Residents Services

APP. REF. NO: 68096/APP/2013/2876

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 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, Sport and Green Spaces**

Address 52 PADDINGTON CLOSE HAYES

Development: Part two storey, part single storey rear extension.

LBH Ref Nos: **68096/APP/2013/2876**

Drawing Nos: PL/ASB/1
Design and Access Statement

Date Plans Received: 01/10/2013 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 09/10/2013

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The property is a two bedroom semi-detached house with a detached garage situated at the head of a residential cul-de-sac of similar linked detached, semi and terraced dwellings in north Hayes, thus forming part of the Developed Area of the Borough.

During the time of the site visit, building work has commenced on a detached dwelling directly adjacent to the north of the application site.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal is for the erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension (measuring approx. 4.5 metres wide x 4.4m deep x 2.9m high at ground floor level/3.65m deep at first floor) to provide a kitchen/dining room and a third bedroom above, across the full width of the property.

The ridge of the pitched roof extension would be kept approx. 1.0 metre below that of the main building whilst the hipped end would match the angle of the main roof slope seen on the side elevation.

The two storey extension, which would contain two rear facing windows, would project 0.75m beyond a similar first floor rear extension approved to the other half of this pair, No. 50, under a separate planning application ref. 63135/APP/2012/467 in May 2012.

The extension would be finished in external materials - brick, roof tiles and upvc window and door frames - to match those on the existing house.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

63135/APP/2012/467 50 Paddington Close Hayes

First floor rear extension (Resubmission)

Decision Date: 11-05-2012 Approved

63135/APP/2013/2202 50 Paddington Close Hayes

First Floor rear extension

Decision Date: 30-09-2013 Refused

63753/APP/2011/2416 52a Paddington Close Hayes

Part two storey, part single storey rear extension

Decision Date: 15-12-2011 Refused

63753/APP/2012/471 52a Paddington Close Hayes

Part two storey, part single storey rear extension (Resubmission)

Decision Date: 15-05-2012 Approved

68096/APP/2011/2419 52 Paddington Close Hayes

Part two storey, part single storey rear extension

Decision Date: 15-12-2011 Refused

68096/APP/2012/468 52 Paddington Close Hayes

Part two storey, part single storey rear extension (Resubmission)

Decision Date: 11-05-2012 Approved

Comment on Planning History

A part two storey part single storey rear extension to this property was refused under ref. 6809/APP/2011/2419 in December 2011 because of its introduction of a flat roofed section continued back from the existing ridge height and thus its failure to harmonise with the original building and impact on the street scene under UDP Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 plus HDAS.

Following a re-submission under ref. 6809/APP/2012/468, a part two storey, part single storey rear extension was permitted in May 2012. This extension was 3.5m deep on the ground floor and 2.9m at first floor level and thus matched the depth of the first floor extension approved to No. 50 at the same time.

* It should be noted that the first floor extension now built to No. 50 Paddington Close, which is 3.65m in depth and aligns with the existing ground floor of that property, and for which retrospective planning permission was sought and refused (under ref. 63135/APP/2013/2202 in September 2013), is thus not lawful.

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

13 neighbouring occupiers have been consulted (11.10.2013) - one response in support has been received. In addition, a site notice was displayed at the site on 1.11.2013.

Environmental Protection Unit - recommend informative(s) regarding control of nuisance from construction work and contamination (former munitions factory/depot site).

4. 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:

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.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
CACPS	Council's Adopted Car Parking Standards (Annex 1, HUDP, Saved Policies, September 2007)
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration relate to the effect of the application proposal on the character and appearance of the original property, on the visual amenities of the street scene/surrounding area and on the amenities of adjoining occupiers. A further consideration is made in respect of parking provision for the enlarged dwelling proposed.

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) under Policy BE13 states that all development should harmonise with the existing street scene whilst Policy BE19 seeks to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. The extension would not be especially visible from within the close or thus to the detriment of the general street scene or the surrounding residential area as a whole.

Policy BE15 permits extensions that are in harmony with the scale, form, composition and proportions of the original building. In order to achieve this, the extension should thus be designed to appear subordinate to the original (Hillingdon Design And Accessibility Statement - Residential Extensions, paragraphs 3.1 and 6.4) and not protrude too far from the rear wall. For semi-detached houses on plots of more than 5 metres width, 3.6 metres is considered an acceptable depth at both ground and first floors. The height of an extension should not exceed 3.4m at ground floor or that of the existing building at first floor and roof lines should be parallel to the existing with a matching pitch but have a ridge height at least 0.5m lower than the original roof.

The depth of both the ground and first floor elements of the extension would clearly

exceed the HDAS maximum and the proposal is thus considered to be out of scale and proportion with the original building and thus not subordinate to it.

In these respects therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and to HDAS - Residential Extensions.

With regard to the impact of the extension on the amenities of adjoining occupiers, these are sought to be safeguarded in terms of daylight/sunlight (Policy BE20), outlook due to proximity and bulk (Policy BE21) and privacy (Policy BE24).

There would be no effect on the amount of daylight (as measured by the depth and 45 degree angle of light taken from the nearest habitable room windows), outlook or privacy currently enjoyed by the neighbours at No. 50 Paddington Close, which has permission for a marginally less deep first floor extension (this is not the extension that has been built to that property). The other immediately adjoining dwelling, proposed to be built at No. 52a and which would be separated from No. 52, would also not be affected for the same reason, being the subject of a similar approval for rearward extension on two floors.

The nearest facing properties in Fellowes Close beyond the application site rear boundary are some 21.35 metres away from where the first floor extension would finish. There is however a ground floor extension (approx. 2.8m in depth) to No. 4 which contains habitable room windows that would thus be that much closer, about 18.5 metres away. Despite the screening provided by the tree towards the rear boundary therefore, it is likely that at certain times of the year, the privacy of these occupiers could be compromised. The proposal would thus give rise to additional overlooking potential from the bedroom windows and therefore conflicts with Local Plan Policy BE24 and HDAS in this regard.

Local Plan Policy BE23 states that extensions to residential buildings should maintain external amenity space sufficient to protect the amenity of future occupants and HDAS sets out the minimum requirements in this respect, which for three bedroom properties is 60 sq. metres. The proposal would retain a rear garden of approx. 5.2m x 8.1m (42 sq.m.), given the building works for the adjacent dwelling has split the size of the site, for the future occupiers and thus does not comply with Policy BE23 or HDAS in this regard.

The proposed extension would increase the number of bedrooms in the property to three, but the existing parking provision of two off-road vehicle spaces, including the garage, meets the Council's maximum standards in this regard and there would be no implications for highway safety as a result. The proposal thus complies with Local Plan Policy AM14.

There are no landscape features of merit that would be directly affected by or require protection during the construction of the extension, if approved, and thus the proposal conforms with Local Plan Policy BE38.

For the reasons stated above, the application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by reason of its size, scale and bulk, would fail to to be subordinate to or harmonise with the architectural composition of the original building and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal is contrary to 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.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Due to its depth and separation distance beyond the rear boundary, the proposed extension would be likely to give rise to additional overlooking from the first floor bedroom windows and result in a loss of privacy to the adjoining occupiers in Fellowes Close. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension would result in an inadequate provision of outdoor amenity space being available to the detriment of current and future occupiers of the dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

1 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.

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) 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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

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.

guidance.

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.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
CACPS	Council's Adopted Car Parking Standards (Annex 1, HUDP, Saved Policies, September 2007)
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

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