

**Planning Application Submission
58, St. Margaret's Road
Ruislip
HA47PA**

**PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS & MAIN ISSUES
1848 Doc – PL 02**

Proposal: First Floor Side Extension & Conversion of Roof Space.

1. Site & Locality:

The proposed application site is located at the far southern end of St. Margaret's Road and is the last property on the west side of said road. It is a three bedroom semi-detached house built around the late 1920's to mid-1930's. The plot borders the open land that includes the Bishop Winnington Ingram Fields and through which the Celandine Route runs. The site lies within the Developed Area as noted in the London Borough of Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012). The River Pinn also runs through the adjoining open land and hence the property is in Flood Zone 2. The latter issue was dealt with under the planning approval referred to in s.2 below.

2. Proposed Scheme:

All previous extensions have exhausted Permitted Development rights and therefore a full planning application is required. The application property is not listed, in a conservation area or a Building of Townscape Merit. In its current form the property is a three bedroom semi-detached house. The proposed first floor extension sits over the ground floor

extension (the subject of the planning application reference 48892/APP/2015/4422 granted approval in January 2016) and creates an additional 26m² of accommodation at this level. A new staircase is proposed from this level to access the roof space where, by the construction of side and rear roof extensions, an additional 35m² of accommodation will be created. The property will therefore become a four bedoomed house.

The only relevant planning history is the ground floor extension granted under the application noted in s.2 above.

3. Main Planning Issues

The main issues associated with the proposed works is their effect on the character and appearance of the existing property, any adverse impact on the visual amenities of the street scene and neighbouring properties and the impact on the residential amenity of the location. The increase in the number of bedrooms does not require additional parking as the two existing spaces within the curtilage meets the requirements set out in Appendix C: Parking Standards of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies.

The first floor extension is a straightforward continuance of the ground floor and would be constructed in the same materials.

Policy A1.11 of Appendix A: Householder Development Policies of the Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies states that two storey side extensions should be set back from the main front wall. The ground floor extension, granted planning approval as noted in s.2 above, has no set-back, however, the proposed first floor extension front wall will be set back 1000mm to ensure compliance with the above policy. The window in the front elevation at first floor level is of the same width as that below. There is no dormer or roof extension proposed on the front elevation.

The proposed roof extension to the rear elevation has its ridge set below the level of the ridge of the existing roof by approximately 500mm, and is set away from the hips of the existing and set back from the existing eaves approximately 600mm. The rear elevation of the proposed first floor extension sits well in relation to the projection and lower eaves line of the existing bathroom and the recent ground floor extension.

There are no windows in the side elevation at ground or first floor level and no dormers are proposed in the roof on this side of the extension. The roof extension is generally compliant with Policy A1.20 of Appendix A: Householder Development Policies of the Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies.

4. Landscaping

The southern boundary of the site adjoins the Nature Conservation Site of Metropolitan or Borough Grade 1 Importance. Photograph 3, Side Elevation, shows an abundance of soft landscaping already established tight against the boundary fence. In view of this we believe further landscaping is not required.

The proposed first floor extension would be constructed in the same materials as the ground floor extension. The latter was built using similar materials and details as the original property and therefore the proposals, the subject of this advice application, should blend to produce a complimentary addition to both the house and street scene.

In view of the location and orientation of the proposed roof extension we believe it will not have any adverse effect visually and will not be over-dominant or un-neighbourly with no detrimental effects on the residential amenity of the immediately adjacent properties.

When taken together with the consideration of policy noted s1, 2 & 3 above, we do not believe the proposals would constitute a visually intrusive or overbearing development.