Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 61 ADELPHI CRESCENT HAYES

Development: First floor side extension

LBH Ref Nos: 60953/APP/2015/3750

Drawing Nos: 04 05 Location Plan (1:1250) 01 02 03

 Date Plans Received:
 08/10/2015

 Date Application Valid:
 11/12/2015

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the south side of Adelphi Crescent at its junction with Adelphi Way and comprises a two storey semi-detached house which is currently in the process of being extended by way of a single storey side extension, a loft extension including a hip to gable extension and rear dormer and a rear extension. The attached house, 59 Adelphi Crescent, has a hipped roof and lies to the west and has a single storey rear extension. To the south east lies 3 Adelphi Way, a two storey terraced house with a single storey detached double garage and a single storey rear extension. The street scene is characterised by similarly designed two storey semi-detached houses and the application site lies within the 'developed area' as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). The application site is covered by TPO 24, however, there are no protected trees within the application site.

1.2 **Proposed Scheme**

The application seeks planning permission for a first floor side extension. The extension is proposed to sit above the single storey side extension which has been recently constructed as permitted development. The extension would be set back 0.5m behind the front wall of the host dwelling and would have a gabled roof to match that on the host dwelling. The extension would provide a bedroom and study.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

60953/APP/2005/2071 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

ERECTION OF TWO-STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE)

Decision Date: 27-09-2005 Withdrawn Appeal:

60953/APP/2005/3129 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

ERECTION OF PART SINGLE STOREY AND PART TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, PART SINGLE STOREY AND PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE).

Decision Date: 01-08-2006 Refused Appeal:

60953/APP/2006/2483 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH A PART FIRST FLOOR ADDITION ABOVE (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE)

Decision Date: 07-11-2006 Refused Appeal:21-SEP-07 Dismissed

60953/APP/2007/3280 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE)

Decision Date: 26-02-2008 Refused Appeal:10-OCT-08 Allowed

60953/APP/2010/93 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

Conversion of dwelling to 1 one-bedroom and 1 two- bedroom flats, part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side and alterations to front.

Decision Date: 23-04-2010 Refused Appeal:

60953/APP/2011/1214 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

Conversion of dwelling to 1, two-bedroom flat and 1 studio flat, part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side and alterations to front.

Decision Date: 22-11-2011 Approved Appeal:

60953/APP/2012/2311 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

Details pursuant to conditions 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 16 of Planning Permission 60953/APP/2011/1214 dated 29/11/2011 (Conversion of dwelling to 1, two-bedroom flat and 1 studio flat, part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side and alterations to front)

Decision Date: 26-11-2012 Refused Appeal:

60953/APP/2015/1944 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 3.5 metres, for which the maximum height would be 3.7 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.9 metres

Decision Date: 01-07-2015 PRN Appeal:

60953/APP/2015/2015 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

Decision Date: 01-07-2015 Approved Appeal:

60953/APP/2015/466 61 Adelphi Crescent Hayes

Conversion of dwelling to 1 two-bedroom flat and 1 studio flat, part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side and alterations to front

Decision Date: 17-03-2015 NFA Appeal:

Comment on Planning History

There has been an extensive planning history at this site which is as follows:

60953/APP/2015/2015 - Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development) APPROVED

60953/APP/2015/1944 - Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 3.5 metres, for which the maximum height would be 3.7 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.9 metres. APPROVED

60953/APP/2011/1214 - Conversion of dwelling to 1, two-bedroom flat and 1 studio flat, part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side and alterations to front.APPROVED

60953/APP/2010/93 - Conversion of dwelling to 1 one-bedroom and 1 two- bedroom flats, part two storey, part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side and alterations to front. Refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal does not provide direct and convenient access to the rear garden area, and would result in the occupants of the first floor level flat having to gain access to the rear amenity area, by walking past the habitable room windows of the ground floor unit. This would result in a loss of privacy to the occupants of the ground floor unit and would fail to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation to the future occupants of the ground floor flat, contrary to policies BE19, BE24 and H7 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved policies September 2007) and section 4.12 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposal would result in the dining/living room and kitchen windows of the ground floor unit being overlooked from the communal garden when used by the future occupiers of the first floor flat resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy. As such, the proposal fails to afford an acceptable standard of internal living conditions and residential amenity to the future occupiers of the ground floor unit contrary to policies BE19 and BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

3. The floorspace of the proposed one bedroom first floor unit would be below the required 50sq.m for a one bedroom unit. As such, the internal size is inadequate and fails to provide an acceptable standard of amenity for future occupiers contrary to policy 4B.1 of the London Plan, policies BE19 and H7 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and section 4.6 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Layout.

4. The proposal fails to meet the requirements of lifetime homes and is thus contrary to London Plan policy 4B.5 and to the adopted Supplementary Planning Document Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon.

5. The proposal would result in inadequate provision for car parking which would be likely to cause on-street parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), paragraph 4.33 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts and the Council's Parking Standards (Annex 1, adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, Saved Policies, September 2007)

60953/APP/2007/3280 - ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE) was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed extensions, by reason of their scale, design and form, would fail to harmonise with the appearance of the original house including its characteristic roof form which includes large overhanging eaves and a flattening of the roof slope towards the edges and would not remain subordinate to it. As such, the accumulation of extensions would be detrimental to the appearance of the original house and the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Borough's adopted Unitary Development Plan and Design Principles 3.0, 4.0, 5.0 and 6.0 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions.

