

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 26 BROADWOOD AVENUE RUISLIP

Development: Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front roof lights, 6 side roof lights and alterations to elevations

LBH Ref Nos: 16080/APP/2017/1893

Drawing Nos: 2160301-3 Rev A
SCP2160301-001
2160301-3
2160301-2 Rev A
2160301-1

Date Plans Received: 23/05/2017 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 23/05/2017

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the northern side of Broadwood Avenue. The original property comprised a two storey detached house with two storey front projection, with white render and black timber detailing set above brick at ground floor. To the side was a single storey garage and to the rear there was a single storey flat roofed extension across the width of the dwelling. The property has now been extended including a two storey side extension; a part two storey, part-single storey rear extension, including to the rear of the side extension and the conversion of the roofspace including the raising of the ridge and eaves height and 1 side dormer window; 2 rear dormer windows and rooflights to the sides and front. To the front there is an area of hardstanding providing parking for at least 2 cars and there is also a large landscaped rear garden.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising mainly large detached houses of a variety of designs.

The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). The site is also covered by TPO 277.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This is a retrospective planning permission to address the differences from the approved plans (under application 16080/APP/2016/1142) to the built scheme, for the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and the conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front roof lights, 6 side roof lights and alterations to elevations.

It is noted that the plan submitted with this application denoting the application as approved is plan number 2160301-1, however this was superseded during the consideration of

application 16080/APP/2016/1142 and replaced by 2160301-1 Rev. A, which was the approved plan. In consideration of this proposal the changes as built from the approved plan have regard to Rev A, not the plan as submitted.

Also the previously approved application required the proposed extension to have materials to match the original dwelling, which has not been done. During this application process a revised front elevation has been submitted to show a proposed amendment to the front elevation.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

16080/A/89/2208 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

To fell Oak Tree (T14) on TPO 277

Decision Date: 22-03-1990 Approved **Appeal:**

16080/APP/2016/1142 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front rooflights, 6 side rooflights and alterations to elevations

Decision Date: 26-07-2016 Approved **Appeal:**

16080/APP/2016/3282 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

Details pursuant to condition 7 (Method Statement) of planning permission Ref: 16080/APP/2016/1142 dated 26/07/2016 (Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front rooflights, 6 side rooflights and alterations to elevations)

Decision Date: 27-10-2016 Approved **Appeal:**

Comment on Planning History

16080/APP/2016/3282 - Details pursuant to condition 7 (Method Statement) of planning permission Ref: 16080/APP/2016/1142 dated 26/07/2016 (approved)

16080/APP/2016/1142 - Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front rooflights, 6 side rooflights and alterations to elevations (approved)

16080/A/89/2208 - To fell an Oak tree (approved)

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

7 neighbouring properties were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 16 June 2017. A site notice was also erected on the lamp post to the front of no. 28 expiring on the 27 June 2017. Five responses were received raising the following issues:

- Overall size and height of the new building is overbearing in nature, an intrusive form of development and detrimental to the street scene
- Fails to comply with the original planning application
- Overdevelopment

- Loss of privacy, the increased height, length and volume has created direct lines of sight into our property
- Loss of light
- Design and materials out of keeping with the street scene
- In breach of local covenants
- Application should have a Sustainable Water Management Plan as Broadwood Avenue is designated as high risk of flooding by surface water
- The design is architecturally alien to the streetscene and does not respect local architecture
- Condition 3 of the original application required materials to match the original dwelling, this has not been done

A letter of support counter signed by 6 persons was submitted.

A petition against the proposal with 35 signatories was submitted.

Officer response: Issues relating to the breach of covenants is a civil legal issue and not a material planning consideration. Any approval of planning consent does not override any other legal requirement. All other issues are addressed within the main report.

Ruislip Resident Association - We support the local resident with regard to the alterations to the dwelling which do not conform with the earlier approval. The applicant claims the height has only been increased by 0.3m but local residents have challenged this. Google street scene of the original house shows the house lower than no. 24 and in harmony with the stepped down eaves and ridge lines forming part of the local scene. The impression now is of a much higher building which disrupts the previous rhythm. Further concerns arise about the height of the new rear extension and the possible breach of front building lines. The new building certainly would appear to be overdominant and is detrimental to the existing street scene.

Agents comments - The roof lights in the side elevation are obscure glazed and fixed shut. Broadwood Avenue contains a wide variety of building styles. There is a range of roof types, including catslide, front gables, hipped, front dormers and mansard. There is also a great variety of eaves heights, including eaves terminating at first floor level, eaves below first floor level window height and many different eaves heights on full two storey dwellings. Similarly ridge heights are not consistent. The following properties are the same height or higher; 8, 11, 19, 22, 24, 30, 46, 55, 57, 60, 77 and 82. The building as built sits comfortably in this context.

Trees/Landscape - The land to the rear is covered by TPO 277. This application is a minor amendment to a previous submission. No objection subject to conditions for Tree protection and landscaping.

Flood and Water Management - The site is identified at risk of surface water flooding in the rear garden according to the Environment Agency Flood Maps. The Council accept that the extension has been built but the drainage plans showing where the surface water from the extension drains to need to be provided. If this drain to the main surface water sewer then a Sustainable Drainage condition should be applied.

