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

Address 53 WIELAND ROAD NORTHWOOD

**Development:** Two storey side/rear extension

LBH Ref Nos: 28044/APP/2016/2888

Drawing Nos: 5369/A100 Rev. B 5369/A101 Rev. B TS15-332T1 TS15-332T2 TS15-332T3 5369/A102 Rev. B 5369/A103 Rev. B

Date Plans Received:26/07/2016Date Application Valid:26/07/2016

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

#### 1. CONSIDERATIONS

#### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a period detached property situated on the south eastern side of Wieland Road. The property benefits from a good sized landscaped front garden set behind a well established hedge. It has a central pathway leading between two lawned areas to the front door. To the side there is a driveway, which can accommodate 2 cars and leads to a detached single garage. To the rear is a large landscaped garden enclosed with hedges. The principle elevation faces North West.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising two storey detached properties. The property is set behind open grass verges which are a characteristic of this area.

The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and lies within the Gatehill Farm Estate Area of Special Local Character.

#### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks permission for the erection of a two storey side/rear extension. The proposed side extension measures 4m in width and 14.2m in depth, including a rear projection of 6m. The extension then returns across the full width of the rear elevation (16.2m including the side extension) and is set beneath an extended roof of a height to match the existing. This includes two rear hipped projections with a valley between. There is a small section of single storey to the front of the garage and level with the existing front projection which has a crown roof detail of 3.6m in height.

#### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

28044/APP/2015/4173 53 Wieland Road Northwood

Part two storey, part single storey side extension and two storey rear extension

Decision Date: 14-01-2016 Refused

Appeal:

### Comment on Planning History

28044/APP/.2015/4173 - Part two storey, part single storey side extension and two storey rear extension (refused)

The previous application was refused on the basis of the scale, bulk and design of the proposal, the impact on the neighbouring property and the closing of the significant gap between the properties.

#### 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

6 neighbours and the Gatehill Residents Association were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 29 August 2016. A site notice was also erected on the lamp post on the junction of Wieland Road and Elgood Avenue. There were 3 responses received from neighbouring properties who raised the following issues:

- The proposal does not comply with HDAS as it is not set back 1.5m from the side boundary

- The owner has failed to issue Certificate B to the Gatehill Residents Association as owners of all verges

- The proposed development is over two and a half times the size of the existing house and is not subservient

- Does not respect the architectural style of the original dwelling

- Does not allow sufficient space for landscaping

- The only change involves bringing the eaves down on the north east elevation resulting in an incongruous and unbalanced elevation out of sympathy with the original dwelling which it overwhelms

- A rear extension of 6m in depth breached HDAS guidance

- Overlooking from the side velux windows
- It appears to breach the 45 degree rule in respect of no. 51 Wieland
- The new driveway reduces the landscaping to the front to less than 25%
- Substantial overdevelopment
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy

A petition of 69 signatures against the proposal was also received which repeats the above objections.

Officer note: The agent has previously advised the land is within the clients ownership and the correct certificate has been signed. Issues of landownership are not material planning considerations and are a civil issue to be resolved between interested parties. Any subsequent grant of planning approval does not override any other legislation or rights of ownership. Other issues raised are addressed in the report.

Northwood Residents Association: No response has been received

Northwood Hills Residents Association: No response has been received

Trees/Landscaping - This site is covered by TPO 172, however no protected trees will be affected. There is a line of mature Leyland Cypresses along the rear/side boundary (between 51 an 53, the roots of which may be affected by construction. However this is a private matter - these trees are not valuable enough to constrain development.

Highways - No objection

### 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
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

AM14	New development and car parking standards.
BE5	New development within areas of special local character
BE6	New development within Gate Hill Farm and Copsewood Estates areas of special local character
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.
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

#### 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 Gatehill Farm Estate Area of Special Local Character, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings and provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property. Put simply, are the previous reasons for refusal overcome by this scheme?

