

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

**Address** 66 FAIRWAY AVENUE WEST DRAYTON

**Development:** Installation of a side dormer and enlargement of roofspace to create habitable accommodation including the erection of a single storey front extension and installation of a porch

**LBH Ref Nos:** 29143/APP/2017/3100

**Drawing Nos:** Z/549/03 Rev. A  
Z/549/02 Rev. A  
Z/549/01 Rev. A  
LP-66.

**Date Plans Received:** 24/08/2017      **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 24/08/0017

**Date Application Valid:** 31/08/2017

### 1. CONSIDERATIONS

#### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a detached extended bungalow that is located to the North of Fairway Avenue. Its principal elevation faces South. The existing property at No 66 Fairway Avenue comprises a single storey flat roof rear extension. The site backs onto a railway line. The adjacent dwelling to the East (no 64) is a bungalow and to the West is a two-storey semi-detached property.

The application site is situated in 'West Drayton Garden City Area of Special Local Character' (ASLC). Fairway Avenue comprises varying architectural styles with a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. The area is characterised by dwellings with generous front gardens. Fairway Avenue features grass verges and mature and semi-mature trees.

#### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal involves increasing the height of the roof and the installation of a side dormer to create habitable accommodation. The proposal also includes the erection of a single storey front extension and the installation of a porch to front.

The overall height of the existing dwelling would increase from approximately 5 metres to 7 metres. The side dormer window would have set-ins from the sides and eaves of at least 1 metre but a 0.5 metre set-in from the apex. It is indicated as having an obscure glazed window and it will serve a bathroom/wc.

The front extension would be 1m deep and 5m wide. The porch would be 1.5 metres deep by 2.7 metres wide and 2.7 metres high.

#### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

29143/A/91/1362      66 Fairway Avenue West Drayton

Erection of a pair of semi-detached houses (involving demolition of existing bungalow) (outline application)

**Decision Date:** 07-02-1992      Refused      **Appeal:**

29143/APP/2010/1425      66 Fairway Avenue West Drayton

Single storey rear extension to include alterations to existing side and demolition of existing conservatory to rear.

**Decision Date:** 27-08-2010      Approved      **Appeal:**

29143/APP/2014/2863      66 Fairway Avenue West Drayton

Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 metres, for which the maximum height would be 2.5 metres, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.5 metres

**Decision Date:** 30-09-2014      Refused      **Appeal:**

29143/APP/2014/3827      66 Fairway Avenue West Drayton

Single storey rear extension

**Decision Date:** 08-01-2015      Refused      **Appeal:** 14-JUL-15      Allowed

#### **Comment on Planning History**

Prior Approval application (ref: 29143/APP/2014/2863) was refused for a 6 m extension to which a neighbour objected. The officer's report acknowledged a large existing rear extension at No 64 of a comparable depth, however concern was raised regarding the loss of light and the overbearing impact to side windows.

29143/APP/2014/3827 for a single-storey rear extension was refused but allowed on appeal. One reason for refusal related to impact on No. 64 Fairway Avenue. In response, the appeal inspector commented -

"The neighbouring property (No 64) has a substantial rearward single storey extension comparable to that proposed. The concern over residential amenity stems from fears over impact upon a side window in this neighbouring property. However that window is well down the flank away from the rear elevation and already faces and is close to a blank wall on the appeal site. Outlook is presently minimal, light would be restricted currently and the orientation is such that sunlight will be already very limited. To my mind the addition of a further two metres of flat roofed extension in a Northerly direction to the West of this neighbouring property would make very little difference to the benefits currently gained by the window in question. To the other side there would be sufficient separation distances between the appeal proposal and No 68 to prevent any loss of residential amenity in that direction."

The Inspector considered the proposal to have a low impact to the character of the area. That extension has been implemented.

