

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 than 10 dwelling 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. ADVERTISEMENT 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 63 BRIDLE ROAD EASTCOTE

Development: Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and infill extension to entrance

LBH Ref Nos: **69386/APP/2014/3021**

Drawing Nos: Proposed Front and Rear Elevations
Proposed Side Elevation
Block Plan (1:200)
Location Plan (1:1250)
Proposed Floor Plans

Date Plans Received: 22/08/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 15/09/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a detached two-storey property with a detached garage addition at the rear located on the northern side of Bridle Road, directly east of the junction with Francis Road, which leads to Barnhill. The property has bay windows at ground and first floor level and a barn-hip style roof with low set eaves. The ground floor of the property has a large recess/ first floor overhang adjacent to the main entrance.

The character of the area is residential comprising mainly detached properties with differing detailing and designs, set within elongated plots.

The application site lies within the Developed Area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme. It seeks permission for what is described in the proposed as part two storey, part single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and single storey front extension. However the plans would indicate the proposal is actually for a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension (beyond the proposed two storey side extension) and the infill extension to front entrance.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

69386/APP/2013/2278 63 Bridle Road Eastcote

Part two storey, part first floor side/rear extension, infill extension to entrance and alterations to roofs over bay windows to front

Decision Date: 14-10-2013 Refused

Comment on Planning History

69386/APP/2013/2278 - Part two storey, part first floor side/rear extension infill extension to entrance and alterations to roofs over bay windows to front was refused for the

following reasons:

1. The proposed side extension by reason of its size, scale, height, bulk and prominent siting in this open prominent position would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance and would result in an incongruous addition which would detract from the character and appearance of the existing property and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) and The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2. The proposed extensions and alterations, by virtue of their design, siting, size and scale would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the appearance of the original house, the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 -UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) and The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

An appeal against the refusal was dismissed.

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

The following neighbours were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 7 October 2014 as follows: -

- 59 Bridle Road
- 2 Francis Road
- 65 Bridle Road
- 86 Bridle Road

No responses were received from the neighbours

Eastcote Residents Association: No response has been received

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:

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

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
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings and provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property.

The proposed two storey side extension measures 10.4m in length at ground floor level, including a 1.3m projection beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The single storey rear extension, measures 2.45m wide and has a flat roof measuring 3m high. The first floor element of the proposal measures 9.1m long and runs the full length of the existing dwelling. It also measures 2.45m wide, adjoins the existing roof at 7.7m high at the ridge and 5.4m at the eaves. It is 1m from boundary of the site.

The previous proposal raised concerns over changes to the roof design to the existing dwelling. This proposal has amended the design to retain the distinctive barn-hip shape over the extension. Furthermore the two storey element of the side extension has moved forward so the front is level with the existing dwelling, but has removed the rear projection, which was raised as a concern by the Planning Inspector.

The appeal decision however, also identified that whilst a gap of 1m to the boundary would comply with HDAS, the proposed side extension would significantly erode the existing space to the side of the property. It was considered therefore that the proposed extension would detract from the open character of the road junction to the detriment of the street scene. Consequently the erosion of this space, together with the loss of some of the distinctive features of the building would combine to significantly detract from the importance and positive contribution that the property makes to the streetscene. The Inspector commented as follows:

"5. The proposed extension would leave a gap of one metre to the boundary with Francis Road, and to that limited extent would comply with the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions. However, the proposed side extension would significantly erode the existing space to the side of this property and would project further beyond the return building line established by the properties in Francis Road. The proposed extension would therefore detract from the open character of this junction. In my view, this open character makes an important contribution to the street scene. Consequently, the erosion of this space, together with the

loss of some of the distinctive features of the building, combine to significantly detract from the important and positive contribution that the appeal property makes to the street scene."

Given that the space to the side is still being eroded the proposal is considered unacceptable and contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Section 5 of the SPD HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The appeal decision also raised concern that the side extension would result in the infilling of the recess to the front elevation, and would result in the loss of this distinctive feature of the property and thus this element of the proposal and its impact on the character of the property is considered unacceptable.

Given the siting of the proposed extension, there would not be any issues in relation to loss of light, overshadowing, loss of outlook or overdominance in relation to the adjoining properties. Policy BE24 states that the proposal should protect the privacy of the occupiers and their neighbours. The proposed extension to the side elevation adjacent to the road does not give rise to any issues of overlooking or loss of amenity. As such, the proposal is in compliance with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Paragraph 5.13 of Residential Extensions. HDAS: Residential Extensions requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. The property benefits from a good sized rear garden and adequate garden space would be retained.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed side extension by reason of its size, scale, height, bulk and prominent siting in this open prominent position would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance and would result in an incongruous addition which would detract from the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) and The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed side extension, by virtue of its position and siting would result in the loss of the distinctive front open porch feature and would thus be detrimental to the appearance of the original house, the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) and The Council's 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:

AM14	New development and car parking standards.
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
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

guidance.

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

Telephone No: 01895 250230