Planning, Environment and Community Services | **APP. REF. NO: 67971/APP/2011/1894**

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 then 10 dewlling 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. ADVERTISMENT 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 Planning, Environment and Community Services can determine this application.

Case Officer

Adrian Harding

Signature:

Date: 3rd October 2011

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

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date: 3rd October 2011

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:



Date: 3rd October 2011

NONE OF THE ABOVE DATES SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS TO THE ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning & Enforcement Services**

Address 94 RALEIGH AVENUE HAYES

Development: Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, involving alterations to front and side elevations and demolition of existing rear element

LBH Ref Nos: **67971/APP/2011/1894**

Drawing Nos: KGS/RAL/403P1A/1
KGS/RAL/403P1A/2
Location Plan

Date Plans Received: 02/08/2011 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 03/08/2011

Date Application Valid: 08/08/2011

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

No. 94 Raleigh Avenue is a semi-detached property located in a area of similar uniformly spaced two-storey semis within this developed area to the north of Uxbridge Road.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

It is proposed to demolish the existing single storey rear addition to this semi-detached property and erect a full width extension, part single and part two storey to provide new kitchen (g/floor)and fourth bedroom (f/floor). This extension would be provided with a pitched roof to match the slope of the existing hip end and would align in depth with the rear extension to the other half, No. 96. The proposals also include alterations to the front elevation, with a new front door and window in a revised internal plan layout, and new windows to the front sitting room (g/floor) and to both bathroom and landing (f/floor) on the side elevation adjoining the shared alleyway between Nos.94 and 96 Raleigh Avenue.

1.3 Relevant Planning History
Comment on Planning History

None relevant.

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

10 neighbouring properties have been consulted - no responses received.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Policies:

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.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original house and the surrounding area and the possible impacts on residential amenities, in particular those of the adjoining occupiers.

Two storey extensions should always appear subordinate to the original house (paragraph 6.4 of the HDAS: Residential Extensions), thus harmonising with the street scene and with the scale, form and proportions of the original building in a way that complements the character of the area. The proposed extension would achieve these aims as there would be no significant change in the appearance or character of the property when viewed from the street. Also, by continuing the existing hipped roof lines back and being kept below the main ridge (as set out in paragraph 6.6 of HDAS), the extension would respect the original form of the dwelling in scale and proportion.

With regard to its character and form therefore, it is considered that the proposal would fully comply with HDAS: Residential Extensions and with UDP Saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19.

Two-storey rear extensions are acceptable provided these do not over-dominate or over-shadow a neighbouring property resulting in loss of outlook and daylight. The requirements set out in paragraphs 6.2 and 6.4 of the HDAS: Residential Extensions are that such extensions should not extend beyond a line taken at 45 degrees from the nearest window of the neighbouring property(s) nor exceed (for a plot width of more than 5 metres), a depth of 3.6m.

The proposal is for an extension of 3.55m depth and matches the lines of the main roof which is extended back. However, the extension would exceed the 45 degree line taken from the centre of the ground and first floor windows of No. 92 to the south and as such would result in a loss of outlook and daylight for occupiers of that property. The potential for loss of sunlight and thus overshadowing to this property as a result of the extension would though be negligible due to No. 92 being positioned to the south. Nonetheless, UDP Saved Policies BE20 and BE21 seek to prevent new buildings or extensions which fail to safeguard and would result in a loss of the residential amenities of existing houses.

In other respects the extension meets the criteria set out in the HDAS with all new windows within the proposed extension either rear facing (kitchen/bedroom) or on the side elevation and fitted with obscure glazing/top opening (landing/bathroom) to prevent overlooking (paragraph 6.9) and amenity space retained to this four bedroom house in excess of 100 sq.metres (paragrpah 6.18).

In terms of impact on amenities therefore the proposal would be contrary to guidance set

out in paragraph 6.2 of the HDAS: Residential Extensions and to UDP Saved Policies BE20 and BE21.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 R12 Extension Over Dominant Refusal

The proposed development by reason of its overall size, bulk, depth and orientation in relation to the adjoining property, No. 92 Raleigh Avenue, would constitute an unneighbourly over-dominant form of development resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and daylight. As such, this would be contrary to Policies BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon UDP Saved Policies 2007 and to guidance set out in the Hillingdon Design And Access Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008).

INFORMATIVES

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) set out below, and to all relevant material considerations, including Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Policy No.

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.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: Daniel Murkin **Telephone No:** 01895 250230