

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

**Address** 16 THE FAIRWAY RUISLIP MIDDLESEX

**Development:** Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer a side dormer, 1 side rooflight, conversion of roof from hip to gable end and installation of gable end window to front (Retrospective)

**LBH Ref Nos:** 61854/APP/2014/728

**Drawing Nos:** 16/007/4  
16/007/1  
16/007/5  
16/007/6  
Location Plan (1:1250)  
16/007/3  
16/007/2

**Date Plans Received:** 03/03/2014      **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

**Date Application Valid:** 12/03/2014

### 1. CONSIDERATIONS

#### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the western side of The Fairway. It forms a pair with no. 14 The Fairway, each of which has a two storey projecting gable end in the principal elevation which creates a valley roof form between the dwellings. The dwellinghouse has a front driveway and rear garden, a rear dormer window, front/side dormer window and hip to gable conversion (without consent) and an existing rear extension.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and appearance, consisting of mainly semi-detached style properties. It is noted that the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings containing the application site is reflected in the design of Nos.10 and 12 The Fairway, these being the only examples of this style of dwelling within the immediate vicinity.

The site is situated within a Developed Area as identified in the policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012)

#### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for a loft conversion incorporating a hip to gable roof conversion, rear dormer window, front/side dormer window and a side rooflight.

The front/side dormer has been built on the north facing side roofslope of the dwelling and is also attached to the principal roofslope. The dormer has a maximum height of 3.85 metres, is set 0.25 metres back from the front wall of the gable end and is 0.25 metres above the eaves. The dormer is built up to the ridgeline of the dwelling and has a maximum

depth of 2.58 metres, with a sloped roof design.

The rear dormer window has a sloped roof 2.5m high and set down 0.2m from the existing ridgeline of the main roof and 0.25m up from the eaves. The dormer is 2.1m deep and 6.7m wide. The dormer is set in from the sides of the roof by a minimum 0.7m. The materials match the existing property.

The proposal accommodates a 4th and 5th bedroom with an en-suite.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

61854/APP/2013/3558 16 The Fairway Ruislip Middlesex

Single storey side extension

**Decision Date:** 07-02-2014      **Refused**      **Appeal:**

#### Comment on Planning History

61854/APP/2013/3558 - Single storey side extension was refused on 7 February 2014.

A enforcement case has also been opened against the application dwelling due to the unauthorised building work completed at the site.

### 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 near neighbours and the South Ruislip Residents Association were consulted and a site notice displayed on 22 March 2014 giving 21 days to comment. 2 objections were received. In summary the objections are:

1. Property is now completely out of character and does not harmonise with the rest of the neighbouring properties.

2. The rear dormer completely dominates the building which now looks more like a block of flats than the rear of a semi detached house, completely over dominating the surrounding view from adjacent properties.

3. No 18 has now lost light and outlook (the extension is overshadowing). There is now no privacy at all at no 18. I would like to add that No 16 already has a large ground floor extension and large brick built out house - which may possibly be used for occupancy.

4. Conversion/extension has already been built causing considerable inconvenience and problems to me, my family and my property.

5. It is causing loss of light, loss of outlook and loss of privacy. It is domineering and overshadowing,

6. It is also an eyesore which does not fit it with the look of the surrounding properties/street.

7. When sitting on my patio/garden there is no sunlight in the morning anymore which there was previously. The property already has a large rear extension and an outbuilding which I suspect people are staying in.

8. A constant stream of people coming and going in this property at all times of the day/night with lots of vehicles parked there, leaving me wondering how many people live there and how many more extensions they will want to build.

9. The front roof extension has dramatically changed the appearance. It no longer has any symmetry with the attached house and looks out of place. The various extensions to this house have increased its size disproportionate to the size of its site. This is also causing problems with parking.

CASE OFFICER COMMENT: The issues with regards to the number of people living at the site is not a material planning consideration. The other issues are considered in the main body of the report.

Ward Councillor: Requests that the application is reported to committee.

#### **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:

OE1 Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area

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.

BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.

BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.

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 planning issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the impact on the character and appearance of the original dwellinghouse and surrounding area, impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and provision of

acceptable residential amenity for the application property. There are no parking issues related to this proposal.

