

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 169 JOEL STREET EASTCOTE PINNER

Development: Boundary wall with iron railings to front, including electronic iron gates and pedestrian gate and involving soft landscaping (Part Retrospective)

LBH Ref Nos: 22642/APP/2014/2278

Drawing Nos: Planning Statement
Location Plan
Supporting Photos
1212.6 Rev A
1212.5

Date Plans Received: 27/06/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 02/07/2014

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site lies to the east of Joel Street and is occupied by a two storey detached dwelling house. The house is finished in brick and render with a tiled roof. The dwelling is set back from Joel Street by 10-15 metres meaning that the dwelling is also set back from the common building line of properties along Joel Street. The dwelling has side facing windows close to the southern boundary.

The front garden has a gravel surface and is bounded by a hedge which runs along Joel Street and stops where it meets the vehicular access to the application property. The property has a detached single garage to the north. The rear garden is grassed over and enclosed by mature trees around the boundary and by a 1.8m high timber fence.

The adjoining properties to the north and south both have habitable room windows in the side elevations facing the application site.

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

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a boundary wall which would vary in height due to sloping ground levels at the site. The wall would be between 0.67 to 1.22m high with 0.5m high pillars and railings measuring above giving a total height of between 1.2 to 1.74m high. The brick wall would match the existing house. A black metal gate and a vehicular sliding gate are proposed. The proposal would extend across the front of the property and to the side adjoining No.171. A box hedge would be proposed behind part of the wall and railings.

The application differs from the previously refused scheme in that a 1.5m-2m high box hedge is proposed to be planted adjacent to parts of the front and side boundaries, behind

the wall.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

22642/APP/2014/94 169 Joel Street Eastcote Pinner

Boundary wall with iron railings to front and side to include electric iron gates and pedestrian gates involving removal of hedge

Decision Date: 31-03-2014 Refused **Appeal:**

Comment on Planning History

The application is a resubmission of planning application ref. 22642/APP/2014/94, which was refused for the following reason:

The proposed walls, railings and gates, by reason of the loss of the hedge/landscaping and the overall height and appearance would be detrimental to the visual amenity, character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The boundary wall and pillars were already erected and this has resulted in enforcement action (ref.ENF/372/14) to either lower the fence and brick pillars or to apply for planning permission.

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

7 neighbours were consulted on 4.07.2014 and a site notice was also displayed on 12.07.2014. One letter received from an adjoining neighbour with no objections.

Northwood Hills Residents Association:

As you were the case officer for the previous application which was refused it would be easy for you to see why this application should be refused as well. The challenge now is that the applicant despite being refused, have carried out the work just the same. Identical to the refused application. This has caused loss of hedge which would take years to replace. This application doesn't just require a refusal but an enforcement action to take it back to the original as it is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area. We, at Northwood Hills Residents Association would like to see not just rejection of the application but enforcement at the same time.

There is a councillor request for the application to be determined at 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:

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.
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 original dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area and the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings.

Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Local Plan seek to ensure that development harmonises with the character of the surrounding properties and street scene, and in particular the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Policy BE19 further requires that development should complement and improve the amenity of the residential area.

HDAS: Residential Extensions section 10 states all front walls and enclosures should make a positive contribution to the streetscene and must ensure adequate visibility for all vehicles entering and exiting the property. Materials used and the height of any wall/enclosure must be in keeping with the character of the area. Furthermore, front gates over 1m in height will be refused planning permission because of their overbearing impact on the streetscene. The erection of railings over 1m in height around front gardens will also be refused planning permission for this reason, as will the erection of railings onto boundary walls.

The proposed boundary wall would have a finished height of between 0.67 to 1.22m in height with gates and railings higher than 1m. As such, the scheme would be contrary to the above guidance and Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). Whilst there are boundary walls and railings in the area, these are not directly comparable to the length of the frontage of the application site. Overall, it is considered that the proposed scheme by reason of the height, length and

appearance of the proposed boundary treatment would be detrimental to the architectural integrity of the existing house and detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Sliding gates are proposed and highways have no objection to the scheme with regards to any potential harm to the highway safety. As such, the proposal would be in compliance with Policy AM7 of the Local Plan.

In conclusion, an objection is raised in relation to the detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area and the application is therefore recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed walls, railings and gates, by reason of the overall height, length and appearance would be detrimental to the visual amenity, character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to Policies BE13 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.

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:

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.
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

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 2014 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address

**169 Joel Street
 Eastcote
 Pinner**

**LONDON BOROUGH
 OF HILLINGDON**

**Residents Services
 Planning Section**

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

Planning Application Ref:

22642/APP/2014/2278

Scale

1:1,250

Planning Committee

North

Date

September 2014



HILLINGDON
 LONDON