Residents Services

APP. REF. NO: 70313/APP/2014/3401

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 37 RAMULIS DRIVE HAYES

Development: Single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 1 front rooflight

LBH Ref Nos: **70313/APP/2014/3401**

Drawing Nos: PEB1 Rev P2
PPB1 Rev P2
PL1 Rev P1
P9 Rev P2
P3 Rev P1
P4 Rev P2
P1 Rev P2
P2 Rev P2
P10 Rev P1
P11 Rev P1
P12 Rev P1
P5 Rev P2
P7 Rev P2
P8 Rev P2
P6 Rev P3
P13 Rev P2
P14 Rev P2

Date Plans Received: 23/09/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 15/10/0014

Date Application Valid: 15/10/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a mid terrace two-storey dwellinghouse with brick elevations under a tiled roof. The property faces both Ramulis drive at the front and Lochan Close at the rear. The garden area at the rear is approximately 55sqm.

The site is located within a developed area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks permission for a rear dormer and a single-storey rear extension. The internal roof area would provide space for a third bedroom whilst the ground floor extension would provide additional internal space for a kitchen.

The rear dormer would span across the entire width of the rear roof plane measuring 3.6m (W) 4.03m (D) and 2.5m (H). The bottom of the dormer would be 0.47m from the eaves and 0.37m from the ridge. The dormer would be a flat roof design with tiled cheeks.

The rear ground floor extension would have a depth of 3m, height of 2.7m and a width of 4m. There would be a door and a window facing into the garden.

The retained rear garden area would be 43sqm.

1.3 Relevant Planning History
Comment on Planning History

There is no relevant planning history attached to this property.

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

Teo neighbours were consulted on the application on the 16th October 2014 and a site notice was displayed close by.At the time of the expiry of the consultation period on 6th November there had been 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
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.

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 the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings and the provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property and the availability of parking.

Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions section 7 discusses loft conversions and roof alterations and states at paragraph 7.3 that the more visible the rear elevations of a house are from public areas the more important it is that it is well designed. The degree of public visibility will influence the assessment of visual impact in each case. At 7.5 the HDAS states that it is important to create an extension that will appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it will be set. Roof extensions that would be as wide as the house and create the appearance of an effective flat roofed third storey will be refused permission.

In this case, the rear dormer would be highly visible from Lochan Close. Although there are other examples of flat roof dormers within the area which can also be seen from public vantage points they are smaller and adhere to the guidelines within the HDAS. In this

case, the full width dormer would effectively create the appearance of a three storey flat roofed building resulting in an incongruous and overdominant roof extension, which would dominate rather than be subordinate to the roof space within which it is set. The dormer would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the character of the original property and represent an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, given its very prominent location, within the surrounding street scene and wider area and would thus be contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The front rooflight is considered acceptable with no discernible impact on the character and appearance of the property or within the wider area and is positioned in an appropriate manner and complies with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The rear extension mainly complies with the guidance set out within the HDAS with regard to its proposed dimensions and appearance. However, the HDAS at section 5.13 states that sufficient garden space should be retained as a consequence of an extension. The guidelines require 40smq for a two-bedroom dwellling and 60sqm for a three bedroom dwelling. Combined with the proposed loft conversion which would add a third bedroom to the existing two-bedroom property, if the extension were to be approved the garden area would be insufficient at 43sqm which is considered inadequate for a three bedroom dwelling. The consequence of the extension and the subsequent reduction in rear garden space therefore does not comply with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The application property does not benefit from on-site car parking provision. However there does not appear to be any parking restrictions within the area and the proposal would not materially affect the parking provisions within the street.Hence in terms of policy AM14 of the saved UDP, September 2007, the application proposal would not alter existing car parking arrangements.

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms and those altered by the proposals would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan.

However, on balance given the above reasons the application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 R6 Design Dormer - Refusal

The proposed dormer by reason of its size, bulk, design, massing etc., would be over-dominant detrimental to the form of the original roof to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene, locality and area in general. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Council's adopted policies in particular policy(s) BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Saved Policies (November 2012)

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The addition of the rear dormer creating a third bedroom combined with the proposed rear ground floor extension would result in there being a material reduction in the rear garden area contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Saved

Policies (November 2012)

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) 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:

Part 2 Policies:

BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
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.

guidance.

Contact Officer: Carol Grant **Telephone No:** 01895 250230