2. The proposed first floor rear extension by reason of its siting, shallow mono-pitch roof profile and design would not harmonise with appearance of the rear elevation of the original house. It would detract from the appearance of the original house and the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies BE13, BE15 & BE19 of the Borough's adopted Unitary Development Plan and design principles 6.6 and 6.7 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions.

3. The proposal, having regard to the size of the enlarged accommodation, would fail to maintain an adequate amount of amenity space for the occupiers of the enlarged property, and as such would result in an overintensive use of the remainder of the garden to the detriment of the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies BE19 and BE23 of the Borough's adopted Unitary Development Plan and paragraph 3.13 of the HDAS Residential Extensions.

An Appeal was subsequently allowed. The Inspector advised that the roof of the extension would match that over the existing house, in terms of side hip, eaves height and materials but with a lower ridge height. The appellant has pointed out that the flared shape of the roof is not properly reflected in the submitted plans but emphasises that it would be the intentior to replicate this in the roof over the extension. Subject to this detail being incorporated in the design the extension would harmonise well with the existing house and appear satisfactory in the street scene in compliance with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan.

Prior to this appeal application reference 60953/APP/2006/2483 for the erection of a part single storey, part two storey side extension and single storey rear extension involving the

demolition of the garage was refused and dismissed at appeal.

The Inspector advised that the cumulative effect of the side extension, together with the rear extension and variety of roof forms, produce an awkward looking and overdeveloped property that would occupy too much of this prominent corner plot.

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

9 Neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 14.10.15 and a site notice was displayed which expired on 13.11.15. A second set of consultation letters was sent out on 14.12.15 after the application was re-validated.

3 letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns:

1. The retrospective nature of the development.

2. The loss of privacy resulting from the rear dormer

3. The 2011 planning permission has expired and the ground floor extension is therefore built without planning permission.

4. Possible HMO use and inadequate parking in a busy, congested area which has a busy bus route.

5. The first floor side extension would exacerbate the visual impact in combination with the loft conversion.

6. Loss of light resulting from rear extension

Officer note: The loft conversion benefits from a valid Certificate of Lawful Development and the overlooking resulting from this element is not a material planning consideration. The rear extension benefits from a Prior Approval and loss of light resulting from this is not a material planning considered. Whilst the 2011 has expired, the single storey side extension is built as permitted development.

The application has been called to committee for consideration by a Ward Councillor.

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:

- 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.
- 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 considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden and car parking provision.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design. Furthermore policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) resist any development which would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or would fail to safeguard the design of existing and adjoining sites.

It has been acknowledged by an appeal Inspector in 2006 that the site is located in a prominent corner plot. The scheme dismissed at appeal, which did not involve the loft conversion, was considered to be an over-development of the plot. Since that appeal was dismissed there have been a number of planning permissions, a certificate of lawful development and a prior approval for further additions to this this property (as detailed above). The extended property is at odds with the adjoining property at Number 59 Adelphi Crescent which has its original hipped roof. There is currently a lack of symmetry.

The addition of the first floor extension above the authorised ground floor extension would further unbalance this semi-detached property and appear as an incongruous overdevelopment in this prominent corner position. This is exacerbated further by the fact that the extension is not set back at both levels by 1m in accordance with the Council's guidance contained within HDAS Residential Extensions. The purpose of the guidance is to ensure that extensions appear subordinate in appearance to the main house. Whilst it is acknowledged that the ground floor exists, the first floor is not set back by the required 1m and only has a very minimal set down from the main ridge of the roof. There is a lack of a meaningful visual break between the front face of the existing house and the front of the proposed extension which prevents it appearing sufficiently subordinate. As a result it is considered that it would have a negative impact upon the visual amenity of the site and the surrounding area in conflict with 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).

The extension would be screened from the adjoining property at Number 59 Adelphi Crescent by the host dwelling and would not therefore give rise to a loss of residential amenity. Furthermore in view of the separation between the flank wall of the proposed extension and that at adjacent number 3 Adelphi Way, with the garages between, the proposed extension would not give rise to an unacceptable loss of light or outlook. No windows are proposed in the flank elevation and as such the extension would not give rise to an unacceptable loss of privacy. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development in compliance with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the extension, would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (November 2012) and subsequent London Plan Housing Policy Transition Statement (May 2015).

The proposal would not give rise to a loss of garden space and is therefore considered acceptable in accordance with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

A number of concerns have been raised by neighbours regarding the possible HMO use and the increased demand for parking in an area which is heavily congested due to the nearby shops and bus routes. The application property is shown on the submitted plans as a single private dwelling which would require 2 car parking spaces to comply with the Council's parking standards. Two spaces are provided. As such the proposal would comply with Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed first floor side extension, by reason of its siting in a visually prominent location, size, scale and design in combination with the existing extensions to the property, its inadequate set back from the main front and set down from the main ridge, would fail to harmonise with the appearance of the existing dwelling and would accentuate the imbalance in the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part. As such, the accumulation of extensions would result in an over-development, detrimental to the 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 - 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 Council's 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
---------	--------------------------

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.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments

