

DELEGATED 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, Building Control, Sport & Green Spaces**

Address 120 HARTLAND DRIVE RUISLIP

Development: Use of dwelling for respite care for disabled children (not more than 6 residents living together as a single household) and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front rooflights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with new gable end window

LBH Ref Nos: **39206/APP/2014/4117**

Drawing Nos: 14160/05
 Location Plan (1:1250)
 14160/03
 14160/04
 14160/02
 14160/01

Date Plans received : 27/11/2014

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 27/11/2014

1. **SUMMARY**

The application seeks planning permission for a change of use from Use Class C3a to C3b (Dwellinghouses) and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front rooflights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with new gable end window.

The proposal would provide insufficient parking provision for the proposed residential units and would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where parking demand already exceeds supply, thereby leading to conditions which would be prejudicial to the operation of the highway network and pedestrian/highway safety.

The design and appearance of the proposed hip to gable extension, would contrast with the hipped roof on the other side of the row of terrace. It would appear as a discordant and incongruous addition, detracting from the character and architectural composition of the original house, imparting and asserting an asymmetrical and imbalanced appearance to this row of terraced houses, and as such, would adversely affect the appearance of the street scene and locality.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), policies AM7, AM14, 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. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 **NON2** Non Standard reason for refusal

The roof alteration/extensions, by reason of the hip to gable end roof design and the size, scale, bulk, and design of the rear dormer window, in this visually prominent position, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the terrace of houses of

which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would 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: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would provide insufficient parking provision for the enlarged residential unit and would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where parking demand already exceeds supply, thereby leading to conditions which would be prejudicial to pedestrian and highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (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 I53 Compulsory Informative (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 guidance.

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.
H4	Mix of housing units
H5	Dwellings suitable for large families
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and

	the local area
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
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 7.3	(2011) Designing out crime
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character
LDF-AH	Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010

3 I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

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.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

120 Hartlands Drive comprises a circa 1940 two-storey end of terrace dwelling of brick construction and conventional pitched and hipped roof and single storey wrap around extensions. The property is subdivided into two flats. The property is attached to No. 118 to the north west and is located on the corner of Hartlands Drive and West Mead. At this point the streetscene is characterised by end terraced properties meeting West Mead road with side elevations that provide a rhythm of building line and spaces. The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising primarily short terraces of properties. The site lies within a Developed Area as identified in the policies of the Adopted Hillingdon Local Plan.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for a change of use from Use Class C3a to C3b (Dwellinghouses) and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front rooflights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with new gable end window. The rear dormer window measures 4.4m wide, 2m high with a flat roof and 2.35m deep. The proposal would change from two flats to a single dwellinghouse comprising 5 bedrooms, 3 bathrooms and a lift. The materials would match the existing house.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

39206/APP/2003/1375 120 Hartland Drive Ruislip

ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR SIDE AND PART FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AND
CONVERSION OF HOUSE TO TWO THREE- BEDROOM SELF-CONTAINED FLATS

Decision: 16-07-2003 WD

39206/APP/2003/1774 120 Hartland Drive Ruislip

CONVERSION OF SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE TO SELF-CONTAINED GROUND FLOOR
THREE-BEDROOM AND FIRST FLOOR ONE-BEDROOM FLATS

Decision: 08-09-2003 Refused

Appeal: 05-01-2004 Allowed

39206/APP/2012/267 120 Hartland Drive Ruislip

First floor rear extension

Decision: 17-04-2012 Refused

39206/APP/2014/3318 120 Hartland Drive Ruislip

LOFT CONVERSION AND A CHANGE OF USE TO RESPITE CARE FOR DISABLED
CHILDREN

Decision: 22-10-2014 NFA

Comment on Planning History

39206/86/1880 Householder development - residential extension Approved 1986

39206/APP/2003/1375 Erection of a first floor side and part first floor rear extension and
conversion of house to two three bedroom self-contained flats Withdrawn 2003

39206/APP/2003/1774 Conversion of single dwellinghouse to self-contained ground floor
three-bedroom and first floor one bedroom Refused on parking grounds 2003 Allowed on
appeal 2004. No first floor element in this scheme.

