

Report of the Director of Planning & Community Services Group

Address 53 PINN WAY RUISLIP

Development: Two storey rear and single storey side extensions, involving part demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings.

LBH Ref Nos: 1244/APP/2009/1132

Drawing Nos: 01A
02A
03A

Date Plans Received: 27/05/2009

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 27/05/2009

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the east side of Pinn Way and comprises a two storey detached house with a front projection, front gable, porch and a glazed roof canopy along the southern flank wall. To the south lies 55 Pinn Way and to the north lies 51 Pinn Way, both detached houses. This side of the road has a staggered building line and as such, 51 Pinn Way lies in front, and 55 Pinn Way lies to the rear, of the application property. Also, the gradient of the land is such that the rear garden is at a lower level to the street. The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising two storey detached houses and the application site lies within the developed area as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007). The application site also lies within an Archaeological Priority Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extensions on the north and south flank walls.

The proposed two storey rear extension would extend the width of the existing property (11.1m wide) and be between 3.9m and 5.9m deep. Two hipped end roofs would be installed set 0.6m below the existing ridge height.

The single storey side extension on the southern flank wall would be set flush with the front of the house. It would have a width of 2.2m and depth of 11.8m, finished with a mono pitched roof with a maximum height of 4m.

The single storey side extension on the northern flank wall would also be in line with the front wall of the house. It would have a width of 2.6m and depth of 9.7m, finished with a mono-pitched roof with a maximum height of 4.5m.

It would appear from the proposed front elevation plan that the existing front porch has been replaced with a canopy over the front entrance. The front entrance is also shown replaced with a double fronted entrance. However, the ground floor plan shows the existing

front door and porch retained.

**1.3 Relevant Planning History
Comment on Planning History**

None

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

EXTERNAL:

121 adjoining owner/occupiers and the Ruislip Residents' Association have been consulted. 13 letters of objection and a petition with 29 signatories have been received.

Letters of objection:

- (i) The scale of the proposed development would be out of character with the original house, the street scene and the surrounding area;
- (ii) The proposal would result in an increase in on-street parking;
- (iii) The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site;
- (iv) The proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the area;
- (v) The proposed development would not harmonise with the character and appearance of the area;
- (vi) The proposal would result in a significant reduction in the private amenity space;
- (vii) The overall size of the proposed development would result in increased noise, smells and intensification of the use which will have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.

Petition:

"This petition is signed by the residents of Pinn Way, Ruislip who are immediately affected and deeply concerned about the scale of the extension to the above property.

We consider that the proposed development of 53 Pinn Way does not conform to the Council's planning policies and therefore we strongly object to it.

The proposed plans show gross over-development as the bulk and size of the extension is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area. This eyesore would undoubtedly detract from what is an attractive area of North Ruislip and it would in no way improve or complement the character of the area.

The plans also state that there are no trees or hedges within falling distance of the boundary which is incorrect. In addition we also have concerns about traffic and parking as we feel that the size of the proposed development means that adequate provision has not been made for this.

We request that our objections are forwarded to the Planning Committee."

Ruislip Residents' Association:

"We are writing in support of local residents, who have expressed concern at the form of development proposed in this application. Our particular concerns are:

- (i) The extended building would have a footprint double the size of the existing house.
- (ii) The rear extension would not be subordinate to the original house and appears to exceed the maximum permitted depth (HDAS 6.4). It would also block the existing open aspect between Nos.53 and 55, particularly when viewed on the approach from Eastcote Road.
- (iii) The impact the extension would have on the side windows on the south elevation of No.51. It is also not clear from the plans whether it complies with requirements of HDAS 6.3.
- (iv) There is no provision for side access to the rear of the property. The proposed roof appears to be large enough to create considerably more living space and presumably this could be allowed under Permitted Development rights at some future date.
- (v) The plans displayed on the LBH website do not include a roof layout, which we understand is now a requirement. Without this layout it is difficult to interpret the roof arrangement proposed over Bedrooms 2 & 3. The rear elevation indicates a change in the plan of the rear wall at this point with a hipped gable over, but on the information provided it is not clear how this would be achieved.

To summarize we believe that, due to its bulk and size, the proposed building would have a detrimental effect both on the street scene and the amenity of adjacent properties."

English Heritage (Archaeology): The present proposals are not considered to have an affect on any significant archaeological remains.

