

as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007) and lies within an area covered by TPO No. 160. However there are no protected trees on or close to the application property.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This is the third application that has been submitted which includes a single storey rear extension.

The originally refused scheme (ref. 63559/APP/2007/2838) proposed a front extension/porch with a canopy roof that extended across the whole of the front elevation at ground floor level. The front porch was set flush with the southern flank wall and measured 2.7m wide, set 300mm from the existing front bay window, 1.5m deep and was finished with a mono-pitched canopy roof supported by a column, 2.3m high at eaves level and 3.2m high at its highest point. The existing entrance door along the southern flank wall was shown to be relocated to the front.

The proposed single storey rear extension measured 5.6m wide for the full width of the application property, 3m deep and was finished with a mono-pitched roof 2.5m high at eaves level and 3.4m high at its highest point. The single storey side link was located between the southern flank wall of the application property and the detached side garage. It was set flush with the front wall of the garage and the rear wall of the proposed rear extension and comprised a door at each end. This element of the scheme measured 0.9m wide, 5.2m deep and was shown to be finished with a front/ rear pitched roof matching the height and angle of the proposed mono-pitched roof of the rear extension.

The proposed side element provided a link between the proposed rear extension and the side garage. It was also proposed to convert the garage to habitable purposes comprising a study and WC.

The latest refused scheme (ref. 52982/APP/2007/3781) attempted to overcome the reason for refusal of the previous scheme by omitting the canopy roof section of the front porch. The front porch measured 2.7m wide, 1.5m deep and was finished with a mono-pitched roof 2.3m high at eaves level and 3.1m high at its highest point. The remainder of the scheme was as per the previously refused scheme.

This current application attempts to overcome the reason for refusal of the previous scheme by omitting the front porch and the part single storey side element, retaining the detached side garage as a garage, and by replacing the mono-pitched roof with a flat roof and reducing the height of the roof from 2.3m to 3.1m to 2.6m high.

The proposed single storey rear extension would now measure 6.5m wide, covering the full width of the application property and extending to the flank wall of the existing side garage thereby infilling the gap between the application property and the garage in the rear garden. It would be 3m deep and finished with a flat roof, 2.6m high with two rooflights. A door is proposed in the wall of the proposed single storey rear extension between the application property and the side garage facing the street. It would provide access to the open area along the side of the application property. A new ground floor side window is proposed to replace an existing side door to the house facing the side garage. The applicant has confirmed that the property originally provided two bedrooms and two box rooms but an internal partition wall has been removed so that it now provides

two bedrooms and a box room.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

63559/APP/2007/2838 8 Pastures Mead Hillingdon

ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION WITH PITCHED ROOF, SINGLE-STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE USE.

Decision Date: 07-11-2007 Refused

63559/APP/2007/3781 8 Pastures Mead Hillingdon

ERECTION OF A FRONT PORCH, SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE USE.

Decision Date: 18-04-2008 Refused

Comment on Planning History

Planning permission (ref: 63559/APP/2007/2838) for the erection of a single-storey front extension with pitched roof, single-storey side and rear extension and conversion of garage to habitable use was refused, under delegated powers, on the 7th November 2007 for the following reason:

'The proposed front canopy, by reason of its siting, excessive width and design, would represent an incongruous and visually intrusive addition that would detract from the appearance of the original house and the street scene generally, contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Borough's Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2007 and section 8.0 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: 'Residential Extensions'.'

Members may recall that a planning application (ref: 63559/APP/2007/3781) for the erection of a front porch, single storey side and rear extension and conversion of garage to habitable use, was reported to the Central & South Planning Committee on 8 April 2008 with a recommendation to grant planning permission. However, Members resolved to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

'The proposals would represent an unduly dominant and unneighbourly overdevelopment of the site, due to the siting and scale of the proposed rear extension, the reduction in amenity space and unsatisfactory parking arrangements. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policies BE20, BE21, BE23 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.'

