

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 67 HIGH ROAD ICKENHAM

Development: Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and two storey side extension

LBH Ref Nos: **8568/APP/2014/4086**

Drawing Nos: 01
 02
 03
 04
 05
 Location Plan (1:1250)
 Block Plan (1:500)
 Planning, Design and Access Statement

Date Plans Received: 18/11/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 24/11/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling, which is also a locally listed building, located on the south western side of High Road. The external brickwork walls of the property are covered by a traditional hipped roof with an existing two storey extension to the side and porch to the front.

The adjoining property to the east of the site has an existing single storey rear extension while to the west is the Soldiers Return public house.

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 the erection of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension and two storey side extension.

The ground floor rear extension would have a depth of 5m and occupy the full width of the existing property while the first floor element would extend to the same depth with a width of 4.5 metres.

The first floor side extension would have a width of 3.1m and would project beyond the side elevation of the existing extension by 0.7 metres.

The roof of the house will also be extended to cover the the proposed and existing side extensions, creating a crown roof profile as result.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

None relevant to this application.

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 4 neighbouring properties and the Ickenham Residents Association were consulted on the application on 26th November 2014. By the close of the consultation period on 17th December 2014, one objection had been received:

- The proposed two-storey side extension would not appear as a subservient addition, and as required by HDAS guidelines, section 5.8, it should be set down by 0.5 metres. It would also result in a loss of symmetry between the two properties. The first floor aspect of the rear extension would be sited in close proximity to the neighbouring property's habitable window, and it would need ensuring that no light angles would be breached.

OFFICER COMMENT: The issues raised above will be discussed in the main body of the report.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE:

Conservation Officer:

There would be no objection in principle to the proposed single storey rear extension; however the depth would need to be reduced to a maximum depth of 4m from the property's original rear building line, in accordance with council HDAS guidance.

- The proposed fenestration to the rear would not be in keeping with the existing property. This would need to be revised to sash style windows and doors, to match the original property.

- The proposed roof lights to the single storey rear extension would be considered incongruous additions, creating a cluttered roofscape. Therefore the number of roof lights would need to be significantly reduced. A proposed flat roof to the rear would need to be finished with a brick on edge parapet.

- The two storey side extension as designed would be detrimental to the character of the original property. The design of the side addition would considerably alter the symmetry of the pair of properties. The proposed two storey side extension should remain as a lean-to side wing maintaining the symmetry of the properties and not step out towards to rear of the property.

- The part two storey rear extension would not be in keeping to the plan form of the original property. As proposed it creates a wrap around over dominant element, which would be highly visible from the main road and neighbouring public house.

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:

BE8	Planning applications for alteration or extension of listed buildings
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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

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

Section 3 of the HDAS Residential Extensions guidance, states: Single storey rear extensions to semi-detached houses should not exceed 3.6m in depth and should have a maximum height of 3m for a flat roof or 3.4m for a pitched roof. The proposed single storey rear extension would have a depth of 5m and flat roof height of 2.8m which is contrary to the above guidance. However, the height and depth would match the existing single storey extension of the adjoining property at No.69 and is therefore considered acceptable in this instance.

Paragraph 6.4 of the HDAS Residential Extensions guidance, states: First floor rear extensions should always be designed as to appear subordinate to the original house. Extensions to semi-detached houses on a plot more than 5m wide should not exceed 3.6m in depth. The proposed first rear extension would have a depth of 5m, which is contrary to the above guidance. Furthermore, with a width of 4.5m the proposal would occupy the majority of the rear elevation of the existing dwelling, forming an overdominant development that would fail to appear as a subordinate addition.

The proposed first floor side extension would be attached to the rear of the existing side extension at the property. However, the new addition would project 0.7m beyond the side elevation of the existing development forming a discordant and incongruous addition that would give the property at disjointed appearance. The impact of the side extension to the appearance of the surrounding area is exacerbated by its high visibility from the front of the dwelling and the public highway.

The proposed development also includes the creation of a crown profile which would not only significantly increase the size and bulk of the existing dwelling but would further unbalance the symmetrical appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings, to the

detriment of the architectural composition of the surrounding area.

Therefore, the proposed first floor side and rear extensions by reason of their size, bulk and design would fail to appear as subordinate additions and would result in the complete over development of the site and have an unacceptable impact to the character of the original property and the visual amenity of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Paragraph 6.2 of the HDAS Residential Extensions guidance, states: Two storey rear extensions will only be allowed where there is no significant over-dominance, overshadowing, loss of outlook and daylight. Any extensions at first floor level should not extend beyond a 45-degree line of sight taken from the nearest first floor habitable room window of the neighbouring property.

At 5m the proposed extension would exceed the maximum depth of 3.6m permitted for first floor rear extensions in the HDAS guidance. Its width would occupy the majority of the rear elevation of the existing property and would be built in close proximity to the shared boundary line with 69 High Road. As a result, the size, scale, bulk and rearward projection of the proposal is considered to form an overdominant addition that would breach the 45 degree line of sight taken from the nearest habitable window of the neighbouring property, causing an undue loss of residential amenity to the occupiers of the dwelling in terms of loss of light, outlook and overshadowing. Therefore the proposed development is contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 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 proposals would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan.

Following the construction of the rear extension approximately square metres of private amenity space would be retained for the occupiers of the dwelling which is in accordance with Paragraph 4.9 of the HDAS guidance and Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposed extension is considered to not materially increase the parking demand for the occupiers of the site.

Given the above, the application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey rear extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk, excessive depth, height and proximity to the adjoining dwelling at 69 High Road, would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers, by reason of loss of light, loss of outlook, overshadowing and overdominance. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 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 two storey rear extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk, excessive depth and design would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the visual amenity of the wider area in general and would thus be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE8, 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.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed side extension by reason of its size, design, projection beyond the existing side elevation, creation of a crown roof profile and visibility from the public highway would create a discordant and incongruous addition that would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE8, 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.

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. 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
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

BE8	Planning applications for alteration or extension of listed buildings
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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: Patrick Marfleet

Telephone No: 01895 250230