

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 4A EASTBURY AVENUE NORTHWOOD

Development: Part two storey, part single storey front/side/rear extension involving raising of roof

LBH Ref Nos: 36828/APP/2014/184

Drawing Nos: PL200
Location Plan (1:1250)
PL202
PL201
PL204
PL203

Date Plans Received: 20/01/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 27/01/2014

DEFERRED ON 25th April 2014 FOR SITE VISIT ON

The application was deferred from the North Planning Committee on the 25th March 2014 in order for a Members Site Visit to take place.

The members site visit has been scheduled and will have been undertaken before the North Committee on the 14th April 2014.

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The proposed site comprises a two storey detached property on the south side of Eastbury Avenue. The site is located approximately 100m east of the junction with Eastbury Road. The property has a front garden area partly laid to hardstanding for vehicular parking and partly with mature shrubs, plants and flower beds. To the rear there is a large garden area laid mainly to lawn with mature boundary planting.

The property benefits from a detached single storey garage / utility room on the west side of the property. The property is constructed of brick beneath a tiled roof.

The wider area comprises similar sized properties of varying designs and scale all set on reasonably sized plots.

The site is located outside but adjacent to the Northwood Frithwood Conservation Area, whose boundary is the rear boundary of the application site.

The site is within the developed area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012) and the site is covered by TPO 155.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposed scheme comprises a part two storey, part single storey front, side and rear extensions involving raising of the roof.

The proposed extension would extend at two storeys past the side elevation of the dwelling and would incorporate the existing detached garage structure to the site. The part two storey side extension measures 12.5m long, 3.2m wide and 5m high (to the eaves) and would extend 2.5m beyond the rear part of the original house at ground floor level. The side extension would be set flush with the further forward part of the building (the ground floor with catslide roof above) and would create a two storey gable end feature in place of the catslide roof. In addition a single storey front extension with canopy would extend across the front of the building, in recessed section of the principal elevation. The roof height of the building would be increased from 8.17m to 9.33m to incorporate the increased width and depth of the building.

The part two storey rear extension measures 1.2m deep and 5m high (eaves) and spans the width of the building. There would be two single storey rear extensions measuring 2.5m deep from the original rear elevation, 3.7m and 3.9m wide respectively and 3.3m high.

The proposed extensions would provide an extended living room, library, sun room, gym, utility, garage and two additional bedrooms.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

36828/85/1768 4a Eastbury Avenue Northwood
Tree application (P)

Decision Date: 17-12-1985 Refused **Appeal:**

36828/A/88/1904 4a Eastbury Avenue Northwood
To fell T3 larch on TPO 155

Decision Date: 19-10-1988 Refused **Appeal:**

36828/B/89/1811 4a Eastbury Avenue Northwood
To fell Larch T3 on TPO 155

Decision Date: 14-12-1989 Refused **Appeal:**

36828/C/90/1429 4a Eastbury Avenue Northwood
To fell T3 (Larch) on TPO 155

Decision Date: 02-10-1990 Refused **Appeal:**27-JUL-92 Dismissed

36828/D/92/2103 4a Eastbury Avenue Northwood

To remove the two lowest whorls of branches from the mainstem of T3 (Larch) on TPO 155 and to sever all roots which pass beneath the drive (on the west side of T3) to a depth of 200mm

Decision Date: 13-01-1993 Approved **Appeal:**

36828/E/93/0957 4a Eastbury Avenue Northwood
To fell one Larch (T3) on TPO 155

Decision Date: 25-02-1994 Refused **Appeal:**

36828/F/95/0365 4a Eastbury Avenue Northwood
To fell one Lime (T2) and one Larch (T3) on TPO 155

Decision Date: 07-07-1995 Refused **Appeal:**
36828/G/95/1766 4a Eastbury Avenue Northwood
To fell 1 Lime (T2) on TPO 155

Decision Date: 12-01-1996 Approved **Appeal:**

Comment on Planning History

There is no relevant planning history for this application, apart from applications for tree works at the site which would not impact on the determination of the current application.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 26th February 2014

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

11 letters were sent to local residents and the Residents Association on 28 January 2014 and the site notices were posted on 4 February and 9 February 2014, and the the application was advertised on 5 February 2014.

8 letters of objection were received in response to the public consultation

1. Parking problems
2. Too big
3. Possible loft conversion in future
4. Loss of privacy
5. Increase flood risk
6. Larch tree missing at the front on plans
7. Sewer system cannot cope with enlarged house.
8. Condition to limit working hours
9. Loss of light
10. Increased traffic
11. Out of character with the area

In addition a petition was submitted with 22 signatures. The objections are:

1. Loss of privacy and light due to increased height
2. Too big increase from 3 bed to 5 bed and additional rooms such as a gym, sun room, library, study and utility room.
3. Increased risk of surface water flooding and sewer overflow.

Officer Comment: Many of the points above are addressed in the planning assessment below. However, the site does not fall in a flood risk zone or critical drainage area, accordingly appropriate drainage could be secured by way of condition. The size of the property in relation to extra bedrooms and other rooms is considered against the planning policies but a refusal could not be justified solely on number of rooms. Sewer capability will be addressed at the Building Regulations stage.

Internal Consultees

TREES AND LANDSCAPING OFFICER:

This site is covered by TPO 155 Significant trees / other vegetation of merit in terms of Saved Policy BE38: There is a protected Larch (T3 on TPO 155) situated close to the proposed extension. The tree will not be directly affected, however the soil around its roots could be compacted by construction-related activities. There is also a Western Red Cedar closer to the house. This does not constrain development and should probably be removed. Recommendations: A plan should be submitted that shows the location of the Larch and some form of ground protection around it. Conclusion (in terms of Saved Policy BE38): Acceptable, subject to conditions RES8 and RES10.

