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

Address 2 RAISINS HILL EASTCOTE PINNER

**Development:** Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 2 rear dormers, 2 side rooflights and 1 front rooflight

LBH Ref Nos: 32216/APP/2015/517

Drawing Nos: RH2-1003A RH2-1004A RH2-1005B RH2-1006 RH2-1001 RH2-1002

 Date Plans Received:
 10/02/2015

 Date Application Valid:
 20/02/2015

Date(s) of Amendment(s): 10/02/0015

#### 1. CONSIDERATIONS

#### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two storey, detached dwelling located on the west side of Raisins Hill. The building is set back from the main highway and benefits from an attached garage, a driveway and a garden to the front of the site. The site benefits from a large side and rear garden which is flat in nature. The dwelling is characterised by a centrally pitched hipped roof to all sides and feature bay windows in the prinpal elevation. The dwelling is finished with brick and tile hanging to the front elevation.

There is a hardstanding to the front of the dwelling that has sufficient space to park one addiotional car.

The site is adjoined by detached dwellings to the northwest and southeast of the site. The street scene is residential in character with the surrounding dwellings along Raisins Hill being predominantly semi-detached interspersed with detached houses of a similar character and appearance to one another.

The application site lies within the developed area and an Area of Special Local Character as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is for planning permission for the erection of part two storey and part single storey rear side extensions and part single storey part two storey rear extension and alterations to the front elevation.

The applicant also proposes the conversion of the roofspace to habitable room to

incorporate to dormers and 3 x rooflights. The proposed rear element would would project 5.55m overall from the rear elevation of the main dwelling.

The proposed two storey side element to the southeast flank would measure 5.75m in width at the ground floor and 4.9m at frist floor level with overall depth of 13.60m at ground floor and 11.20m at first floor.

The two storey side extension to the northwest flank would be 2.6m wide would be erected in line with the rear extensions and would be characterised with a crown roof which would be erected to the same ridge and eaves height as the main dwelling.

Two high level roof lights would be inserted to the southeastern flank roof slope and 1 high level roof light be inserted in the northwestern flank roof slope.

each of the proposed rear dormers would measure 1.5m in width and 1.8m in height.

The proposed would also involve alterations to the front elevation of the existing attached garage.

The proposed extensions would provide an en suite bedroom at ground floor level labelled as 'lounge', enlarged kitchen, family room, lounge, utility room and WC at ground floor level and an additional and enlarged bedrooms at first floor level and 'media room' within the roofspace.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

There is no relevant planning history in connection with this planning application.

#### 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

21 local addresses were consulted by letter on 23.02.15 which expired on 16.03.15. 9 letters of objection and a petition with 53 signatures have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

1) The proposed will result in increase in size by 200% and will neither be subordinate nor subservient.

2) It is not in harmony with the streetscene.

3) Inadequate off-street car parking for potentially 7 bedroom house would impede emergency service access and inconenient local residents.

4) The proposed side extension will result in loss of light and amenity to No. 4 raisins Hill.

5) There is the potential to carve the extended property into multiple dwellings with devatating consequences on the character and amenities of the locality.

6) The extensions' proximity to side boundaries would have overpowering visual impact on the street scene.

7) the application represents overdevelopment which would affect visual and residential amenity.

INTERNAL

Conservation and Urban Design Officer:

The design of the scheme is unacceptable in that it would not be subservient and the fenestration would not match the existing.

# 4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.	
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.	
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.	
BE5	New development within areas of special local character	
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008	
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments	
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction	

# 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 of special Character, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property and the availability of parking.

Guidelines within the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential extension allows two-storey side and rear extensions under certain criteria. Paragraph 5.1 requires all residential extensions of 2 or more storeys to be set back a minimum of 1m from any side boundary as this protects the character and appearance of the street scene and allows external access to the rear garden and rear part of the house. Paragraph 5.10 requires the width and height of the extension to be in relation to the original house and should be considerably less than the width of the original house and in any case no more than 3.5m wide. Fenestration should reflect the existing house and materials should match or complement the materials of the original house. Adequate garden space should be retained and in the case of a 4+ bed house this should be 100m2.

The HDAS also discusses rear and first floor extensions of which, on a detached house there is a general presumption against those where the extension would abut or come close with the adjoining house. Two-storey rear extensions are only allowed where there would be no significant over-dominance, over-shadowing, loss of outlook or loss of daylight and extensions at first floor level should not extend beyond a 45 degree line of sight. Two storey rear extensions should always appear subordinate and project no more than 4m from the rear elevation. Single-storey rear extension should not project more than 4m deep for details properties.