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:

5 adjoining owner/occupiers have been consulted. 6 letters of objection (2 from same objector) and a petition with 19 signatures from the Pastures Mead Residents' Association have been received making the following comments:

Letters of objection:

All the points made in the petition (see below) have been re-iterated, together with the following points:

- (i) The proposal will result in two separate residences with insufficient off-street parking and amenity space for the units.
- (ii) Increase in on-street parking
- (iii) Loss of sunlight to living room and study of No. 6 Pastures Mead
- (iv) Insufficient rear garden would remain leading to flooding
- (v) The proposal would result in a house in multiple occupation
- (vi) The plans are inconsistent - the side and rear elevation plans misrepresent the true height of the extension
- (vii) Company businesses are registered at the application property. These businesses lead to additional on-street parking
- (viii) Insufficient time to make proper representation
- (ix) Present occupant is a medical surgeon and property could be used as a surgery, with ground floor reception, waiting room and consulting room.

Petition:

As the above planning application for a rear extension is virtually the same as the previous ones which were refused, our strong objections still stand as follows:

1. The proposed plans show over-development of an extremely small, centre plot.
2. Their proposed rear extension will leave them with almost no back garden and exacerbate flooding problems. It shows excessive development: when nos. 6, 12 and 7 extended to the rear of their properties were not allowed to build across the entire back of the house, which they are proposing to do.
3. The current owners also park their second car on their front lawn and a third car on the shared access driveway with No. 10. If they include their garage as living accommodation (as indicated in the drawing) this will add to ongoing parking issues in the close. These are soon to be made worse when people begin to take residence of the 21 new flats in Hillingdon Gardens. Hercies Road residents already park in the 8 designated residence parking spots in our road.
4. Building on and converting more land and reducing green space will worsen the flooding potential.
5. Although the new plans show the living room returned to its former use (in the earlier plans it was shown as a bedroom), we are concerned that this is in name only as there is now an additional downstairs shower room indicated. As there is currently just one couple living in this 4 bed roomed, 2 bath roomed house, this implies that the house is being extended and converted from a family home to a rental development for multiple occupancy. Our small close will be unable to accommodate the potentially large increase in residents and visitors cars.

6. The resulting loss of outside amenity space (of a 7.7m rear garden, this extension will take up approximately 3.2m) leaving only a 4m rear garden which is insufficient for a 4/5 bedroom family residence.

7. The location plan is incorrect as the boundary line indicated infers that the access driveway belongs to No. 8 when it is in fact shared with No. 10. This affects the number of off-street parking spaces they actually have.

8. The drawing indicates that the extension will be structurally attached to the garage (by way of creation of a new cavity wall). We understand that this is not permissible and adds to our concerns that people may live in the garage (encouraging unsuitable living conditions and pushing their cars onto the street).

9. A business (Jinhua Indus Enterprises Pvt. Ltd) is registered as operating from No. 8 Pastures Mead (source Companies House) and we have concerns that this may relate to the intention to extend the property as it was incorporated on 20th December 2007 (when the previous planning application was made). Also, on the internet (source RightMove.co.uk) this address is registered as flats, not a detached residence.

10. As with the previous application, this has been submitted during the Christmas holiday season and having only received notification of this further application 7 days into the 21 day period for objection, we have serious concerns that the owner of No. 10 may be away on holiday and will not return until after this period has expired. Whilst we cannot object on his behalf, we are aware that he objected strongly to the original proposal and trust that this will be taken into consideration in his absence.

North Uxbridge Residents' Association - No comments received

Officer's comments: These points are addressed in the report

INTERNAL:

Trees:

The Site

The site is a detached house, with detached garage set in a modest sized plot, within a cul-de-sac. Although situated within the area covered by TPO No. 160, there are no trees (protected or otherwise) within, or close to, the site.

The Proposal

The proposal is to erect a flat-roofed single-storey rear extension across the width of the rear elevation of the house which will link to the garage at the side of the plot. No vegetation or significant landscape features will be affected by the development. However, the 3.0 metre deep extension will have the affect of reducing the remaining area of amenity space currently provided by the rear garden.

Recommendation

No objection and in this case see no need or opportunity for landscape conditions.

Ward Councillor: Requests that this application is reported to the Planning Committee for determination.

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.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
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): 3.0 Rear Extensions and Conservatories: Single Storey
CACPS	Council's Adopted Car Parking Standards (Annex 1, HUDP, Saved Policies, September 2007)
LPP 4A.3	London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.

