

MARK UP OF OFFICERS REPORT
FROM PREVIOUS APPLICATION

Residents Services

APP. REF. NO: 74741/APP/2019/1194

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, Transportation and Regeneration**

Address 20 MILTON COURT ICKENHAM

Development: Single storey side/rear extension, first floor rear extension and extension to existing porch to front

LBH Ref Nos: **74741/APP/2019/1194**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan (1:1250)
 Block Plan (1:500)
 20MC-01
 SKPBP-01
 32911_03_P
 32911_04_P
 32911_05_ES
 20MC-04
 20MC-05
 20MC-02
 20MC-03
 Design, Access and Planning Statement

Date Plans Received: 08/04/2019 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 10/04/2019

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

This is an attractive link-detached, Arts & Crafts influenced, 1930s property. It is one of many similar, but mostly individually designed houses on Milton Court which is situated within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.

Milton Court is formed around a rectangular green, having three gateway roads and being open and verdant in its landscaping. This helps perpetuate the village feel of the CA. This property sits on the corner of one of these gateway roads and therefore holds a prominent position. No. 20, shares this gateway position with No.22 and has been designed with some matching architectural details to the east side elevation.

The architectural detail of the existing property adds richness to the character of the streetscapes it fronts and should be preserved.

This property, No. 20, has a projecting bay to the principle elevation with a curved two storey bay window, with tiling, to the front, surmounted by bracketed, deep projecting eaves. The entrance porch appearances suggest that the existing porch was originally open and was enclosed at a later date. The rear wing sits under a half hipped gambrel roof and offers an impressive elevation to the streetscape of Almond Avenue. Unusually, three of its elevations front a highway. These elevations are therefore more important to the public realm than they would be if the property were in a more usual position.

The application site lies within a 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This application proposes a single storey side/rear extension, first floor rear extension and extension to existing porch to front

The proposal seeks to extend the building with a wrap around single storey extension, extending 5m out to the rear and a 2m inline extension to the first floor and roof.

1.3 Relevant Planning History **Comment on Planning History**

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 16th May 2019

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

12 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 12/4/19 and a site notice was displayed in the area. By the close of the consultation period, no responses were received:

Conservation and Urban Design Officer:

Summary of Comments

Unusually, the situation of this property is such that in addition to being in a conservation area, 3 of its elevations front a highway. This means that the design of any extension to these elevations will be held to a high standard for approval. The scale and design of the extension threatens the garden village character of the conservation area. The current application neither preserves nor enhances the property, streetscape or the conservation area. Significant revisions are recommended.

Officer comment: The conservation officers full comments are considered in the main issues section below.

Access Officer

I have considered the detail of this planning application and have no comments to make.

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

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas

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.
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 7.4	(2016) Local character
LPP 7.8	(2016) Heritage assets and archaeology
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

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 location of the application property within the designated Ickenham Village Conservation Area is of considerable importance within the determination of this application, and it is imperative that any development accords with Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012), which states; 'New development within or on the fringes of Conservation Areas will be expected to preserve or enhance those features which contribute to their special architectural and visual qualities.'

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.

Section 3.0 Single Storey Rear Extensions states detached houses an extension up to 4m deep is acceptable. pitch roofs can be acceptable and must not exceed 3.4m at its highest point.

Section 4.0 Single Storey Side Extensions states the design of a side extension should not dominate the existing character of the original property. In order to appear subordinate the width and height should be considerably less than that of the main house and be

PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT EVEN WITH ARTICLE 4 DIRECTIVE
IS 4 METRES
COMPLIES
REFER TO S MILTON COURT WHICH HAS SLIGHTLY LARGER EXTENSION APPROVED.

between half and two thirds of the original house.

Section 6 Two Storey Rear or First Floor Rear Extension states the extension should always be designed so as to appear 'subordinate' to the original house. Rear extensions will only be allowed where there is no significant over-dominance, overshadowing, loss of outlook and daylight. The first floor should not extend beyond a 45-degree angle. detached houses an extension up to 4m deep is acceptable. The height of the extension should not normally exceed the height of the existing building. The roof lines of the extension should normally be parallel to those of the existing building and the eaves line. The new roof should appear subordinate to the original roof and so have a ridge height at least 0.5m lower than the original roof.

Section 8.0 Front Extensions, Porches and Bay Windows states front extensions are eye catching and change the face of the building. They do not only affect the character and appearance of the building itself but also the street scene. Changes and extensions to the front of the house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. It should also appear subordinate in scale and form, must not extend past the line of any bay window and in the case of being combined with a garage conversion they may be integrated with a forward extension of the garage not exceeding 1.0m.

Unusually, the situation of this property is such that 3 of its elevations front a highway. This seems to have been considered in the original design of these prominent elevations, which all have a pleasing degree of architectural detail, with the primary elevation facing the green. This means that the design of any extension to these elevations will be held to a high standard for approval.

The proposal seeks to extend the building with a wrap around single storey extension, extending 5m out to the rear and a 2m inline extension to the first floor and roof.