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings and the public realm contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place. Policies BE5, BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that the layout and appearance of new development should "harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area." The NPPF (2011) notes the importance of achieving design which is appropriate to its context stating that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'

HDAS advises that extensions should always be designed so as to appear 'subordinate' to the original house. Rear extensions will only be allowed where there is no significant overdominance, overshadowing, loss of outlook or daylight. In particular, a two storey rear extension should not protrude out too far from the rear wall of the original house and should not extend beyond a 45 degree line of sight from adjacent first floor windows. If this can be achieved, then the maximum depth of 4m for a detached property should not be exceeded. For two storey side extensions, the width and height should be considerably less than that of the original dwelling and for single storey extensions the roof height should not exceed 3.4m at the highest point.

Paragraph 5.1 of the HDAS, requires all residential extensions and buildings of two or more storeys in height to be set back a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary for the full height of the building. This protects the character and appearance of the street scene and protects the gaps between properties. Furthermore Policy BE22 requires all two storey side extensions within the Gatehill Farm Estate to be a minimum of 1.5m from the boundary on all levels. The properties within Gatehill Farm are set within spacious plots and the set in distances assist in retaining this spacious character and visual separation. For single storey extensions the roof height should not exceed 3.4m at the highest point.

This is a substantial extension of more than double the footprint of the original building (from 182.8sqm to 435.7sqm). The proposed side extension brings the development virtually up the boundary of the site, with just a maximum of 0.5m separation towards the front. At the rear the proposed two storey full width extension at 6m in depth is a very large addition in excess of HDAS requirements. It is noted that the proposed amendments to the roof form over the rear extension go some way to addressing the previous concerns over the triple pitch hips, but it is considered that the overall scale of the proposed development is not subordinate to the original dwelling and would be a bulky and incongruous addition. Furthermore the proposed side extension built up to the boundary with no. 51 Wieland Road would result in a cramped development at odds with the spacious character of the road and wider area. The proposals are therefore considered unacceptable.

As such it is considered that the proposal significantly increases the width, depth and bulk of the original house and is not subordinate to the original dwelling. Therefore the proposal fails to accord with the requirements of Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The new windows for the principle rooms face the rear garden or the front of the property. There are first floor windows and roof windows proposed on the side elevations but as these will serve bathrooms they could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.8m. It is therefore considered there would be no additional loss of privacy to that already existing. It is acknowledged that both the adjacent properties extend further to the rear than the application site and that the proposed extension would not project significantly further to the rear than the deepest point of these dwellings. However it is noted that bedroom no. 2 of no. 51 is recessed from the central projection and would be set back 4.4m from the end of the proposed two storey extension situated just 1.5m to the side.

It is therefore considered that the proposals would harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining detached property from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over-dominance and that the proposal would breach the 45 degree line of sight from the adjacent property no. 51. As such, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Paragraph 5.13 of Residential Extensions. HDAS: Residential Extensions requires sufficient garden space to be retained as a consequence of an extension. The property benefits from a good sized rear garden and adequate garden space would be retained. Concern has been raised that the proposed driveway would result in less than 25% landscaping to the front, however even excluding the green verge to the front approximately 50% of the landscaping is shown to be retained.

The proposal incorporates a new integral garage which replaces the detached garage to be demolished and provides a new driveway to the front which would accommodate sufficient parking provision.

The previous reasons for refusal have not been overcome in this scheme, and this application is therefore recommended for refusal.

### 6. **RECOMMENDATION**

**REFUSAL** for the following reasons:

## 1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extensions, by reason of their size, scale, bulk and design would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the visual amenity of the street scene and the wider Gatehill Farm Estate Area of Special Local Character. Therefore the proposal would 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 Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

### 2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey side/rear extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 51 Wieland Road by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of

the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

# **3** NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its size, scale, height and siting within 1.5m of the side boundary, would result in the closing of the significant gap between the properties necessary to maintain a visual separation harmonious with the character of the area. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the character and visual amenities of the street scene and the wider Gatehill Farm Estate Area of Special Local Character. 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, BE19 and BE22 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 (2016). 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.
- 2 In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the 'Saved' UDP 2007, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service. It is also noted this is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme where the Officer Report and Reasons for Refusal specifically identify issues to be addressed.

### 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:	
	AM14	New development and car parking standards.
	BE5	New development within areas of special local character
	BE6	New development within Gate Hill Farm and Copsewood Estates areas of special local character
	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.
	LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
	NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
	HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

**Telephone No:** 01895 250230