The overall design of the proposal does not accord with the guidelines within the HDAS. The new roofline would not be lower than the host dwelling. Two storey side extensions to detached houses are expected to be set back by 1m from the front building line to ensure a subordinate appearance to the existing house and the roof height of the extension on be lower by at least 0.5m below the ridge height of the host dwelling and the design of the roof should follow that of the existing roof. The proposed side extension would be flush with the front building line with the inclusion of a single storey front element thus creating a role reversal where the original dwelling now appears subordinate to the side extension. Both aspects of the design are contrary with the published guidelines within the HDAS.

The side wall of the extension to the northwest would be set in approximately 0.7m from side the boundary line which is also contrary to the set guidelines. The original dwelling is 6.25m wide with the front part of the extension measuring 5.75m wide, the side extensions would at parts be more than 2/3 the width of the original dwelling which does not satisfy the guidance within the HDAS.

The ground floor element of the rear extension would project 5.55m in depth. The two storey element of the rear extension is approximately 15m wide and only 0.7m from the common boundary with the northwestern neighbour. The upper storey would project 4m deep but given the separation distance this would accord with a 45 degree sight line. However, the first floor element taken together with the ground floor coupled with their proximity to the common boundary the dimensions of the rear extensions are not in accordance with the guidelines within the HDAS in that it would be almost the same depth as the original building thereby adversely impacting on the architectural integrity of the host building.

Although the proposal would be able to meet the internal, external amenity space and car parking requirements, when viewing the entire scheme, as a whole, the amount of built-form proposed wraps around the entire house and creates an over-developed appearance out of proportion with the scale, form and the simple architectural composition of the original dwelling. the crown roof form would poorly relate the the appearance of the main house.

The property lies within an area of special character and therefore new development would be expected to preserve or enhance the those features which contribute to the special architectural and visual features. The property is situated in an exposed position on Raisins Hill with a lot of space around it and could be considered a prominent feature. This open space allows long views across Raisins Hill towards the property and the entire southeast and northwest sides of the property is easily seen. The Conservation officer has made a comment that the sheer width, size and height of the side extensions and lack of setdowns from the main ridgeline would eclipse the main building.

It is considered the proposed full width at ground floor level combined with the proposed front fenestration which would not match the existing would sit uncomfortably with the fenestration of the front elevation. The overall height, design, bulk and the size of the extensions would contrast with the main house, be visually intrusive on the original design and proportions of the property and to the overall character of the area. As such, the proposal is contrary to the advice given within the (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions and Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The HDAS requires the retention of adequate garden space as a consequence of any proposed extensions. The proposal would create a 5 bedroom house of which there would be a minimum requirement of 100m2 of private rear garden. In this case there would be more than 350sqm available which would be compliant with paragraph 4.9 of the HDAS and Policy 23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan-Part Two-Saved Policies (November 2012).

Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan-Part Two-Saved Policies (November 2012)require adequate off-street parking to remain. It is noted on the site visit that the site would be able to easily accommodate 2 additional parking which is acceptable as part of the front garden is already laid to hardstanding with a crossover onto the highway.

There is 1.8m closed boarded fence, topped with vegetation, along the site's common boundary with no. 4 Raisins Hill. The extension is not considered to have any impact on the residential amenities of the adjacent property at no. 4 Raisins Hill given that there are no side openings within No. 4 which would be deprived of daylight or be overshadowed or overlooked. In relation to the properties to the northwest no overlooking, loss of privacy or loss of daylight/sunlight would occur, given the separation distance.

On balance, it is considered that the proposal results in an over-development of this modest dwelling failing to harmonise with the original scale, architectural composition and proportions of the host and forms an incongruous addition detrimental to the visual amenities of the area of special character. The proposal does not accord with the guidelines within the HDAS and is contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19, BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan-Part Two-Saved Policies (November 2012) and the recommendation is to refuse.

# 6. **RECOMMENDATION**

# **REFUSAL** for the following reasons:

# 1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey side extensions, by reason of their siting, size, scale, width, height and design, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition or harmonise with the character of the orginal house and would thus be detrimental to the appearance of the original house, the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the Raisins Hill Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, 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.

# 2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, size, scale and width would result in an unacceptable reduction of an important gap between nos. 2 and 4 Raisins Hill, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities, character and appearance of the Raisins Hill Area of Special Local Character and to this existing open area of the street scene. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, 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 (2015). 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
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
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.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
BE5	New development within areas of special local character
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction

**Contact Officer:** Peter Korankye-Gyabong

**Telephone No:** 01895 250230

