

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 an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	<input type="checkbox"/>

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	<input type="checkbox"/>
25.	WORKS TO TREES	<input type="checkbox"/>
26.	OTHER (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's 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 DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Comment on Planning History

No recent relevant planning history.

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

Three neighbouring properties and South Ruislip Residents Association were consulted on 20-02-2024.

No objections were received by the end of the consultation period.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Highways - No comments.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF12 -23 NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and locality the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden, trees and landscaping, flood risk impact and car parking provision.

Character and Appearance

:

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also required that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

With regards to front extensions, Policy DMHD 1 states that:

- 1) Alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused;
- 2) Porches should be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building; pastiche features will not be supported; and
- 3) Notwithstanding the above, at least 25% of the front garden must be retained

With regard to side extensions, Policy DMHD 1 requires:

- 1) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property;
- 2) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded;
- 3) garages should reflect the size guidelines set out in Appendix C Parking standards;
- 4) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary or in the case of properties in the Copse Wood and Gatehill Estates, at least 1.5 metres, but more if on a wider than average plot, in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses;
- 5) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation;
- 6) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported; and
- vii) in Conservation Areas, single storey side extensions may be required to be set back.

With regards to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 states that:

- 1) single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth or 3.6 metres where the plot width is 5 metres or more;
- 2) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- 3) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level;
- 4) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions

will be expected to be finished with a parapet;

5) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;

6) two storey extensions should not extend into an area provided by a 45-degree line of sight drawn from the centre of the nearest ground or first floor habitable room window of an adjacent property and should not contain windows or other openings that overlook other houses at a distance of less than 21 metres;

7) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house;

8) pitched roofs on extensions should be of a similar pitch and materials to that of the original roof and subordinate to it in design. Large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported; and

9) full width two storey rear extensions are not considered acceptable in designated areas or as extensions to Listed Buildings or Locally Listed Buildings.

With regard to Roof Extensions

1) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof.

They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line;

2) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;

3) raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported;

4) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling; and

5) in Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character and on Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, roof extensions should take the form of traditional 'dormer' windows, on the rear elevation, to harmonise with the existing building. The highest point of the dormer should be kept well within the back roof slope, away from the ridge, eaves or valleys, whilst each window should match the proportions, size and glazing pattern of the first floor windows.

The proposed porch is modest in scale, measuring a depth of 1m, a length of 1.8m and featuring a pitched of 3.2m. In isolation, there are no design objections to the porch.

The application site features an existing garage which extends approximately half way the length of the host dwelling. The application proposes a part single, part two storey side extension utilising the existing footprint of the garage. The single storey element of the side extension (together with existing garage) would measure a width of 3m, a length of 10.7m (to the rear) and would feature a lean-to roof up to a height of 3.3m. The existing garage would be converted to a 'Reception' and a window would replace the existing garage door. The first floor side extension would measure a depth of 3m, a length of 8.7m (to the rear) and would feature a hipped roof measuring a height of 7.8m. The proposed first floor side extension is set back 1m from the front building line and set down 0.6m from the ridge, however there is not set-in from the side boundary. In this regard, the proposed part single, and proposed two-storey side extension would fail to comply with Policy DMHD 1.

Turning to the rear, the application proposes a part-single and part two-storey rear extension. The single storey rear element would measure a depth of 3m, a length of 9.4m and will feature a lean-to roof up to a height of 3.5m. The first floor rear would protrude 2m from the rear building line, measure a width of 3.3m and feature a pitched hipped roof up to a height of approximately 6.8m. It is acknowledged that the parameters of the rear extension complies with Policy DMHD 1.

The application also proposes the conversion of loft space into habitable space to include a rear dormer, hip to gable end conversion and 1 No. additional roof light. The proposed rear would measure a width of 5.8m, a depth of 3.4m and a flat roof height of 2.6m. Policy DMHD 1 states that the Council would not support overly large roof extensions, and roof extensions should not exceed more than two-thirds the average width of the roof. The proposed rear dormer would exceed more than two thirds the average width of the roof and would fail to retain a substantial element of the existing original roof slope. The proposed hip-gable roof form would diminish the symmetry with the attached pair. The proposed variation is further exaggerated by virtue of the proposed two-storey side extension. The proposed two-storey side hipped roof extension in combination with the hip to gable extension and overly large rear dormer appears obtrusive and unsympathetic within the street scene and has an unacceptable impact upon the host dwelling. Together both the roof and first floor extensions would appear visually awkward and at odds with the original house design and prevailing character along this section of the street.

The proposed development would substantially alter the appearance of the property. The significant increase in bulk and mass by virtue of the part-single, part two-storey side and rear extension, together with the hip to gable conversion and large rear dormer would result in an incongruous development. It is considered that the proposed development, when viewed as a whole, would be completely disproportionate and unsympathetic to the original architectural composition of the host dwelling. Thus, resulting in the proposed development having a harmful impact on the original dwelling, the attached pair, and the wider street scene.