CONSERVATION OFFICER:

BACKGROUND: This is a relatively unaltered modest inter-War detached property which backs onto the Northwood, Frithwood Conservation Area. It is unpretentiously detailed and well proportioned with a front projecting catslide roof and vertically tile-clad hipped roof tower facet. It is set alongside other detached properties of the same size and similar design. The area is characterised by such detached inter-War housing together with some earlier properties. The property is tight onto the boundary of the conservation area and any extension to the rear could impact its overall character and appearance.

COMMENTS: The two storey side/front extension is not subordinate to the existing property. The juxtaposition of the front gable would be dominant and awkward, and together with the other front extensions and alterations to the elevations would be obtrusive, harming the well proportioned and modestly detailed front elevation. These, together with the raising of the roof, would mean the property would dominate the streetscene, and enclose the gap between the properties. This is against the advice given in the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions. In particular, page 32 (Section 8.0) which states, '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.' The proposals will almost double the size of the existing house and will not maintain the standard of design more generally in the area.

There will also be a moderate impact on the appearance of the conservation area. I am concerned that when viewed from the rear, the adverse width, height and projection of the extensions and resulting loss of spaciousness will not sustain its significance. No report has been provided to assess this impact and consequential enlargement of the property being obtrusive. HDAS is clear. Para. 6.2 states 'Two storey rear or first floor rear extensions will only be allowed where there is no significant over-dominance...'. These proposals are not subordinate to the existing property and spoil its simple proportions. In addition, the proposal will not sustain the appearance of the ASLC and therefore this application should be refused.

CONCLUSION: Unacceptable. The proposal will not sustain the significance of the heritage asset or the appearance of the streetscene.

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.
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
BE18	Design considerations - pedestrian security and safety
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

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 residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property, the availability of parking and the impact to protected trees.

The proposed single and part storey extension extends across the full width of the property to a depth of 2.5m. The depth is in line with the guidance in paragraph 3.3 and 6.4 of the HDAS Residential Extensions which advise that for detached properties such extensions should have a maximum depth of 4m. The height of 3.3m, for the single storey part and matching the original eaves and ridge line would be compliant with HDAS guidance. The side extension replaces an existing single storey garage and in total width is less than two thirds of the original width and therefore compliant with HDAS guidance in this respect.

As part of the overall development the proposal comprises a part two storey / part single storey front extension. The single storey extension effectively being a large porch area with canopy. The two storey part extends the first floor bedroom space and involves the creation of a large gable structure. Chapter 8 of the HDAS guidance advises that front extensions should be subordinate and not dominate the character and appearance of the building and the host property. The current proposal fails to comply with this guidance and

would form a dominant and incongruent feature out of keeping with the character of the street scene. The porch is also a dominant feature, due to its width, and is not in compliance with HDAS guidance in section 8 and has an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the building.

Whilst compliance with guidance in HDAS :Residential Extensions is one part of the consideration, it is important to also consider the impact on the character of the property and area in line with the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies. As clearly identified in the response by the Council's Conservation Officer the proposed development is not subordinate to the main house and particularly from the front where the large two storey extension is proposed. The infilling of the gap between the garage and the main house and the significant increase in the height of the building contribute to the conclusion that the proposed scheme is an incongruous feature in the streetscene and harmful to the character and appearance of the main house. From the rear it is considered that the scale and form of the extension will have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the adjoining conservation area.

Therefore, when taken as a whole the proposed extensions would not be subordinate to the main house and constitutes an overdevelopment of the original property. As such it does not comply with Policy BE4, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012) and guidance in HDAS Residential Extensions.

In terms of the impact on the neighbouring dwellings, the proposed side extension has no windows in the side elevation which could not be conditioned to be obscure glazed and therefore the proposals would not give rise to any overlooking. The other windows are in the front and rear elevation and are comparable to the outlook from the rear windows of the existing property and again are not considered to lead to any overlooking of neighbouring properties.

With regard to impact upon the outlook and light of neighbouring properties, the side extension and the two storey rear extension would be sited close to the boundary with the properties No 4 and 6 Eastbury Avenue. However, given the distance to these properties, 2.8m and 4m respectively it is considered that the proposed extensions would not have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of these properties, given that they would not breach the 45 degree guideline when taken from the neighbouring properties.

Therefore, it is considered that the development would comply with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Saved Policies (November 2012) or guidance in HDAS Residential Extensions.

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 Policies BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Saved Policies (November 2012) and 3.5 of the London Plan (2011).

Over 150 sq m of garden space would remain for the extended property which is acceptable for a five bedroom property and therefore complying with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012).

The property would still retain parking for at least 2 cars to the front and therefore is considered acceptable for a five bedroom property in accordance with policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012).

The Council's Tree Officer has confirmed that subject to suitable planning condition relating to tree protection during building works, the proposed development is not harmful to the trees that are subject to preservation orders, given the distance of these trees to the proposed development. As such the proposed development complies with Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012).

Due to the size of the extension there would be a CIL requirement of £4910.04 were planning permission to be granted.

In conclusion, given the impact of the proposed extensions on the host property and the wider character of the area the application is recommended for refusal

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed part two storey part single storey side, rear and front extension, by virtue of its siting, size, scale and overall design, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original house, the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area, including the adjacent Northwood Frithwood Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - UDP Saved 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

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
BE18	Design considerations - pedestrian security and safety
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

guidance.

Contact Officer: Mark Jones

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

**4a Eastbury Avenue
 Northwood**

Planning Application Ref:
36828/APP/2014/184

Planning Committee
North Application

Scale
1:1,250

Date
April 2014

**LONDON BOROUGH
 OF HILLINGDON
 Residents Services**

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



HILLINGDON
 LONDON