

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 72 CAMPDEN ROAD ICKENHAM

Development: Part two storey, part single storey side/rear/front extension and porch to front

LBH Ref Nos: **71273/APP/2015/3669**

Drawing Nos: 215123/02 Rev. A
215123/01

Date Plans Received: 02/10/2015 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 05/10/2015

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in the developed area of Ickenham. The area is mainly characterised by similar dwellings, a number of which have been extended. The dwelling has an attached garage with conservatory to the side/rear. There is an outhouse to the rear. No.74, attached, has been extended by a single-storey extension to the side. No. 70 has a small flat roofed utility room to the side facing the application site and there are also ground and first floor secondary windows facing towards the application site.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks permission to construct a two-storey side and part single storey side, rear and front extension. The property would be increased from three to four bedrooms. The two-storey side extension will be to the full height of the existing house. The extension will replace the single-storey garage/conservatory extension. The single storey front extension incorporates a porch and extends across the two-storey part of the proposal. To the rear the proposal is a single storey mono-pitch extension which will run almost the full width of the extended property at a height of 3.8 metres and a depth of 4 metres. There is a wall of approximately 1.8 metres between the properties at that point which will be retained.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

None

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 application was subject to neighbour notification on 7/10/2015. Nos.40 and 42 Thornhill Road and Nos. 33, 35, 70 and 74 Campden Road were notified. A site notice was posted on 9/10/2015. One response was received. The neighbour objected on

grounds of loss of light to the hallway, utility room and landing window.

The Ickenham Residents Association commented that the development is not subservient and is therefore inappropriate in terms of Section 5.8 of the HDAS. and also that the side extension should be set back 1 metre in accordance with Section 5.6 of the HDAS.

These issues are considered elsewhere in the report.

Trees and Landscape has no objections but notes that there will be a displacement of a car park space. No more than 25% of the garden should be hard-surfaced.

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.

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 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 amenities of neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable amenity for the application property and the sufficiency of car parking.

Impact on character of original dwelling and surrounding area

Policies BE13 and BE15 of the UDP seek to ensure that development harmonises with the character of surrounding properties and street scene and, in particular, the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original dwelling. Policy BE19 further requires that development should complement and improve the amenity of the residential area. Section 5 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS Residential Extensions sets out the criteria by which planning applications for extensions must be assessed. The HDAS recognises that extensions at first floor provide additional bedrooms or other accommodation but have the potential to have a significant

impact on neighbouring properties and the character of the street.

Paragraph 5.1 requires extensions to be set back a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary. The development meets this requirement. Paragraph 5.6 requires ground and first floor extensions should be set back 1 metre from the front building line. Paragraph 5.8 states that for semi-detached properties the roof height of the extension should not exceed the height of the main roof and so should be lowered by at least 0.5 metres at roof level. The main two-storey development is aligned with the existing front elevation and the single-storey element is forward of the front of the existing dwelling. As such the development does not meet the requirements of either paragraph 5.6 or 5.8 and would not appear as a subservient extension. This would have the material impact of unbalancing the semi-detached pair which would be detrimental to the character of the street.

Impact on neighbours amenity and impact of rear extension.

Paragraph 3.0 of the HDAS states that a single-storey rear extension is the most common type of extension and can be the most cost effective solution to creating more space. The extension should always be designed to be subordinate to the original house and should not protrude out too far from the rear wall. This is because the extension may block daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties. To help clarify this the Council have set out depth guidelines depending on the type of original house. In the case of terraced or semi-detached on a plot of more than 5 metres wide an extension up to 3.6 metres deep is acceptable. The roof should not exceed 3.4 metres at its highest point. In this case the proposal exceeds both these dimensions, being 4 metres deep and 3.8 metres high. The attached property, No. 74 has a habitable room with a window close to the common boundary. As such the development is not considered to be subordinate to the existing property and is likely to result in conditions prejudicial to the amenities of occupiers of the adjoining property by reason of material loss of daylight and sunlight and an overbearing impact.

No. 70 has a utility room and secondary windows facing towards the proposed extension. However, given the secondary nature of the windows and the compliance with the 1 metre to the boundary requirement in the HDAS, it is considered that it would be difficult to demonstrate harm.

Impact on amenity space

The proposal would retain over 150 sq.m of private amenity space. Therefore sufficient private amenity space would be retained for the occupiers of the dwelling in compliance with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two: Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Impact on car parking

The proposal would increase the property from a three to four bedroom dwelling. The development will result in the loss of a garage which provides one space. However, the proposal retains two spaces without the need to utilise any existing soft landscaped area. Therefore it is considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of Policies B38 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan 2012, Part 2 and accords with the guidance under Section 11 of the HDAS.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its siting, size, scale and design, including the lack of a set back from the front at all levels and the lack of a set down of the proposed ridge from the main ridge of the roof, 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 is therefore 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 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed single storey rear extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, depth, height and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 74 Campden Road by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP 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 (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:

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

guidance.

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.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster

Telephone No: 01895 250230