It is acknowledged that a number of neighbouring properties including No. 181 and No. 183 Torcross Road (directly to the east of the site) benefit from hip to gable extensions and rear dormers, both allowed under permitted development. Despite the presence of hip to gable extensions and rear dormers, it does not mitigate the potential harm due to the combination of two-storey side and rear extensions.

Importantly, a material consideration in this application is the recent refusal and dismissed appeal at No. 183 Torcross Road. The recently refused application proposed a part two storey, part single side/rear extension, porch to front and installation of Juliette balcony with alterations to fenestration (Application Ref: 75777/APP/2021/212). The proposed extensions were in combination with the existing hip to gable and rear dormer at the site. The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its siting in this open prominent position, size, scale, bulk and design in terms of how the hipped roof integrates with the existing gabled roof, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semidetached houses of which it forms a part and to the 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) and Policies DMHB 11 DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

2. The proposed extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk, height, depth, width, proximity to the side boundary and projection forward of the return building line along Beech Close, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 DMHB

12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

In assessing the application at Appeal (Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3272176 Dated 30.06.2021), the Inspector stated that "cumulatively with the roof extension, the 2-storey side and single storey rear extensions would be visually and physically dominate the host property rather than be subevent additions. There would be a difference between the hipped roof form of the proposed side extension and the now gable roof of the property. The difference in roof form would not successfully physically or visually integrate the proposed side extension with the original property". In the conclusion, the Inspector identified harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the host dwelling, as such conflicting with HLP Policies BE 1, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1. It is considered that a similar conclusion can be reached at this application site.

To conclude, the proposed hip to gable conversion, large rear dormer together with the two storey side/rear extension, by reason of their cumulative size, scale, bulk, height and design (including the proposed relationship with the gable and hipped two-storey side), would result in a disproportionate, visually obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would be detrimental to the appearance of the original host dwelling, and would cause harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the existing street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2021), Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 and of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Residential Amenity:

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure, amongst other matters, that: ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

No. 177 and No. 181 are the principal properties that need to be considered in terms of residential amenity.

No. 177 is located to the west of the site and comprises the adjoining property. The proposed part single and part two storey side extension is located on the eastern elevation and is unlikely to impact the amenity of No. 177. The proposed single storey rear extension would protrude 3m from the rear building line at No. 177, the first floor rear would be located 6m from the shared boundary with No. 177. Taking the above into consideration, Officers are satisfied that it would not result in unacceptable overshadowing or a loss of light to No. 177. There are no windows proposed on the side elevation which would result in overlooking or a loss of privacy.

No. 181 is located to the east of the site and comprises a two-storey semi-detached property. The neighbouring property benefits from a single storey side and rear extension. The proposed two-storey side and rear extensions would extend along the shared boundary with No. 181. The proposed rear extension would not protrude beyond the neighbouring rear building line and by virtue of the staggered building line, the two-storey rear would not breach the 45 degree line taken from the first floor habitable window. The proposed two-storey side and rear would be located hard up against the shared boundary with No. 181, and located approximately 2.8m from the neighbouring first floor flank wall. It is noted that the neighbouring property features three windows

on this elevation all serving non-habitable rooms (stairs and bathroom). As such, whilst the siting of the extension so close to the boundary is not acceptable in design terms, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable overshadowing or a loss of light to No. 181. Further, there are no windows proposed on the side elevation which would result in overlooking or a loss of privacy

In terms of the roof enlargements and the rear dormer, by virtue of their nature and design, would not cause any significant loss of light penetrating to neighbouring properties. There are no openings along the flank elevation of the proposed roof extension which would result in direct overlooking or loss of privacy. The views achieved from the dormer windows would not be dissimilar to the views from the first floor openings, and it is considered that there is ample separation to the rear and the diagonal views achieved by virtue of the rear dormer would not be dissimilar to the other dormers within the street. As such, it is unlikely that the proposed openings on the rear dormer would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking that would warrant a refusal.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposal would not cause undue harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

External Amenity Space Provision:

The proposed development would retain sufficient rear garden space. This would be in accordance with the minimum private amenity space standards set out in Table 5.3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). As such, it is considered that the proposal would not undermine the provision of external amenity space for the existing occupiers at the site, in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Parking and Highway Safety:

The site benefits from hardstanding outside the front of the property with enough space for one car. Whilst the proposal would result in the loss of one parking space as a result of the garage conversion, the Highways Officer has reviewed the scheme and raises no objection to the proposed parking arrangements. It is therefore considered that the proposal is unlikely to significantly exacerbate the pressure for street parking or prejudice highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with the overarching objectives of policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion:

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed hip to gable conversion, large rear dormer together with the two storey side/rear extension, by reason of their cumulative size, scale, bulk, height and design (including the proposed relationship with the gable and hipped two-storey side), would result in a

disproportionate, visually obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would be detrimental to the appearance of the original host dwelling, and would cause harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the existing street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2021), Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 and of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

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. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.
 - a) We have however 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.
2. 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).

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 Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) 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 Polices

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Polices:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
NPPF12 -23	NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

Contact Officer: Niamh McMenamin **Telephone No:** 01895 250230