

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 7 MAYBANK GARDENS RUISLIP

Development: Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include raising of roof height, a rear dormer, 1 front rooflight and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with a new gable end window

LBH Ref Nos: 1621/APP/2013/3383

Drawing Nos: 3154/01 A
3154/02 B
3154/03 C
3154/04 A
Location Plan

Date Plans Received: 14/11/2013 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 25/11/2013

Date Application Valid: 09/12/2013

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the west side of Maybank Gardens and comprises a two storey end-of-terrace with a hipped roof and a front projection with bay windows. To the rear is a single storey rear extension and a garage at the bottom of the garden. The application property adjoins No.5 to the south of the application site and No. 9 to the north. The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising terraced properties. The application site lies within the '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 a loft conversion incorporating a hip to gable roof and rear dormer window with two gable windows and a front rooflight

The rear dormer window would have a flat roof, which would increase in height as it projects out, resulting in the dormer window being 0.25m higher than the ridge of the main roof. The dormer would be 3m deep, 4.25m wide and 2.145m high. The dormer would be set in from the sides of the roof by a minimum 0.50m and 0.25m from the eaves of the roof. The materials would match the existing property. One roof light is proposed on the front elevation and two gable windows to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m above floor level. The proposal would comprise a third bedroom with an en-suite and store room.

It should be noted that there are inconsistencies on the elevational plans with regard to the width of the rear dormer and the height of the ridge, which differ between elevations. Given the application is recommended for refusal this is not considered to be an issue, however an informative should be added to ensure that this issue is addressed within any re-submission or subsequent appeal.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

1621/APP/2004/1632 7 Maybank Gardens Ruislip
ERECTION OF PART SINGLE / PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Decision Date: 30-07-2004 Refused **Appeal:**

1621/APP/2004/2306 7 Maybank Gardens Ruislip
ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH THREE ROOFLIGHTS

Decision Date: 29-09-2004 Approved **Appeal:**

1621/APP/2005/327 7 Maybank Gardens Ruislip
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH 3 ROOFLIGHTS

Decision Date: 17-03-2005 Refused **Appeal:**

1621/APP/2005/890 7 Maybank Gardens Ruislip
ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION REF.1621/APP/2004/2306 DATED 29/09/2004)(RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)

Decision Date: 03-05-2005 Approved **Appeal:**

1621/APP/2013/1012 7 Maybank Gardens Ruislip
Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include raising of roof height, a rear dormer, 1 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: 12-06-2013 Refused **Appeal:**

1621/APP/2013/1942 7 Maybank Gardens Ruislip
Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 1 front rooflights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with a new gable end window

Decision Date: 05-09-2013 Refused **Appeal:**

Comment on Planning History

The proposal has previously been submitted under a Certificate of Lawful Development application ref.1621/APP/2013/1012. The application was refused because the proposal would exceed the height of the the highest part of the roof and it has not been demonstrated that the side gable windows are non-opening below 1.7m measured from the floor of the room in which the window is installed and that the roof lights would not protrude more than 150mm beyond the plane of the roof.

The applicant then submitted a planning application (ref.1621/APP/2013/1942), which was refused for the following reason:

The proposed hip-to-gable conversion, rear dormer window and skylights, by reason of their design, position, size, height, scale, bulk and design, would result in a discordant and intrusive feature that would be harmful to the appearance of the terrace and the character and appearance of the original property and the wider locality. Therefore, the proposal would be 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.

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**

5 neighbouring properties, The Eastcote Residents Association and Northwood Hills Residents Association consulted on 10th December 2013 and a site notice was also displayed on 20th December 2013. One letter of representation was received from the applicants with a petition with 20 signatures supporting the application. The comments are summarised below:

1. A number of revisions have been made to address the previously refused application including replacing the skylights with roof tiles, reducing the size of the dormer window and ensuring appropriate window opening heights. The skylight to the front of the property has been increased in size to allow natural light within the dormer.

2. A precedent has already been set for a hip to gable by 4 out of 5 terraced blocks which make up Maybank Gardens.

3. We also ask that the Committee grant permission for the raised sloping and flat roof to provide the minimum height recommended within a loft conversion. This is because of the low roof beam height of the terraced block. The neighbouring property No.9 has a loft conversion within the same end of terrace design, but this was only achieved by lowering the ceilings of the first floor of that property. This is a major undertaking and lowering the ceilings also significantly changes the original internal character of the house, which we do not wish to do.

4. The reason for the extension is to create an additional bedroom so the applicant's daughter and son do not have to share a bedroom.