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

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 BE13 and BE15 also state that the layout and appearance of new development should harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area.

HDAS: Residential Extensions advises that extension should be designed to be subordinate to the original dwelling. In particular rear extensions should not protrude out too far from the rear wall of the original house. For a detached house an extension up to 4m would be acceptable with a roof height for single storey extensions not exceeding 3.4m. Two storey extensions should not breach the 45-degree line of sight taken from the nearest of the first floor window of any room of the neighbouring property. For side extensions the width should be considerably less than the original dwelling and should be set back 1m from the boundary. It further advises that careful consideration must be given to the proportions and design of any dormer windows.

The two storey side extension measures 2.45m in width (set back from the side boundary by 1m) and 12m in depth, including a two storey rear projection of 4m and a further single storey of 1m. To the rear the part single storey, part two storey extension measures 9.75m in width. The single storey element measures 5m in depth and 3.8m in height. The two storey element is 4m in depth and 6.15m in width, situated on the eastern side of the rear elevation. In terms of scale this aspect of the proposal is consistent with that previously approved and although this was a substantial extension to the property both to the side and rear, given the size of the existing property and the application site as a whole it was not considered that the scale of the proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the building or the wider area.

In consideration of the proposal as built, the walls of the whole building have been raised by 0.3 m, with the extended hipped roof above. This results in a raised ridge and eaves height when compared with the neighbouring properties. This has been combined with the rebuilding of the front fenestration. This has removed the original timber framed detailing within the white finished render set above soft red brick on the front projection and the loss of the central half dormer window. The front projection has been entirely faced with a brown brick and the half dormer has been replaced with an elongated central window and a small hip feature in the roof above. The first floor windows were originally set close beneath the eaves as is characteristic of many properties within the street scene but these are now set 0.3m below the roof. Condition 3 of the approved consent required the proposed extension to be finished in materials to match the existing property to safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to ensure that the development did not have an adverse effect upon the appearance of the existing building. The alterations have significantly changed the character and appearance of the original house, increasing the scale and bulk and resulting in the loss of the original detailing which is characteristic of the wider street scene. A revised front elevation has been submitted showing the re-introduction of the original detailing and the increased depth of the central hipped feature bringing it down over the central window. This is an improvement on the building as built, however this does not address the other concerns raised. It is therefore considered that the proposed development by virtue of its design and increase in height is a bulky and incongruous addition to the streetscene which fails to respect the character of the area and is unacceptable. As such it fails to comply with the requirements of Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and HDAS: Residential Extensions.

Notwithstanding this it is also noted that some of the detailing included within the plans is not consistent with the extensions as built. This includes the rear patio doors to the rear and the position of the rooflights, which are indicated to be situated close together and high up on the roofs slopes but are set further apart and lower on the roof.

HDAS advises that a single storey rear extension up to 4m deep and a height of 3.4m with a pitched roof would be acceptable for a detached house and a two storey rear projection should not compromise a 45 degree line of sight from the first floor windows of the adjacent dwellings. This is to ensure the extension appears subordinate to the original house and would not block daylight and sunlight received by neighbouring properties. The proposed single storey, two storey side extension where it is adjacent to the boundary with no. 24 is set back 1m from the boundary. The neighbouring property is also set back 1m giving a total separation of 2m. It is also noted that the first floor of the neighbouring property has the same rear building line as the existing dwelling but the proposed plans indicate that the proposed two storey extension would not compromise a 45 degree line of sight from the nearest first floor window. With regard to the side window on the eastern

elevation facing no. 24 this is at first floor level, however this is to an en-suite and could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.8m. To the other side no. 28 is a slightly larger property extending slightly deeper into the plot. Revised plans identify that the proposed single storey extension would only project 3m beyond the rear of that property. The side facing dormer window will serve a bedroom which would overlook the rear roof slope of the adjacent property and their private amenity space. However it is noted that the proposed plan shows a further rear dormer serving this bedroom, so the side facing dormer could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.8m in height. All these details are as per the previous submission and were not considered to impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties. However it is noted no. 24 has a side rooflight facing the application site, which serves as the only window to a bedroom. The increased height of the property and resultant increase in the height of the eaves in close proximity to this window is considered to significantly impact on the amenity of the amenity of the occupiers of this room by virtue of loss of light, visual intrusion and over-dominance. 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.

The proposal incorporates the existing attached garage into the proposal and would result in the loss of the associated parking space. However the existing driveway to the front would accommodate sufficient parking provision.

The 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 increased height, size, scale, bulk and design would result in a form of development which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would 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 - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by virtue of its increased height, size, scale, bulk and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 24 Broadwood Avenue by reason of overdominance, 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.

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. The Council's supports pre-application discussions however we have been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

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

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

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 2016 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

26 Broadwood Avenue

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

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

Planning Application Ref:

16080/APP/2017/1893

Scale:

1:1,250

Planning Committee:

North

Date:

October 2017



HILLINGDON
LONDON