

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 76 ELLIOTT AVENUE RUISLIP

Development: Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension involving demolition of existing attached garage

LBH Ref Nos: **69425/APP/2013/3711**

Drawing Nos: 52 L(0-) 001 Rev. P1
 52 L(0-) 002 Rev. P2
 52 L(0-) 010 Rev. P1
 52 L(0-) 020 Rev. P1
 52 L(--) 200 Rev. P3
 52 L(--) 301 Rev. P4
 52 L(--) 100 Rev. P5
 52 L(0-) 030 Rev. P1
 52 L(0-) 031 Rev. P1
 52 L(--) 300 Rev. P4

Date Plans Received: 13/12/2013 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 13/02/2014

Date Application Valid: 20/12/2013

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on Elliot Avenue leading to Forbes Way and comprises a two storey end-of-terrace dwellinghouse with an attached garage and a front driveway for 2 car parking spaces and rear garden amenity. There is a no boundary treatment to the front, creating an open plan layout between the application site and no. 72 Elliot Avenue. The dwellinghouse is of modern construction.

The nearby area is predominantly residential in character and appearance and consist of similar types properties.

The site is situated within a Developed Area as identified in the policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012)

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for a two storey side and a single rear extension.

The two storey element would run the full length of the dwellinghouse for 7.2m, be 1.9m wide with an eaves height of 4.9m rising to the existing ridge height (7.8m).

The single storey rear extension would extend 6.1m wide (full width of dwellinghouse), 2.75m deep, 2.25m to the eaves and 3.4m to the ridge of a mono pitched roof. Casement windows to the rear and 2 roof lights are proposed. There are no flank windows proposed.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

69425/APP/2013/2453 76 Elliott Avenue Ruislip

Two storey side extension involving part conversion and part demolition of existing garage to habitable use

Decision Date: 24-10-2013 Refused

Comment on Planning History

69425/APP/2013/2453 - This scheme was a refused and this amended scheme is designed to overcome the reasons for refusal.

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

6 neighbours were consulted and a site notice erected on 18 January 2014 giving 21 days to make their representations. No comments were received.

Internal Consultees:

The Tree Officer was consulted and raise no objection to the proposed development

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.

OE1 Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area

LPP 3.5 (2011) Quality and design of housing developments

HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the

impact on the visual amenity of neighbouring properties, its effect on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and provision of acceptable residential amenity and parking for the application property.

The two storey side extension would be less than half the width of the original dwellinghouse which is compliant with guidance contained in paragraph 5.10 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Extensions. Paragraph 5.7 of the SPD states that there is no requirement for a set-back from the front of terraced properties therefore, the proposal has been suitably designed to be in keeping with the vernacular of the dwellinghouse and the visual street pattern in accordance with Part 1 Policy BE1, and Part 2 Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of Hillingdon Local Plan UDP Saved Policies (November 2012). Although, it is preferred that there

Furthermore, two storey side extensions normally require a set in of 1m from the shared boundary with the adjoining property which this amended scheme now achieves. It would have a set in of 1m from the shared boundary with and a perceivable set in of 1.3 from the streetscene. This, in turn, prevents a closing of what is a characteristic visual gap, in a tightly developed estate of properties, between neighbouring dwellings that could create a future terracing effect compliant with Part 1 Policy BE1 and Part 2 Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of Hillingdon Local Plan UDP Saved Policies (November 2012).

From a design standpoint, additional windows in the principle elevation facing the highway would have been preferred giving a more symmetrical appearance rather than a blank wall but this is not enough to warrant refusal on these design grounds only.

Turning to the single storey rear extension, it would project 2.75m from the rear wall and extend to the width of the original dwellinghouse on a plot more than 5m. This is considered acceptable in respect of guidance contained in 3.2 of the HDAS-EXT supplementary planning document. Its height would match the maximum height of 3.4m in line with guidance contained in paragraph 3.7. Therefore, the rear extension is considered to have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the dwelling.

In terms of the impact on the neighbouring dwelling, the proposed rear extension would be compliant with the HDAS Residential Extension guidance in terms of its height and depth. Owing to its orientation with No. 78 Elliot Avenue and the height and depth of the rear extension, which would abut the boundary of no. 74 Elliot Avenue, it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies BE20 & BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: UDP Saved Policies (2012).

No windows are proposed in the side elevation of the dwelling and the only outlook would be toward the rear. Therefore, the scheme would comply with Policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: UDP Saved Policies (2012).

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the development, would have an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) and Policy 3.5 the London Plan (2011).

The parking scheme for the previous application was considered acceptable, given the provision of a garage within the ground floor extension. However, no garage is proposed in the current scheme and only 1 off-street parking space would be provided. The adopted parking standards require the provision of 2 off-street parking spaces per dwelling. The proposal would be an enlargement of a dwellinghouse without any resultant increase in

parking space. However, the site has a PTAL score of 1b and is in a modern estate with narrow roads, limited designated parking in the cul-de-sac containing the dwelling and limited on-street parking on Elliott Avenue and the surrounding roads. Therefore, the proposed loss of a parking space would result in the displacement of parking to areas which would prejudice highway and pedestrian safety, given the lack of on-street parking in the surrounding area.

The Council would require 25% of the garden to be retained as soft landscaped, which would not allow for the provision of a further parking space within the front garden of the site.

Given the loss of the parking space and potential for future harm to highway and pedestrian safety, the application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would result in the loss of an off-street parking space in an area of limited on-street parking, resulting in increased pressure for on-street parking, resulting in conditions which would be prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan 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:

guidance.

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.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: Scott Hackner

Telephone No: 01895 250230