Residents Services

APP. REF. NO: 70715/APP/2015/908

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 1 CASTLETON ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Single storey side extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 3 front and 1 side rooflights

LBH Ref Nos: **70715/APP/2015/908**

Drawing Nos: 104-102
104-103
104-104
104-106
104-107
104-108
104-109
104-101

Date Plans Received: 12/03/2015 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 23/03/2015

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application dwelling comprises of a semi-detached bungalow sited on the corner junction of Castleton Road and Cranmer Close. The property is characterised by a hipped roof and benefits from a fair sized front and rear garden which is joined by the area of open land to the north west elevation of the main dwelling.

The property benefits from a detached garage with area of hardstanding which can accommodate a total of 2 cars and a single storey conservatory across the rear elevation.

The surrounding area falls within the residential area of Ruislip and and is characterised mainly by two storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Full planning consent is sought for the construction of a single storey side extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use and insertion of 3 rooflights across front elevation.

The proposed single storey side extension would measure 3m in width and would extend flush with the rear elevation of the original dwelling. The roof would be set down from the ridge height of the host dwelling by 150mm with the eaves finishing level with the original eaves height.

The conversion of the roof space would involve the construction of a rear dormer across the rear roof slope of the original bungalow and the proposed single storey side extension. The proposed dormer would be characterised by a flat roof and would measure 5.8m in width, 2.6m in height and would project to a maximum depth of 3.2m.

The application also proposes 2 roof lights to the front roof slope of the original dwelling and a rooflight to the front and side elevation of the proposed extension.

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

A total of 5 neighbouring properties and the Eastcote residents Association were consulted. 3 objections were received during the consultation period.

No.3 Castleton Road - Number 1 Castleton Road is a semi-detached bungalow located on the corner of Castleton Road and Crammer Close. I reside in the attached bungalow (Number 3 Castleton Road). The proposed extension to Number 1 Castleton Road would be extremely large and unsightly and not in keeping at all with the locale. The planned pitched extended high roof (extending high out to the side of the property) and double dormer extension would stand out as residents come into the road. It is on the corner where everyone must pass when entering from the main road. On this estate there are many semi-detached bungalows of the same mock-tudor design and none have an over-sized double storey extension with double dormer with a high roof extended out to the side. Moreover, my property would be significantly overlooked by Number 1. A further concern is that, since our bungalows are attached, any changes to internal walls and roof etc. may affect the integrity of my bungalow. There has been no communication from my neighbours regarding this matter. I am registered disabled and am housebound most of the time and require peace and quiet due to my chronic health conditions. If this construction goes ahead, I would need to move out of my home for the duration of the building work, which would be a huge and expensive challenge for me to attempt to undertake.

No. 32 Cramer Close - The proposed extension is totally out of character with this well established neighbourhood. I believe that it would spoil the appearance of the area greatly. The dormer would be considerably higher than the front roofline and seems grossly out of proportion with the rest of the bungalow. The width of this dormer is excessive at approx 20 feet, it would be a huge blot on our landscape, and the large windows at the rear would overlook my property. I strongly oppose a conversion of this size.

No.85 Cardinal Road - There are over 60 tradiitonal bungalows on this estate and a conversion would seem totally out of character with the rest of them. Concerned it may affect the apperaance of this area. Would look out of proportion with the rest of the properties due to the prominent corner position and proposed high and wider than the usual roof lines. The rooflights are considered excessive as none of the other bungalows have them.

A signed letter from the residents of No. 3 & 5 Cardinal Road, 32 Crammer Close and 2 Cardinal Road stating: The proposed building works appear to be more extensive than those described in the letter. The proposed side extension would give the appearance of a double two storey side extension. The dormer is large hence the side extension, and the whole rear roof slope would be filled by a dormer that would overlook our properties. Property is on a prominent corner and the extension is far too bulky and out of character with the area. Would also be interested to know how this will affect our drains.

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.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original building, the street scene and the level of impact on the residential amenity and light levels of the adjoining neighbours.

Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part two (Saved UDP Policies) requires alterations and extensions to existing buildings to harmonise with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building. Policy BE13 requires the layout and appearance of extensions to harmonise with the existing street scene and Policy BE19 ensures any new development complements or improves the amenity and character of the area.

The Council's Adopted SPD the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008) or HDAS, contains design guidance (below) for all types of extensions which should appear subordinate in scale to the original building. Section 4.0 states careful consideration should be given to the location of extensions to buildings, building line, frontages and entrances should be respected.Section 7.0 Loft Conversions and Roof Alterations, The degree of visibility and prominence of rear roof slopes caries considerably and therefore as a general rule the more visible a roof is from public areas the more important that it be well designed.

The proposed single storey side extension would be set back 4.85m from the principal elevation of the main dwelling, would measure 3m in width, would finish flush with the rear elevation of the host dwelling and would be characterised by a hipped roof that would replicate the existing roof form. It would be set in from the side boundary sufficiently to to ensure that the characteristic open gap at the junction of roads is not impinged upon to an unacceptable degree, despite the fact that it would be forward of the building line of Cranmer Close. The single storey side element of the extension is considered an appropriate addition to the bungalow.

The proposed rear dormer would in virtue of its scale, form and proportion to the

bungalow would fail to harmonise with the character of the original bungalow.

The proposed rear dormer would be set down approximately 150mm from the ridge height of the original bungalow, however it would result in the whole rear roof space being dominated by a full size dormer. Furthermore due to the prominent location of the application site, it is considered the proposed dormer would be an overbearing feature along the rear roof slope and would fail to harmonise with the character of the existing street scene. Along with the addition of four roof lights, would result in a cluster of windows across the visually prominent roof slopes and fail to harmonise with the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area.

The addition of a full size rear dormer and addition of four rooflights across the front and side elevation of a bungalow that is sited in a prominent position on the corner junction of Castleton Road and Cramer Close would fail to harmonise with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and therefore contrary to the objectives of HDAS and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan.

Policy BE20 requires any new development to be laid out so as to protect the daylight and sunlight levels of existing houses. Policy BE21 requires new extensions by virtue of their siting, bulk and proximity would not result in a significant loss of residential amenity to neighbouring properties and Policy BE24 should protect the privacy of the occupiers and their neighbours.

Due to the corner junction position of the application site, the proposed side extension would have a negligible impact on the privacy and light levels of its neighbouring properties. Due to the height of the windows it is considered there would be a minor level of overlooking into No. 3 Castleton Road, and No. 32 Cramer Close's rear gardens, however due the character of the surrounding area a small level of overlooking would be anticipated as the site falls within a built up residential area. The rear dormer would primarily face their own garden and would not result in an adverse loss of sunlight and daylight to any of the adjoining neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered not to conflict with Policies BE20 and BE21 of the Local Plan.

The amenity space remaining would exceed the required 60m2 for a three bed property.

The roof conversion would result in an additional bedroom and a 3 bedroom bungalow. The existing two off road parking spaces are considered sufficient to serve the needs of the occupiers of the dwelling and compliant with Policy AM14 of the Local Plan.

The proposal is recommended for refusal due to the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, virtue of its scale, proportion and prominence.

For the reasons given relating to scale, proportion and impact on the application property and the surrounding area it is recommended that permission be refused.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed rear dormer window, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, size, scale, bulk and design, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual

amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved 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 (2015). 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.
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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments

guidance.

Contact Officer: Naim Poptani **Telephone No:**