39206/APP/2012/267 First floor rear extension. Refused for the following reason:

The proposed extension, by reason of its bulk, scale, size, design, and projection forward of the recognized established return building line along West Mead on this prominent corner plot, would result in an incongruous, poorly designed, unduly intrusive, and dominant form of development, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the original property. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

12 adjoining properties and South Ruislip Residents Association were notified of the application by means of a letter dated 1st December 2014. A site notice was also displayed on 6th December 2014. No responses have been received.

EPU: This premises is close to the flight path for Northolt and to the Victoria Road. Due to the increased sensitivity to noise of the proposed use suitable measures will need to be taken to protect the future residents from noise. Thus a condition requiring the submission of a noise protection scheme is recommended. Also recommend control of environmental nuisance from construction work informative

Highways:

Further to reviewing the above, I would comment that the development will remove the existing car parking provision at the site and will not provide car parking for the proposed use. In addition, it is noted that the adjacent highway network suffers a high demand for kerbside parking during both the day and evening times. Furthermore, the applicant has not provided any justification for the non provision of car or cycle parking in relation to the proposals or any information in relation to how the site will operate including the number of staff etc.

Therefore, the proposals would be contrary to Policy AM7, AM9 and AM14 of Part 2, of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan 2012, and an objection is raised in relation to the highway and transportation aspect of the proposals.

Access Observations:

I have considered the detail of this planning application and have no comments to make.

6. 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.
H4	Mix of housing units
H5	Dwellings suitable for large families
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
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
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction

LPP 7.3	(2011) Designing out crime
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character
LDF-AH	Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010

In addition:

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

The effect upon the residential amenities of neighbouring properties are considered to be minimal. Taking into consideration the rear dormer window at the neighbouring property, the proposal would not increase the impact of overlooking neighbouring gardens from a higher level. The proposed rooflight and obscure glazed gable windows, due to their height and angle would not directly overlook neighbouring properties. It is considered the proposed rear dormer and windows would not result in an unacceptable increase of overlooking, overdominance or loss of light into the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore in compliance with Policy BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policy BE13 of the Local Plan requires that the layout and appearance must harmonise with the existing street scene, policy BE15 goes on to state that extensions must be in keeping with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building. Policy BE19 also states that new developments should complement or improve the amenity and character of the area.

HDAS: Residential Extensions paragraph 7.4 states roof extensions should relate well to the proportions, roof forms and massing of the existing house and its neighbours. Paragraph 7.5 states an extension should appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it will be set.

HDAS: Residential Extensions paragraph 7.7 states dormer windows should be constructed in the centre of the roof and paragraph 7.7 states on terraced houses the dormer window should be set in at least 0.30m from the sides of the roof, 0.30m below the ridge level and 0.50m from the eaves. As such, the proposed dormer window would comply with this guidance.

The property is located at a junction in a very visually prominent position. The proposal would result in a hip to gable conversion of the end-of-terrace property and a very large dormer which would dominate the roof space within which it would be set. The dwelling at the other end of the terrace still retains its original hip. Therefore, the hip to gable conversion and the large dormer is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the terrace and the visual amenities of the surrounding 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: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

The proposal would provide insufficient parking provision for the proposed residential units and would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where parking demand already exceeds supply, thereby leading to conditions which would be prejudicial to the operation of the highway network and pedestrian/highway safety. The proposal is

therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

As discussed above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

It is considered, that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the development still maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2011).

Over 100sq.m of private amenity space would be retained and there would be sufficient space in the front garden to provide off-street parking space. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

ACCESS

The dwelling would have level access. The access officer has no objections to the scheme.

7.6 Other Issues

None.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012)

London Plan (July 2011)

National Planning Policy Framework

HDAS: Residential Layouts

Supplementary Planning Guidance - Community Safety by Design

Supplementary Planning Guidance - Noise

Supplementary Planning Guidance - Air Quality

HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon

Hillingdon Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document July(2008) and updated chapter 4 Education (August 2010).

Contact Officer: Mandeep Chaggar

Telephone No: 01895 250230