#### Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 9 TRUESDALE DRIVE HAREFIELD

**Development:** Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and porch and canopy

to front involving demolition of existing outbuildings to side

LBH Ref Nos: 4749/APP/2013/140

**Drawing Nos:** 9/TD/02

Block Plan to Scale 1:500

9/TD/04 9/TD/01 9/TD/03

Location Plan to Scale 1:1250

Date Plans Received: 21/01/2013 Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 18/02/2013

#### 1. CONSIDERATIONS

#### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is situated on the western side of Truesdale Drive, and comprises a semi-detached dwelling with a detached garage along the north western boundary. The property is set back 8.1m from the highway with a driveway and garden area in front of the building. The driveway provides sufficient space for 2 vehicles to park off-street. The property is in the process of being extended by way of an approved single storey rear and single/two storey side extension. A large outbuilding stands to the rear of the garden.

The rear garden stretches 30m in depth and abuts a patch of green space which is part of the Harefield Community Centre.

Directly north west lies the non-adjoining property, No.7 Truesdale Drive, a semi-detached dwelling which has an existing shed situated adjacent to the side boundary of the application site.

To the south east lies the adjoining property No.11 Truesdale Drive which has existing outbuilding to the rear.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising predominantly semi-detached dwellings. The application site lies within Developed Area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two-Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

#### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and porch and canopy to front involving demolition of the existing outbuildings to the side. Planning permission has already been granted for extensions under application reference 4749/APP/2012/32, which is explained in more detail within the Planning History Section.

The proposed two storey side extension would be set in 1m from the boundary and would be set back 1m from the front building line at first floor level. It would measure 3.2m wide and would protrude the depth of the existing flank wall (6m) and a further 3.6m into the rear garden at ground and first floor level.

To the rear, the part two storey element would be set in 3.925m from the common boundary of the attached semi-detached property to the south-east(No.11) and would measure 3.6m deep, creating a wrap round two storey element with the proposed side extension. The extension would be approximately 6.0m from the flank wall of the neighbouring property to the north-west (No.7). The roof would be set down from the ridge with a maximum height of 7.9m.

A porch is proposed at the front of the property measuring 2.81m high, 1.2m deep and 3.0m wide. A front canopy addition is also proposed across the frontage of the property over and in-between the porch. The north-western most element of the canopy would be positioned between the recess of the ground floor side extension and the porch, measuring 2.17m deep and 3.21m wide. The south-eastern most element of the canopy would measure 1.2m deep and 3.21m wide.

# 1.3 Relevant Planning History

4749/APP/2012/32 9 Truesdale Drive Harefield

Part two storey, part single storey side/ rear extension involving demolition of existing outbuildings to side

**Decision Date:** 12-03-2012 Approved **Appeal:** 

4749/APP/2012/716 9 Truesdale Drive Harefield

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front rooflights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with a new gable end window (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

**Decision Date:** 30-04-2012 Approved **Appeal:** 

4749/APP/2013/139 9 Truesdale Drive Harefield

Detached outbuilding in the rear garden to be used as garage/store (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for an Existing Development)

**Decision Date:** 03-04-2013 Refused **Appeal:** 

### **Comment on Planning History**

A certificate of lawful development for an existing use relating to a detached outbuilding measuring 61.74 square metres, application reference 4749/APP/2013/139 was refused on the 3 April 2013 and is currently subject to enforcement action.

Planning permission was previously granted on the 14 March 2012, for the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension involving demolition of existing outbuildings to side (Ref: 4749/APP/2012/32). The current planning application seeks to amend the approved scheme to include the following elements:

- i. 1 x new window on first floor front elevation
- ii. 2 x new windows on first floor north-western side elevation
- iii. 2 x new windows on ground floor north-western side elevation
- iv. 1 x new window on second floor (roof area) south-western rear elevation

- v. New front porch
- vi. New canopy between proposed front recess areas and porch
- vii. A gable roof design rather than the approved hipped roof design on the two storey rear element.

#### 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

4 adjoining occupiers were consulted, and a site notice was posted and expired on the 22 March 2013. Two letters were received objecting on the following grounds:

- i. Too many windows are proposed which are out of keeping with the properties
- ii. Construction works have commenced on the site
- iii. The facing brickwork and materials are out of keeping

A petition with 66 signatories was also received in objection to the proposed development and associated building works.

## 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:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
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.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction

#### 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 existing property, the impact upon the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers, the provision of acceptable residential amenity space for the application site and car parking provision.

