storey front and rear extension involving demolition of existing garage and installation of boundary wall to side

LBH Ref Nos: **24442/APP/2015/4639**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan (1:1250)
S1
S5
E1
P4
P1

Date Plans Received: 21/12/2015 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 29/12/2015

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site which is located on the north western side of Long Lane towards the junction with Court Drive, is occupied by a two-storey detached house. The house is set back from the road with a modest depth of rear garden backing onto the dental surgery in Court Drive.

There are 2 No. mature oak trees along the front boundary of the site which dominate the front garden. 2m high metal railings extend across the hared vehicular access and a dwarf wall with lower railings extend across the front boundary.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey front and rear extension involving demolition of existing garage and installation of boundary wall to side.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

There is no 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

The Court Drive Residents Association and 7 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 30.12.15 and a site notice was displayed to the front of hte site which expired on 1.2.16. No response received.

Tree officer:

- Trees and shrubs within the front garden, including the oaks have been approximately located on an existing and proposed plan.
- While there may be no intention to harm the oaks, no topographical or tree survey has been submitted to assess the likely impact of the front extension and construction of the brick wall in particular.
- The application should not be approved without a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment to ensure that the trees can be safeguarded from the proposed work.
- Without this information it would be unsafe to assume that the trees can be protected by condition.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

In the absence of a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment, to BS2012:5837, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the protected trees will be unaffected by the development and has not made provision for their long-term protection.

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. |
| HDAS-EXT | Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008 |
| LPP 3.5 | (2015) 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, the impact upon the Oak trees 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.

Guidance contained in paragraph 5.1 of the adopted HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008). Paragraph 5.1 requires two storey side extensions to be set back a minimum of 1m from a side boundary for the full height of the building, so as to prevent gaps between properties and prevent houses from combining visually to form a terraced appearance. The proposed extension would not comply with this advice. The flank wall of the two storey side extension would be sited just 0.45m off the side boundary. Whilst it is accepted that an existing single storey structure is located alongside this side boundary, the significant increase in bulk, adjacent to the boundary would result in the loss of an important gap at first floor level between the application property and adjacent 135A Long Lane which would be detrimental to the spacing of development in the locality. As a result it is considered that it would have a negative impact upon the visual amenity of the site or the surrounding area in conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The application includes the erection of a front porch which would measure 4.1m in width by 2.1m in depth with a ridge height of 3.38m. Section 8.0 of the HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions specifies that 'changes and extensions to the front of the house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street'. Section 8.1 of the HDAS gives advice 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 streetscene'. Paragraph 8.2 of the HDAS gives advice that 'any porch should be individually designed to follow the character of the existing building. Porches should be subordinate in scale and form and should not be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene. The roof design and the roof material must match the main roof'. The ridge of the proposed porch would extend to the cill height of the first floor window above and in view of its significant scale is considered to detract from the architectural integrity of the host dwelling. It is considered that the design and size of the enlarged porch at the front are such that it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the property, the streetscene and the visual amenities of the wider area, contrary to the requirements of Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and HDAS SPD: Residential Extension

With regards to the single storey rear extension, paragraph 3.4 of the HDAS SPD specifies that single storey rear extensions proposed at detached houses should be no more than 4m deep. The proposal complies with this advice and would appear as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling.

The adjacent property at 135A Long Lane does not have any windows in its side elevation. Given the relatively modest projection to the rear of the property (1.5m) the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook to the occupants of this property. Number 133 Long Lane projects beyond the rear elevation of

the proposed extension and as such would not be affected by the proposed extensions to the side and rear. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development in compliance with Policies 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 the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (November 2012) and subsequent London Plan Housing Policy Transition Statement (May 2015).

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 just 64m² which would fail to meet the HDAS requirement. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2.

Saved policy BE38 seeks the retention and utilisation of topographical and landscape features of merit and the provision of new planting and landscaping wherever it is appropriate. There are 2 No. mature oak trees along the front boundary of the site which dominate the front garden which form a long line of Oak trees along Long Lane which are important in terms of the visual amenity of locality. The proposal includes a brick wall measuring 2m in height to the side of the driveway in close proximity to these oak trees. The applicant has failed to submit a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment, to BS2012:5837 to demonstrate that the protected trees will be unaffected by the development and has not made provision for their long-term protection. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposal includes provision for the parking of two cars which would meet the Council's parking standards in accordance with Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey side/rear extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and proximity to the side boundary, would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, 135A Long Lane, giving rise to a cramped form of development and possible terracing effect, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 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 front porch/front extension, by virtue of its size, scale, design and projection forward, would result in an incongruous and overly dominant addition which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore 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 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

In the absence of a tree survey and arboricultural impact assessment, to BS2012:5837, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the protected Oak trees along the front boundary of the site will be unaffected by the development and has not made provision for their long-term protection. The proposal is therefore detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extensions would, by virtue of their failure to maintain an adequate amount of private usable external amenity space for the occupiers of the existing property, result in over-development of the site detrimental to the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies BE19 and BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the guidance contained within the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

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 (2015). 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.

guidance.

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.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

Telephone No: 01895 250230