

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 an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	<input type="checkbox"/>

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	<input type="checkbox"/>
25.	WORKS TO TREES	<input type="checkbox"/>
26.	OTHER (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Item No.	Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control	
Address:	28 COLUMBIA AVENUE RUISLIP	
Development:	Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer with juliette balcony, 1 front roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end	
LBH Ref Nos:	59385/APP/2023/3377	
Drawing Nos:	Location Plan B189002-02- 1100 Rev A B189002-02- 3100 Rev A B189002-02- 3000 Rev A	
Date Plans received:	23-11-23	Date(s) of Amendments(s):
Date Application valid	23-11-23	

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two-storey end of terraced property located on Columbia Avenue. The property is located at the end of the cul-de-sac and features an existing single storey garage to the side and a rear conservatory. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character comprising terraced 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 site is covered by TPO 327 however there are no trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order within the site or on adjoining land. The site lies in Flood Zone 1 and is designated within a Critical Drainage Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer with juliette balcony, 1 front roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

59385/APP/2023/2865 28 COLUMBIA AVENUE RUISLIP

Erection of a single storey wraparound side and rear extension following demolition of existing garage and conservatory.

Decision: 28-11-2023 Approved

59385/APP/2023/2866 28 COLUMBIA AVENUE RUISLIP

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer with juliette balcony, 1 front roof light and conversion of roof from hip to gable end. (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision: 22-11-2023 Withdrawn

Withdrawn

59385/APP/2004/822 28 COLUMBIA AVENUE RUISLIP

ERECTION OF A REAR CONSERVATORY

Decision: 18-05-2004 Approved

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

It is acknowledged that the site does not benefit from permitted development rights. Permitted development rights for this property were removed by Condition 1 (a / b) and 3 of the original planning permission for the development of the dwelling (Ref: 27175D/87/209 dated 17-09-1987).

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

28 neighbouring properties, Eastcote Residents Association and Rodwell Close Residents Association were consulted on 07-12-2023.

Eastcote Residents Association - No comments received.

Rodwell Close Residents Association - No comments received.

Neighbour Comment (1):

- Considering the potential disruption, request that the work is completed in no longer than 3 months.

Officer Response:

The above comment is noted however it would not be considered reasonable to impose such a condition.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF4	NPPF 2021 - Decision-Making
NPPF9	NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and locality the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden, trees and landscaping, flood risk impact and car parking provision.

Character and Appearance:

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.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - 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 take into account 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 requires that 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.

With regard to roof extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 (2020) states that:

- i) Roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line;
- ii) The Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;
- iii) Raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported;
- iv) All roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling.

The application proposes a hip to gable conversion with a rear dormer. The proposed hip to gable extensions would add substantial bulk to the roof of the property which would be visible from Columbia Avenue. The proposed hip to gable would visually unbalance the appearance and

proportions of the terraced property. It is acknowledged that the associated neighbouring end of terrace dwelling has retained its original hipped roof and the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. The proposed hip to gable, would result in an unbalanced and non-symmetrical gabled roof which would appear completely at odds with the symmetry currently experienced at the site. It is acknowledged that the adjacent terraced features two gabled ends, however this would not mitigate the impact on the associated terraced property.

One of the features of this particular group of terraced properties is that the properties gradually increase in height from north to south, the application property sitting significantly higher than its adjoining properties. The hipped roof allows for a softer appearance in terms of the street scene. The proposed gabled roof would appear bulky and incongruous from the street scene.

The proposed dormer would measure a width of 3.8m, a depth of 3.6m and a flat roof height of 2.5m. The proposed dormer would exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. It would fail to appear subservient to the existing roof. In this regard, the proposed dormer would fail to comply with Policy DMHD 1.

Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwellings, the associated group of terraced properties and the surrounding area. The proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 (2021), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 (2020), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2023).

Residential Amenity:

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure, amongst other matters, that: ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Due to the position and form, the proposed hip to gable conversions would not cause undue harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, in terms of loss of light or outlook. The proposed rooflight on the front elevation would be high level and provide views to the sky. The proposed juliet balcony may provide oblique views of neighbouring properties, however this would not be uncommon with this residential setting. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to unreasonable loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.

Accordingly, the proposal would not cause undue harm on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. However, this would not outweigh the harm identified above in respect to the impact on the character and appearance of the area.

External Amenity Space Provision:

The proposed development would retain sufficient rear garden space. This would be in accordance with the minimum private amenity space standards set out in Table 5.3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). As such, it is considered that the proposal would not undermine the provision of external amenity space for the existing occupiers at the site,

in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Parking and Highway Safety:

The site benefits from hardstanding outside the front of the property with enough space for two cars. It is therefore compliant with the recommended parking standards set out in Table 1 of Appendix C, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to significantly exacerbate the pressure for street parking or prejudice highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with the overarching objectives of policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion:

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Harm to the character and appearance of the area

The proposed hip to gable conversion and rear dormer, by virtue of the inappropriate design, scale, bulk and massing, would appear as a incongruous addition that would fail to respect the original roof form, architectural composition of the original dwelling, thereby visually unbalancing the appearance and the proportions of the group of terraced properties as a whole. Consequently, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the host property and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

INFORMATIVES

1. In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.
 - a) We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.
2. On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2021). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

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 Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance..

Part 1 Policies

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF4	NPPF 2021 - Decision-Making
NPPF9	NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport

Contact Officer: Niamh McMenamin **Telephone No:** 01895 250230