

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 89 LONG LANE HILLINGDON

Development: Hip to Gable Extension, part two storey side/rear extension and single storey side/rear extension

LBH Ref Nos: **3432/APP/2014/2020**

Drawing Nos: 89LL/VA/PL/1B Rev. B

Date Plans Received: 11/06/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 23/06/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the western side of Long Lane and comprises one of a pair of semi-detached properties identical in their character, set within an 8.4m wide plot. The property has a single storey side garage and a single storey rear extension which has been partly removed. The property has a small rear garden which backs onto the rear gardens of No. 2 and 4 Weald Road and to the front there is a small garden which is fully paved to provide two off-street parking spaces.

Both No. 87 Long Lane, the adjoining property to the south and No. 91, the neighbouring property to the north have single storey side garages and single storey rear extensions. No. 87 also has a front porch.

The site is situated within a Developed Area as identified in the policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) where the prevailing character of the area is residential, comprising of mainly semi-detached houses.

There is not a significant difference in site levels.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a hip to gable roof extension, a part two storey side/rear extension and single storey side/rear extension. The proposal would involve the conversion of the hipped roof to a gabled roof. The side extension would be set back 1m from the front of the host dwelling and would be sited alongside the side boundary. The proposed extension would have a hipped roof, set down 0.5m from the ridge. The rear extension would have a mono-pitched roof measuring 3.6m in height.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

3432/APP/2012/1323 89 Long Lane Hillingdon

Part two storey, part single storey side/front extension, single storey rear extension and porch to front involving demolition of existing attached garage to side

Decision Date: 31-07-2012 Refused

3432/APP/2014/1892 89 Long Lane Hillingdon

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 3 front rooflights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision Date: 12-08-2014 **Approved**

Comment on Planning History

A certificate of lawful development application reference 3432/APP/2014/1892 was approved on 12/08/14 for the conversion of the roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 3 front rooflights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end.

Application reference 3432/APP/2012/1323 for a two storey side, single storey rear extension and a front extension/porch was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its siting, size, scale, design and proximity to the side boundary, would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, 91 Long Lane, giving rise to a cramped form of development, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS Residential Extensions.

2. The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its siting, size, scale and design including the lack of a set back from the front would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the appearance of the original house, the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS Residential Extensions.

3. The proposed single storey rear extension, by reason of its excessive height, would represent an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area, contrary to policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS Residential Extensions.

4. The proposed single storey rear extension would, by virtue of its 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 the existing occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies BE19 and BE23 of the saved UDP and the guidance contained within the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

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 26.6.14. 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:

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 (2011) Quality and design of housing developments

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, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable residential amenity and the provision of off-street parking.

Visual Amenity

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. Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Local plan seek to ensure that development 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 HDAS states that in order to prevent harm to the character and appearance of existing dwellings and their wider setting, proposed two storey side extensions should be no more than two thirds the width of the original house and set-back

at least 1m from the main front elevation. This is to ensure that the extension appears subordinate to the main property. In order to preserve an adequate visual gap between properties, the HDAS also recommends that such extensions are set-in at least 1m from the site boundary.

The proposed two storey side extension would not be any more than two thirds the width of the original house and would be set-back 1m behind the main front elevation of the house in accordance with this advice. However the proposal would not retain a gap of 1m to the side boundary and would result in the alteration of the main roof from a hip to a gable with a hipped roof to the extension. Even if the roof conversion is carried out as permitted development, the proposed hipped roof to the extension would be at odds with the gabled roof and would appear as an incongruous addition to the property. Moreover, the two storey side extension would only be 0.2m away from the site boundary and as a result would fail to preserve an adequate visual gap between it and the adjacent property. The two storey side extension is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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 3.4m in height. This is to ensure that the extension appears subordinate to the main house. The proposal marginally exceeds this advice, but is considered, on balance, to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. It is noted that the rear roof has been reduced in height from that which was previously refused to ensure the ridge sits well below the cill of the first floor windows above.

Residential Amenity

Despite its height it is considered that the proposed single storey rear extension would not cause harm to the amenity of nearby residential and occupants through loss of daylight and outlook because it would only be marginally deeper than the single storey rear extensions at the neighbouring properties.

There is a first floor side facing window at No. 91 which would be affected by the proposed two storey side extension, however, as it serves a landing it is therefore considered that the proposed two storey side extension would not cause harm to the amenity of the residents at that property.

No side facing windows are proposed that would cause loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties and the proposed first floor windows in the two storey side extension would be located over 21 metres away from the residential properties directly to the front and rear of the site. Overall it is considered that the proposal 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).

However, Policy BE23 of the Local Plan states that new residential buildings or extensions should provide or maintain external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of the occupants of the proposed as well as surrounding buildings which is usable in terms of its shape and siting. The supporting text relating to this policy emphasises the importance of protecting private amenity space and considers it a key feature of protecting residential amenity. Paragraph 3.13 of the HDAS recommends that a four bedroom house should retain at least 100sq.m of usable garden space. The proposed single storey rear extension means that only 72sq.m of rear garden space would be retained for the site,

which would be substantially below that required and contrary to policy BE23.

Parking Provision

Annex 1 of the adopted Local Plan states that the maximum number of off-street parking spaces required for a property with its own curtilage is two. Two off-street parking spaces would be retained at the site and therefore the proposal would accord with UDP policy AM14.

In conclusion the proposals would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property and its wider setting and would fail to preserve an adequate level of private amenity space, contrary to Local Plan policies BE13, BE15, BE19, BE22 and BE23. Refusal of the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed hip to gable extension of the host dwelling and the size, scale, bulk and design of the two storey side extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original house, would result in a visual imbalance of this pair of semi-detached properties, 87 and 89 Long Lane and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and the wider 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.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its siting, size, scale, design and proximity to the side boundary, would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring property, 91 Long Lane, giving rise to a cramped form of development, 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.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed single storey rear extension would, by virtue of its failure to maintain an adequate amount of private usable external amenity space for the occupiers of the existing property, result in an 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: Part Two - Saved UDP 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 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.
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	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

guidance.

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

Telephone No: 01895 250230