A Ward Councillor has requested that this application be determined by the Planning Committee.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Policies:

- | | |
|------|--|
| 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. |
| AM7 | Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments. |
| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |

HDAS	Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions (adopted in August 2006 and to form part of the emerging Local Development Framework documents): 4.0 Side Extensions: Single Storey 6.0 Rear and First Floor Rear Extensions: Two Storey
LPP 4A.3	London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original house, on the street scene and surrounding area and on residential amenity.

The application site lies within a residential area. Pinn Way is characterised by detached houses of varying styles and designs, some of which, have been extended. Given the character of the area, the principle of extending existing properties is acceptable. However, all extension should comply with the Council's policies and standards.

The proposed two storey rear and single storey side extensions, by reason of their overall size, siting, design, appearance and length of projection, would fail to harmonise with the character and proportions of the original house. In particular, when viewed from the street, the proposed side extensions would fail to appear subordinate with the appearance of the original house, by reason of their overall height, the northern side extension extends to the eaves of the original roof. These extensions would be contrary to paragraph 4.2 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions, which advises that mono-pitched roofs above side extensions should not exceed 3.4m high.

At the rear, given the inaccuracy in the submitted plans, it is not known whether the hipped roof above the two storey rear extension would be set apart or would be attached thereby creating a valley/flat roof and therefore it is not possible to assess the impact of this element of the scheme on the appearance of the original house. Notwithstanding this, the proposed stepped element of the two storey rear extension would project some 6m beyond the rear wall of the original house, contrary to paragraph 6.4 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions, which advises that two storey rear extension should not exceed 4m.

Overall, the proposed development would represent an incongruous form of development which would fail to harmonise with the character and proportions of the original house and detract from the appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area generally, contrary to policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and sections 4.0 and 6.0 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions.

51 Pinn Way would be separated from the proposed northern side extension by its attached garage. That property has a series of windows overlooking the application property. A 4.5m gap would be retained between the flank walls of the proposed side extension and 51 Pinn Way and furthermore, the existing garage at 51 Pinn Way would screen the impact of the proposed development from that house when viewed from the rear. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of 51 Pinn Way through, overdominance and visual intrusion. No windows are proposed facing that house and therefore, no overlooking will

result. The proposed development would result in an increase in overshadowing during the afternoon hours however this increase is not considered to be so significant as to justify a refusal of planning permission.

The proposed two storey rear extension would not project beyond the rear wall of 55 Pinn Way. Furthermore, that property does not have any habitable room windows in the flank wall facing the application site. The single storey side extension along the southern flank wall would project beyond the front wall of 55 Pinn Way. However, as that property lies to the south of the application property, no overshadowing will result.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not harm the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers and would be in accordance with policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007). The new windows would provide an adequate outlook and natural light to the rooms they would serve, in accordance with London Plan Policy 4A.3.

Some 300sq.m of private amenity space would be retained which would be sufficient for the enlarged house. With regards to parking, the application site would remain as a dwelling house and as such, under the Council's parking standards, two off-street parking spaces should be retained. Two off-street parking spaces are retained in the front area and as such, the proposal would not result in an increase in on-street parking, in accordance with policies AM7 and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

With regards to third party comments, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed development would result in an increase in smells, noise and disturbance. Furthermore, it would not result in an intensification of the use as a residential dwelling. No trees or hedges would be affected and it is not proposed to use the roof void for habitable purposes. The remaining comments are addressed in the report.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey rear extension, by reason of its overall size, siting, design, appearance and length of projection would represent a disproportionate and incongruous addition that would fail to appear subordinate to the appearance of the original house. It would be detrimental to the appearance of the original house and would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area generally, contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed single storey side extensions, by reason of their overall height in relation to the original house, would represent disproportionate and incongruous additions that would fail to appear subordinate to the appearance of the original house. They would be detrimental to the appearance of the original house and would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene generally, contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19

of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The submitted plans appear to be inaccurate in that the submitted block and rear elevation plans show differing roof designs. In the absence of accurate plans, the Local Planning Authority has been unable to fully assess the impact of the design of the two storey rear extension in terms of its impact on the original house and the surrounding area generally. However it would appear that a flat roof is proposed to part of the two storey rear extension. This is considered to be out of character with the existing and adjoining properties and the area in general and contrary to policies BE13, BE15, BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

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) set out below, and to all relevant material considerations, including Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Policy No.

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.
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS	Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions (adopted in August 2006 and to form part of the emerging Local Development Framework documents): 4.0 Side Extensions: Single Storey 6.0 Rear and First Floor Rear Extensions: Two Storey

LPP 4A.3 London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.
BE22 Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.

Contact Officer: Sonia Bowen

Telephone No: 01895 250230