(Officer comment: Issue Nos. 1, 2 and 3 are addressed in the main body of the report. Issue No.4 is not considered to be a planning consideration.

Northwood Hills Residents' Association:

There have been 2 other recent applications for a loft conversion at 7, Maybank Gardens. 1621/APP/2013 1942 and 1621/APP/2013/1012 both have been refused. The current changes which include raising the ridge height to accommodate the loft room are not acceptable. No. 7 Maybank Gardens forms part of a row of terraced houses, to raise the ridge height will be unsightly and detrimental to the surrounding area. We request that the application be refused.

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.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

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.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) is relevant to this application. Section 1 of this policy requires development to be of a high quality of design which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area and Section 2 requires that it makes a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, scale and materials and seek to protect the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential properties.

Policy BE13 of the Local Plan requires that the layout and appearance must harmonise with the existing street scene, policy BE15 goes on to state that extensions must be in keeping with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building. Policy BE19 also states that new developments should complement or improve the amenity and character of the area.

HDAS: Residential Extensions paragraph 7.4 states roof extensions should relate well to the proportions, roof forms and massing of the existing house and its neighbours. Paragraph 7.5 states an extension should appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it will be set.

HDAS: Residential Extensions paragraph 7.7 states dormer windows should be constructed in the centre of the roof and paragraph 7.7 states on terraced houses the dormer window should be set in at least 0.30m from the sides of the roof, 0.30m below the ridge level and 0.50m from the eaves. As such, the proposed dormer windows would be set in a minimum 0.50m from the sides of the roof, however would be higher than the ridge of the main roof, contrary to the above policies and guidance.

The proposed rear dormer window is considered to be out of proportion with the existing building, not in keeping with the character of the area, it would have a harmful affect on the appearance of the rear elevation and there would be oblique views from the street scene. The raised sloping roof of the dormer window would be visible from the highway

and would be out of character with the existing house and the surrounding area. As such, it is considered the proposed rear dormer window, by reason of its height and design would create a bulky addition to the roof and would be out of character with the original property and the surrounding area, in conflict with Local Plan Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19.

Furthermore, the proposal would result in a hip to gable conversion of the end-of-terrace property. The dwelling at the other end of the terrace still retains its original hip. Therefore, the hip to gable conversion is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the terrace and the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The non-adjointing neighbour, No.9 Maybank Gardens, has undergone a hip to gable conversion, however, this is one of only a few hip-to-gable conversions and does not set a precedent and could not be considered to improve the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

Taking into consideration the rear dormer window at the neighbouring property, the proposal would not increase the impact of overlooking neighbouring gardens from a higher level. The proposed rooflight and obscure glazed gable windows, due to their height and angle would not directly overlook neighbouring properties. It is considered the proposed rear dormer and windows would not result in an unacceptable increase of overlooking, overdominance or loss of light into the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore in compliance with Policy 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 development still maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2011).

Over 100sq.m of private amenity space would be retained and there would be sufficient space in the front garden to provide off-street parking space. As such, the proposal would not result in a loss of off-street parking and the proposal would comply with Policies BE23 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

In conclusion, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the surrounding area. Therefore, this 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 and rear dormer window, by reason of their design, size, height, scale, bulk and design, would result in a discordant and intrusive feature that would be harmful to the appearance of the terrace and the character and appearance of the original property and the wider locality. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and 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.

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.
- 2 You are advised that the submitted plans contain inconsistent details with regard to the width of the rear dormer and the height of the main roof ridge, which differ between the proposed rear, proposed front and proposed side elevations. Should a resubmission be made in order to address the reasons for refusal it should be ensured that all submitted drawings are accurate and consistent.

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.
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.

guidance.

- | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| BE38 | Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals. |
| HDAS-EXT | Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008 |
| LPP 3.5 | (2011) Quality and design of housing developments |

Contact Officer: Mandeep Chaggar

Telephone No: 01895 250230



Notes

 Site boundary

For identification purposes only.
 This copy has been made by or with the authority of the Head of Committee Services pursuant to section 47 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (the Act).
 Unless the Act provides a relevant exception to copyright.

© Crown copyright and database rights 2013 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address

**7 Maybank Gardens
 Ruislip**

**LONDON BOROUGH
 OF HILLINGDON
 Residents Services**

Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
 Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111

Planning Application Ref:
1621/APP/2013/3383

Scale
1:1,250

Planning Committee
North Application

Date
February 2014



HILLINGDON
 LONDON