The Council's Conservation officer was consulted and stated that while the principle of a part two storey, part single storey extension to the rear is acceptable, the extent and design of that proposed is currently considered unacceptable, failing to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

1ST FLOOR 2METRES IS ACCEPTABLE

The two storey element of this proposal will extend the gambrel covered rear wing, in line, by 2m. This is considered acceptable as it maintains the character and form of the building, whilst not adding too much visual mass to the property, and it is unlikely to cause a significant imbalance with the pair at No.18. The application proposes the retiling of the gambrel roof and this would avoid a visible join in the roof finish. All materials should match the existing.

The proposed single storey is unsatisfactory on a number of counts:

✓ COMPRIES

- It is considered out of scale with the plan form of the original building, the maximum depth to the rear of the property should be reduced to no more than 4m from the original building, in line with the HDAS guidance on extensions. It also eats into the garden, gardens being an important characteristic in the area. It should also not extend beyond the side elevations, especially not the west side, as this loses the form of the building.

- As can be seen in the drawings for the proposed scheme, the characterful rear elevation, framed so pleasingly by the half-hipped gambrel roof, is cut through by the proposed first storey extension and its mock pitched roof. This effectively deadens the pleasing vertical character of the original design form. The single storey element of the rear extension should be limited in width so that it is stepped in from the west side

- GAP PROVIDED - ALSO SAME WIDTH / LESS THAN S MILTON COURT.

SEE SYMMETRICAL
SET OUT ON CENTRE OF GAMBREL
ROOF

elevation. Ideally it would be better sitting symmetrically on the gambrel rear elevation, but given the situation on the east side, extending behind the garage may be acceptable in this case.

The proposed use of a dummy pitched roof is inappropriate in this case as it clashes with the form of the gambrel roof. A low parapet may work better.

- The single storey extension to the west elevation, flattens out the step back to this side and disrupts the line of the gambrel roof, visually cutting it off where it is meant to sit over a vertical wall. The resultant proposed form is incongruous and hides the original form. The proposed high level windows are not in keeping with the existing windows and the eaves would extend forward of the bay to this side which is not desirable. As this elevation also contributes significantly to the interest of the street scene it fronts, the proposed side extension to the west is considered unacceptable.

- The glazing proposed for the rear single storey extension is considered incongruous in this context. As with so much of the rear single storey extension, it cuts across the vertical form of the original design for this elevation. The glazing for the rear ground floor should be more traditional in its design, looking towards the 1930s Arts and Crafts for influence.

ARTS + CRAFTS DESIGN INCORPORATED.

The roof lights to the west elevation will be very noticeable as proposed. They are considered to be too big and as they service an en-suite, they are unnecessary. One smaller conservation roof light, split with a glazing bar would be considered.

Proposed changes to the front elevation include the extension of the already filled in porch. These, originally open porches are a repeated architectural form within the close. It is felt that the proposed porch extension would hide the form of the original, which is still very much apparent in the structure, and that this would be a shame. No.18's extended porch appears to be a canopy only. However, if done well, the proposed porch extension could be acceptable. It might be better if the proportions of the house windows could be better represented in the design of the porch windows and door.

ARTS + CRAFTS DESIGN

The proposed dummy pitched roof above the garage, while matching the height of the proposed porch roof and being designed to continue from the dummy roof of the rear extension, would spoil the continuity with the neighbour's garage roofline. With the loss of the dummy roof to the rear extension, it would seem there would be no need to change the roof of the garage. So on balance, it would seem better to maintain the neighbourly continuity, this will be easier to assess on any follow up drawings.

AS
SEPARATE
APPLICATION

The applicant mentions the planning permission granted to 5 Milton Close, which is a similar house form to that at No.20. However, only the front elevation of No. 5 fronts a highway. Their rear single storey extension is also limited to 4m.

- 5 MILTON COURT
EMULATED.

The conservation officer stated that the proposed scheme fails to preserve or enhance the conservation area. She also recommended that proposed rear single storey extension should be reduced as indicated above, with the west side extension omitted. Revisions should also be made to the rooflights, garage roof form, and the porch could possibly be improved too.

GAP
PROVIDED.

The proposed single storey side/rear extension, front porch and rooflights, by reason of their size, scale, bulk, design and siting in this open prominent position would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ickenham

THIS
SEPARATES
THE

ORIGINAL
FROM THE
EXTENSION

Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions and the NPPF.

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. Policy BE22 applies to extensions of two or more storeys which seeks to retain a 1m set in from the boundary.

With regards to the impact on neighbouring residential amenity, it is considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse harm on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings at nos 18 and 22 from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over-dominance. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposed extension would be in accordance with the objectives set out in Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the extension, would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with the Mayor of London's Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016).

Paragraph 5.13 of Residential Extensions. HDAS: Residential Extensions requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. There would be sufficient garden space retained.

There would be ample parking to the front of the property. As such, the proposal would not therefore conflict with policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Given the above considerations, the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed single storey side/rear extension, front porch and rooflights, by reason of their size, scale, bulk, design and siting in this open prominent position would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ickenham Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions and the NPPF.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. The Council's supports pre-application discussions however we have been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

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 - The spatial development strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

Part 1 Policies:

- | | |
|---------|--------------------------|
| PT1.BE1 | (2012) Built Environment |
| PT1.HE1 | (2012) Heritage |

Part 2 Policies:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |
| BE4 | New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas |
| 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. |
| DMHB 1 | Heritage Assets |
| DMHB 4 | Conservation Areas |
| DMHD 1 | Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings |