

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 29 BROADWOOD AVENUE RUISLIP

Development: Part two storey, part single storey front extension, single storey rear extension and raising of and enlargement of roof to allow for additional habitable roofspace involving demolition of existing conservatory to rear

LBH Ref Nos: 33999/APP/2015/465

Drawing Nos: 14021-29BroadwoodAve-002 Rev. A
14021-29BroadwoodAve-007 Rev. B
14021-29BroadwoodAve-001 Rev. B
14021-29BroadwoodAve-005 Rev. B
14021-29BroadwoodAve-006 Rev. A
14021-29BroadwoodAve-003
14021-29BroadwoodAve-004

Date Plans Received: 09/02/2015 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 23/02/2015

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the south side of Broadwood Avenue and comprises a two storey detached house with a hipped roof, part single storey front and side extension and a subordinate two storey part side extension with a hipped roof located to the east side.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising two storey detached and semi-detached houses of varied design, and detailing. The majority of the properties in the immediate locality have been extended with single/two storey side and rear extensions.

The application site lies within the Developed Area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The application site lies within the area covered by TPO No.235. There is a protected Oak tree, T4 in the rear garden of the application property.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The applicant seeks permission for a part two storey, part single storey front extension, single storey rear extension and raising of and enlargement of roof to allow for additional habitable roofspace, involving demolition of existing conservatory to rear.

The single storey element would replace the existing conservatory and would extend 8.76m wide and 4m deep. The roof would be flat measuring 2.91m high. The single storey element would provide a new dining/living area.

The two storey element would be set within the centre of the dwelling and would measure

4.12m wide, 4.0m deep and 7.41m high with a hipped roof profile. This area would provide a new bedroom.

The existing roof has a crown roof element which the applicant wishes to extend 1m to form a fully hipped roof which would also assist in converting the roof space.

This element of the proposal has been previously approved in 2013.

The proposed scheme comprises the installation of pitched roof to single storey front element and extend the full width of the house. The property currently has a flat roof on this element. The proposed roof would be hipped and measure 3.5m high (max). This would increase the height above the existing 3.1m.

A first floor front extension is proposed with a gable roof measuring 2m deep, set down 2m from the ridge of the main roof, 3m wide with a large window in the front elevation.

The materials would match the existing house and the proposal comprises a fifth bedroom, extended living room and kitchen.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

33999/APP/2000/2330 29 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip
ERECTION OF A REAR CONSERVATORY

Decision Date: 31-01-2001 Approved **Appeal:**

33999/APP/2008/2971 29 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip
First floor front/side extension and new window to ground floor front.

Decision Date: 16-12-2008 Refused **Appeal:**06-OCT-09 Dismissed

33999/APP/2010/1374 29 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip
Erection of a first floor front extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use involving the erection of a crown roof with front and rear dormers and 2 rooflights to sides and new window to existing front.

Decision Date: 20-09-2010 Refused **Appeal:**

33999/APP/2011/414 29 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip
Erection of a two storey side extension (involving part demolition of the existing single storey front/side extension)

Decision Date: 11-05-2011 Approved **Appeal:**

33999/APP/2013/2808 29 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip
Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and raising of roof to allow for conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include installation of rooflights to side

Decision Date: 12-02-2014 Approved **Appeal:**

33999/APP/2014/2099 29 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip
Installation of pitched roof to single storey front element

Decision Date: 11-08-2014 **Approved** **Appeal:**
33999/APP/2015/532 29 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

Details pursuant to discharge condition 5 (Method Statement/Tree Protection) of planning permission Ref: 33999/APP/2013/2808 dated 12/02/2014 (Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and raising of roof to allow for conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include installation of rooflights to side)

Decision Date: 23-03-2015 **Approved** **Appeal:**

Comment on Planning History

The applicant previously sought planning permission for a single/two storey side/front infill extension (33999/APP/2011/414 refers) which was granted on the 11 May 2011. This consent has been implemented, however, it appears that this was not completed in accordance with the approved plans, which involved a small set back in the principal elevation and the existing floor plans show this as flush. However, this would not affect the determination of the current application, which would regularise the design as part of any approval.

Planning permission was refused for the erection of a first floor front extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use involving the erection of a crown roof with front and rear dormers and 2 rooflights to sides and new window to existing front ref. 33999/APP/2010/1374, on the 29 September 2010 on the following grounds:

1. The proposed first floor side/front extension, by reason of its siting and design incorporating a crown roof and front catslide roof that would be substantially different from the hipped roof on the original house would represent an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development which would fail to harmonise with the character, proportions and appearance of the original house. It would detract from the appearance of the original house and the street scene and surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19, of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2. The proposed rear dormer by virtue of its position, size, scale, bulk and design would represent a visually intrusive and overdominant form of development in relation to the enlarged house which would be out of character with the existing and adjoining properties and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the area in general, contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions.

Planning permission was refused 16 December 2008 and dismissed at appeal for a first floor front/side extension and new window to ground floor front ref. 33999/APP/2008/2971 on the following grounds:

1. The proposed first floor side extension, by reason of its siting, overall size, height, design and proximity to the side boundary, would result in an unacceptable closing of the visually open gap between this and the neighbouring property, 31 Broadwood Avenue, giving rise to a cramped form of development, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the

street scene and character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE22, of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2. The proposed first floor side/front extension, by reason of its siting, forward of the front elevation wall of the original house and incorporating a gable end pitched roof that would be substantially different from the hipped roof on the original house and its two storey part side extension, would appear as a visually intrusive and incongruous addition to the original house and would detract from its appearance and architectural composition. The extension would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and local area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19, of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

Planning permission was granted for a part two storey, part single storey rear extension and raising of roof to allow for conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include installation of rooflights to side, reference 33999/APP/2013/2808 on 12 February 2014.

Planning permission (ref.33999/APP/2014/2099) was granted for a Installation of pitched roof to single storey front element on 11.08.2014.

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

4 letters were sent to local residents and the Residents Association on 25 February 2015 and the site notice was posted on 27 February 2015. One objection has been received:

1) The three proposed windows that overlook our property on the ground floor (bathroom window), on the first floor and in the roof space are not obscure glazed windows and this infringes our privacy and is contrary to Policy BE24.

2) It is not clear from the plans if there is a proposal to increase the depth of the rear extension and or the siting and bulk of the first floor extension beyond what planners agreed to in planning application 33999/APP/2013/2808. In this approval, the rear extension was not to extend beyond 2.8 metres of the rear building line of No 31 Broadwood and for the first floor element to be sited 3.3 metres from the shared boundary of No 31 Broadwood Avenue. If there is a proposal to change the depth, size or bulk then we oppose this. We had opposed that application as it was beyond the building line of the road and out of keeping with the style of the rear of the houses.

In addition a petition of support with 22 signatures has been received.

Officer comment: The above issues are addressed in the main body of the report.

Trees and Landscape Officer:

This site is covered by TPO 235.

There is a large, protected Oak tree (T4 on TPO 235) in the rear garden. It is a high value tree and warrants protection during development and long-term retention.

Given that construction-related activity and storage of materials could cause damage to the tree, protective fencing (in accordance with BS 5837:2012) should be erected across the rear garden, approximately 10m from the rear of the house to protect the Oak.

The Oak should be shown on the plans (as retained) and the location of protective fencing should also be shown (as above) on the plans.

Subject to the revision of the plans and conditions RES8 (implementation) and RES10, this scheme is considered acceptable in terms of Saved Policy BE38 of the UDP.

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.

HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

LPP 3.5 (2015) 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.

The extensions to the rear of the property, roof extension and the pitched roof over the existing single storey front extension are acceptable, which have previously been approved under two separate applications.

The Council's SPD for Residential Extensions, section 8 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. Front extensions that will extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused. Front extensions are eye catching and change the face of the building. They do not only affect the character and appearance of the building itself, but also the street scene.'

As such, the proposal to extend the existing single storey front element the full width of the property and the first floor front extension by reason of its design with a large window, projection and size would change the appearance of the original house and would not be in keeping with the street scene.

A proposal for a first floor front/side extension was refused in December 2008 and dismissed at appeal in October 2009. Whilst not directly comparable as the position of the extension was different, the design of the extension with a projecting front gable was similar and on this particular element the Inspector commented as follows:

"In addition, the design of the extension would not reflect the design of the existing house. The proposed gable end with a pitched roof would fail to match the original hipped roof of the existing dwelling. There are other houses with gables in the road, for example, at numbers 31, 32, 34 and 36, but for the most part these gables are part of the original design of the house. The proposed gable end would be a prominent addition to the dwelling and project forward of the hipped roof, overlapping with it in views from the front. Paragraph 5.9 of the SPD says that an existing hipped roof should be extended with a subordinate hipped roof, which is not the case with this proposal."

The siting of the current front extension with gable is considered to be in a more prominent position than the dismissed scheme and would thus have a greater impact visually.

The proposed front extensions overall are therefore considered to be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - 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.

Policy BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that planning permission will not be granted for new development which by reason of its siting, bulk and proximity, would result in a significant loss in residential amenity. Likewise Policies BE20 and BE24 resists any development which would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of nearby residents and occupants through loss of daylight and privacy.

Section 6.2 states that "two-storey rear extensions will only be allowed where there is no overdominance, over-shadowing, loss of outlook or daylight." In order to assess this, any extensions at first floor level "should not extend beyond a 45-degree line of sight taken from

the nearest of the first floor window of any room of the neighbouring property".

No. 31 to the east of the application site currently projects 1.20m beyond the existing building line of the application site (this does not take into account the existing conservatory which is proposed to be demolished). No. 27 currently projects 1.10m beyond the original building line of the application site (again not taking into account the existing conservatory).

As demonstrated in the applicants plans, the proposed two storey element would not breach the 45-degree line of site from the neighbouring properties nearest habitable room windows. In addition the proposed 4m deep single/two storey rear extension development would be sited 2.8m beyond the rear building line of No. 31 Broadwood Avenue and 2.9m beyond the rear building line of No. 27 Broadwood Avenue.

The two storey element would be positioned in the centre of the rear of the property and would be sited 3.3m away from the shared boundary of No. 31. As No. 31 extends to the boundary with the application site, the flank-to-flank wall separation distance would also be 3.3m. The two storey element would be set in 3.32m away from the shared boundary with No. 27 and 4.66m away from its flank wall, thus ensuring that the two storey section of the extension would not breach the 45 degree guideline from either neighbouring occupier.

It is also noted that the proposed rear extensions would not have any windows on the side elevation directly facing the adjoining occupiers which would avoid any overlooking. The proposed roof lights would be positioned above head height and would provide oblique views to the east and west, which are considered acceptable and similar to those of the adjoining occupiers.

The proposed rear extension by virtue of its siting, height, depth and positioning of windows would not cause any undue loss of daylight, sunlight, visual intrusion, overdominance or loss of privacy. Therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development and would be in accordance with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The resulting amenity space of 270 square metres would exceed 100 square metres which is considered adequate for a four bedroom property, and would be in compliance with paragraph 5.13 of HDAS and policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

There is a blanket TPO235 on the site and there is a large, protected Oak tree (T4 on TPO235) in the rear garden. The applicant should submit a block plan to demonstrate that the Oak Tree would be retained and protective fencing would be erected to ensure that construction related activity would not harm the tree. In addition, tree protection conditions have been recommended and the Trees and Landscaping Officer has no objection after the submission of the amended plan. As such the scheme would accord with Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The application proposal would not result in the loss of parking on the site. Two parking spaces are available at the front of the property which would be sufficient for the extended property. Therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not impact on existing on-site parking in compliance with Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Taking into consideration the above, the front extensions would be detrimental to the original house and the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy. Refusal is therefore recommended.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed first floor and single storey front extensions, by virtue of their siting, size, scale and design, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the architectural composition, character and appearance of the existing building and the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be 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 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.
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.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2015) 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 2015 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

**29 Broadwood Avenue
Ruislip**

**LONDON BOROUGH
OF HILLINGDON**
Residents Services
Planning Section

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

Planning Application Ref:

33999/APP/2015/465

Scale:

1:1,250

Planning Committee:

North

Date:

June 2015



HILLINGDON
LONDON