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

HDAS: Residential Extensions paragraph: 7.11 states that the conversion of a hip-end roof into a gable-end roof on the side of dwellinghouses will normally be considered unacceptable due to the unbalancing effect this has on the overall character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which they form a part. The built development has resulted in an unbalancing of the pair of properties as No.14 The Fairway has a hipped roof. Therefore, the hip-to-gable conversion has led to an unbalancing of the appearance of the dwellings and also caused harm to the symmetry between the pair of semi-detached dwelling which flank the junction with Rydal Way.

Paragraph 7.2 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions states that dormer windows to the front of properties will not be acceptable unless this is part of the original character of the area. Front dormers do not form part of the original character of the street and the position, overall size, scale, bulk and design of this element is considered to exacerbate the unbalancing effect between the pair of properties and is in itself detrimental to the overall character of the original property and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area.

Turning to the rear dormer, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions states in paragraph 7.4 that roof extensions should relate well to the proportions, roof forms and massing of the existing dwellinghouse and its neighbours. Paragraph 7.5 states that a roof extension should appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it is set. Furthermore, HDAS: Residential Extensions paragraph 7.7 states dormer windows should be constructed in the centre of the roof and paragraph 7.8 states on large semi-detached dwellinghouses the dormer window should be set in at least 1m from the sides of the roof, 1m below the ridge line and 1m from the eaves. The dormer does not comply with these requirements and even if it was set in from all sides it is considered that it would still result in a dormer which would not relate well to the proportions, roof forms and massing of the existing dwellinghouse and would not appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it is set. The position, overall size, scale, bulk and design of this element is considered to be detrimental to the overall character of the original property and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area.

The proposed roof alterations, by reason of their size, position and design are considered to be out of proportion with the existing building and not in keeping with the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development is considered contrary to Part 1 Policy BE1 and Part 2 Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

During the course of the application the applicant has referenced other developments on The Fairway as setting precedent. However, the extension at No.104 The Fairway cannot be seen from the application site and was not granted planning permission by the Council and could not be considered to set a precedent.

In terms of the impact on the neighbouring properties, the first floor rear windows overlook

the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. The dormer window provides views very similar to the views from the existing first floor windows. It is considered that the proposed rear dormer does not result in an unacceptable increase of overlooking into the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. In addition, the flank window serves a staircase and does not give rise to a demonstrable loss of privacy and could be conditioned to be obscure glazed. The proposal, therefore, accords with part 2 policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The location of the proposed extensions on the roof of the existing dwelling would ensure that no significant loss of light, outlook or sense of dominance occurs to the neighbouring occupiers. Therefore, the proposed development would comply with Policy BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (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 (July 2011).

The proposal would increase the number of bedroom to 5 in total requiring 100sqm of garden space. Approximately 150sq.m of private amenity space would be retained, compliant with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The proposal would not result in loss of off-street parking and the proposal would comply with Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies(November 2012).

To conclude, the proposals is detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing and adjoining properties, the streetscene and the surrounding area, contrary to adopted policy and guidance. As such, the application is recommended for refusal.

## **6. RECOMMENDATION**

### **REFUSAL for the following reasons:**

#### **1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The hip-to-gable roof conversion, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design, fails to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original building and results in a visual imbalance between this pair of semi-detached properties, 14 and 16 The Fairway. The proposal is thus detrimental to the character and appearance of the original and adjoining properties and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore, 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 to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

#### **2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The front/side dormer, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, position and design is an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, detrimental to the character and appearance of the original and adjoining properties and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore, 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 to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

**3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The rear dormer, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, position and design is an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, detrimental to the character and appearance of the original and adjoining properties and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is therefore, 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 to the Council's 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 guidance.

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

OE1 Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area  
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.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
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:** Scott Hackner

**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 2014 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address

**16 The Fairway  
 Ruislip**

Planning Application Ref:

**61854/APP/2014/728**

Planning Committee

**North Committee**

Scale

**1:1,250**

Date

**May 2014**

**LONDON BOROUGH  
 OF HILLINGDON**

**Residents Services  
 Planning Section**

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



**HILLINGDON**  
 LONDON