5. **MAIN PLANNING ISSUES**

The proposed single storey rear extension has been reduced in height in an attempt to overcome the previous reason for refusal. It is considered that, by reason of its siting, design, appearance and length of projection, it would harmonise with the character and proportions of the original house. The proposed rear extension is considered to appear subordinate, as it would be set sufficiently below the cill level of the rear first floor windows. Furthermore, it is not considered to detract from the visual amenities of the surrounding area as there are other properties in the street that have single storey rear extensions, notably at No. 6 Pastures Mead. As such, the proposal would comply with policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007) and section 3.0 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions.

The proposed single storey rear extension would not project more than 3.6m deep or exceed 3.0m high, in accordance with paragraphs 3.3 and 3.6 of the HDAS: Residential Extensions. The rear elevation of this property aligns with the rear elevation of No. 6 Pastures Mead which is separated from the proposal by approximately 1.5m. The proposed length of projection and height would ensure that the proposal would not result in a visually intrusive and/or overdominant form of development or a significant increase in overshadowing of No. 6, the adjoining property to the north. Furthermore, no side windows are proposed facing this property. The existing side garage would screen the

proposed single storey rear extension and the new side window to the house from No. 10 Pastures Mead to the south. As such, the proposal would not harm the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers and would comply with policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007). The proposal would therefore partially overcome the reason for refusal of the previous planning application ref. 63559/APP/2007/3781 as regards its impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

The new windows would provide an adequate outlook and natural light to the rooms they would serve, in accordance with Policy BE20 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007) and London Plan Policy 4A.3.

The new door in the proposed rear extension facing the street would essentially replace an existing side door to the house which would be replaced with a window. The internal arrangements of the application property would remain as a dwellinghouse and this could be secured by way of a planning condition. Furthermore, the registration of a business at the application property does not suggest that a material change of use has occurred.

At present the existing rear garden measures approximately 64sq.m. The proposed development would reduce this to approximately 43m². The applicant has confirmed that the application property is a three bedroom house, including the remaining box room. Given this, the resultant garden area would fail to meet the recommended minimum standard of 60m² for a three bedroom property as advised at paragraph 3.13 of the HDAS: Residential Extensions. As such, it is considered that the proposal does not fully overcome the previous reason for refusal of planning application ref. 63559/APP/2007/3781.

The existing garage would be retained and therefore the proposal would not affect the existing off-street parking arrangements. The proposal would not result in an increase in on-street parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, in accordance with policy AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007) and the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards (Annex 1, HUDP, Saved Policies, September 2007). The proposal would therefore partially overcome that aspect of the reason for refusal of the previous planning application ref. 63559/APP/2007/3781.

The application site lies within an area covered by TPO No. 160, however there are no trees on or close to the proposed development that would be adversely affected. Therefore, the proposal would accord with policy BE38 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007).

With regard to the third party comments, points (i), (ii), (iii), (v) and (vii) and points 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 have been addressed in the report. On points (iv) and 4, the application site does not lie within a flood risk area. On points (vi) and 7, the proposed plans are sufficient for the determination of this planning application and on points (viii) and 10, sufficient time has been allowed for representations to be made. Use as a doctor's surgery does not form part of this application and point 8 is not a building control matter.

For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the application fails to fully overcome the reason for refusal of the previous scheme and this application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NONSC Non Standard Condition

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 adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007) and section 3.0 of the Council's HDAS Design Guide: '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.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
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):

3.0 Rear Extensions and Conservatories: Single Storey

CACPS Council's Adopted Car Parking Standards (Annex 1, HUDP, Saved Policies, September 2007)


LPP 4A.3 London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.

Contact Officer: Sonia Bowen

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. All rights reserved. London Borough of Hillingdon 100019283 2008

Site Address	
8 Pastures Mead Hillingdon	
Planning Application Ref:	Scale
63559/APP/2008/3504	1:1,250
Planning Committee	Date
Central and South	February 2009

**LONDON BOROUGH
OF HILLINGDON**

**Planning &
Community Services**

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



HILLINGDON

Page 01 of 14