



Planning Statement

Planning Application for the erection of a two-storey side, first floor rear wrap around extension and loft conversion incorporating a rear dormer with rooflights to front elevation of dwellinghouse

**273 Balmoral Drive
Hayes
UB4 8DH**



Introduction

This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of the applicant / owner of the property known as 273 Balmoral Drive, Hayes, UB4 DH.

Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property situated on the south westerly side of Balmoral Drive, Hayes. The principle elevation faces to the north. The site is on a corner plot, on the junction with Hurstfield Crescent. The property benefits from a large rear and side garden which benefits from a single storey outbuilding. The front garden provides off street parking space.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and appearance comprising predominantly of two storey semi-detached properties.

The application site is not designated within a Conservation Area, nor an Area of Special Local Character. The site does not contain any Listed Buildings. There are no trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order within the site or adjoining land. The site is not within a Surface Water Flood Zone or Critical Drainage Area.

Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side, first floor rear wrap around extension and loft conversion incorporating a rear dormer with rooflights to front elevation of dwellinghouse.

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:

- DMHB11 Design of New Development
- DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space
- DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
- DMT 6 Vehicle Parking
- LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character. Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies of the Local Plan contains policies that seek to safeguard the appearance, character and amenities of the local street scene and surrounding area.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should consider aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and

established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Development Management Policies (2020) States that:

i) alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also required that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

ii) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property;

iii) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded;

iv) garages should reflect the size guidelines set out in Appendix C Parking standards;

v) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary or in the case of properties in the Copse Wood and Gatehill Estates, at least 1.5 metres, but more if on a wider than average plot, in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses;

vi) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation;

vii) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported; and

viii) in Conservation Areas, single storey side extensions may be required to be set back.

Taking into consideration the boundary treatment and the adjoining neighbour's rear extensions, the proposed extensions would not be overbearing and would not result in a loss of light or loss of privacy for adjoining residential properties. Therefore, the application proposal would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development and would be in compliance with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Development Management Policies (2020).

It is considered, that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the development would still maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Policy DMHB 18 of the Development Management Policies (2020) expects a minimum 60sq.m of private amenity space to be retained for a 2 and 3 bedroom property. The proposal would exceed this requirement, in compliance with the policy requirements.

The parking provision would remain unaffected by the proposal.

Conclusion

The extension to the side of the dwelling would be contrary to the stipulation in Policy DMHD 1 that extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property. However, the supporting text to the policy indicates that the width requirement is intended to avoid over-dominance of the original house. In this case, the proposed extension would be set back appreciably from the main front elevation of the dwelling. It would also be of lesser height relative to the host building, with a much lower roof to the widest part of the extension. Moreover, it would only be the front part of the extension that would exceed this width provision, with the rear section having a width of less than half that of the original property. In combination, I find that these factors would ensure that the extension would appear clearly subordinate to the host dwelling overall, and I do not find that it would be disproportionate or excessive even when taken together with the rear extension.

Decision to grant planning permission should be given 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).

Prof. Plans