HDAS Section 6.0 sets out the requirements for two-storey side extensions on semidetached properties. The proposed side extension complies with the guidance in so far as it is set-in 1m from the side boundary and would be no more than 2/3 the width of the original house. However, two storey side extensions are required to be set back 1m from the main front building line, at all levels to ensure that the extension is subordinate and in scale with the original property. The proposed side extension, whilst set back at first floor level by 1m, is not set back at ground floor level, given that a large canopy which protrudes well in front of the main building line is proposed. The proposal would thus, result in an extension which fails to be subordinate to the original property and would impact unduly on the character and appearance of the existing and adjoining properties and the visual amenities of the street scene and the area in general.

In accordance with paragraph 8.0 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions, front extensions (and canopies) must be minor in nature and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Further, paragraph 8.2 explains that any porch should be individually designed to follow the character of the existing building.

It is considered that the front porch extension would not match or complement the roof design of the original property, nor does the design and detailing harmonise with the original property. The front porch and canopy would dominate the frontage of the property to the detriment of the architectural composition of the original house.

Moreover, one of the purposes of a 1m set-back at the front of the side extension, as proposed, is to ensure that the extension would appear subordinate and would not detract from main house. The front canopy would infill the gap between the 1m set-back and proposed front porch (which would project 1.2m deep) and render the 1m set-back meaningless and thus the side extension, front porch extension and front canopy would cumulatively appear overly dominant and would detract from the character and appearance of the original property.

The proposed two storey element of the rear extension, whilst in accordance with the SPD in terms of its depth and width, proposes a gable roof design, which is not characteristic of the existing or adjoining properties and which serves to increase the overall bulk and scale of the extension such that it would not be considered to be subordinate to the existing property. The proposal would thus, result in a rear extension which fails to be subordinate to the original property and would impact unduly on the character and appearance of the existing and adjoining properties and the visual amenities of the area in general.

Overall, the proposed extensions by reason of their siting, size, scale, bulk and design would fail to provide a subordinate addition to the property and would alter the architectural composition of the property contrary to 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.

The single storey rear extension complies with Section 3.0 of HDAS and has a maximum

projection of 3.6m deep and would be 3.4m high with a pitched roof.

The additional fenestration on the side, front and rear elevations would harmonise with the original house due to their size, positioning and alignment.

Policy BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that planning permission will not be granted for new development which by reason of its siting, bulk and proximity, would result in a significant loss in residential amenity. Likewise Policies BE22 and BE24 resists any development which would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of nearby residents and occupants through loss of daylight and privacy.

The proposed side and rear extensions would be over 6m away from the flank wall of No.7 Truesdale Drive, while the proposed two storey rear element would retain a 3.9m gap from the common boundary with No.11 Truesdale Drive. In such a relationship the proposed first floor rear extension would not breach a 45 degree line of sight taken from the nearest window of either neighbouring properties. Nos. 7 and 11 Truesdale Drive also have two windows located on the flank walls however both of these are secondary windows (serving bathrooms) and it would not lead to any additional overlooking or loss of light.

The proposed first floor (additional) side facing windows would be provided in obscured glazing and fixed shut below 1.7m to prevent overlooking. These windows, whilst not entirely appropriate, would be secondary windows, and conditions can be imposed to ensure that they are obscurely glazed and fixed shut above 1.7m high. The proposed (additional) windows on the front and rear elevations would not cause any undue overlooking due to the separation distances between the windows and the nearest habitable room windows to the north-east and south-west.

As such, the application proposal would not represent an un-neighbourly form of development and in this respect would be in compliance with policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The resulting amenity space would be over 220 square metres which is considered adequate for a four bedroom property and would be in compliance with Paragraph 5.13 of HDAS and Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposal would retain the parking arrangements to the front of the property so as to accommodate two off-street car parking spaces and some soft/hard landscaping. This would be in compliance with policies AM14 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards (Annex 1, adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, Saved Policies, September 2007).

#### 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 and scale and in

particular the lack of a set back from the front at all levels, 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 would therefore 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 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

#### 2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed front porch/canopy extension by virtue of its siting, size, scale, bulk and design would result in an incongruous addition which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building and would harm the character and appearance of the wider area, 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 Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

#### 3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey rear extension by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and in particular the gable roof design, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the appearance of the original house and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore 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 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

#### **INFORMATIVES**

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), 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**

- 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).
- 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

# guidance.

# Part 1 Policies:

ı	DT1	.BE1	(2012)	Ruilt	Environment	
П	г н н	.DEI	(とひ (と)	DUIII		

# Part 2 Policies:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
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.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction

Contact Officer: Henrietta Ashun Telephone No: 01895 250230