## **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**

Neighbouring residents were consulted upon the application on 04/09/2017. Two objections were received to the application raising following issues -

1. Previous proposal for a smaller extension was refused;
2. Serious loss of light;
3. The volume of the house would significantly increased and its bulk and length may appear excessive compared to that of its neighbours;
4. The initial decision on the previous application (29143/APP/2014/3827) described the modest single storey rear extension as "- detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 64 Fairway Avenue by reason of over-dominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook" and also "- detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing property and to the visual amenities of the wider Garden City, West Drayton Area of Special Local Character". The refusal was overturned on appeal, but it is considered that the same comments are applicable to the present application; the bungalow to the East will certainly notice a loss of afternoon light in the back garden and the bulk of the proposed new roof will be ever-present; and
5. Though many dwellings in this Area of Special Local Character have been substantially extended, the current proposals would have a very obvious negative impact on the streetscape, closing gaps and reducing sightlines.

Officer comments - The issues raised are considered within the report.

#### **INTERNAL CONSULTEES**

Flood and Water management - The property is shown in Flood Zone 2, which can be found on the Environment Agency website and so a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must be submitted. The FRA must establish the level of risk to the property and also identify exactly how that risk will be managed. The application should be refused as an FRA has not been provided to assess the risk to the property and show how it is managed to ensure the future occupants will be safe.

Officer comment: The objection was discussed with the flood and water management officer who agreed that the very small scale of the additions at ground floor level (6sq.m) is such that a condition might be possible to address how the extensions can be designed to ensure the future occupants will be safe. That with the very limited footprint increase it might also be hard to argue an in principle objection based on failure to provide a flood risk assessment (typically, although not in this case, very small additions to dwellings will also be permitted development). Nonetheless it was also advised that it would be a matter of officers to argue that such an approach in this case did not set an undesirable precedent.

Conservation and Urban Design - The proposal would dramatically alter the original built form of the property.

### **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.
BE5	New development within 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.
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	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

## 5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues being considered are the impact that the proposed extension on the adjacent neighbouring properties, the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the character and appearance on the street scene.

### DESIGN

The property is situated within the Garden City West Drayton Area of Special Character. It has the outward appearance of a modest bungalow with mock Tudor features. The adjacent bungalow to the East has similar features whilst the properties to the West are more traditional 1930's semi-detached two-storey dwellings.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all development to achieve a high quality of design in extensions, making a positive contribution to the area in terms of layout, form, scale and materials and protecting the amenity of surrounding land and buildings particularly residential properties.

Similarly, the policies contained in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two-Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) require new development to harmonise with the street scene (Policy BE13) and the form, scale and proportions of the original building (Policy BE15) whilst complementing the surrounding residential area in which it is situated (Policy BE19).

The existing dwelling and its neighbour No. 64 Fairway Avenue are of similar design and form a distinct pair. Together they provide an important visual gap between two-storey semi-detached dwellings with views to trees beyond. Together they, therefore, make an important contribution to the street scene in this part of the ASLC.

The Council's adopted SPD, the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008) ( HDAS), sets out the design criteria for the scale and form of loft conversions and roof alterations which will generally be considered acceptable. Roof extensions will be accepted on bungalows, however these should appear subordinate to the size of the roof face within which it will be set. The guidance notes adequate set-ins (of at least 1.0 metre on detached dwellings) should be achieved from the ridge, sides and eaves and dormer windows that are too wide will be refused.

The dormer proposed is disproportionate and does not relate well to the roof form of the existing house. The proposed increase in height and the pronounced pitched roof coupled with inclusion of a large side dormer would result in a significant change to the scale of the original dwelling. The proposed side dormer together with the increase in height would result in an incongruous and excessively bulky box like addition to the existing dwelling. The symmetry and original proportions of this dwelling would be lost. The major change to the roof, both in terms of height and general form, including a side dormer with insufficient set-in from the apex of the roof are not considered to be in keeping with the ASLC and surrounding area generally.

The proposal includes a front extension at ground floor level with a depth of 1m and a width of 5m, this element of the proposal is considered acceptable.

With regard to porches paragraph 8.2 of the HDAS states that they should be individually designed to follow the character of the existing building. Porches should be subordinate in scale and should not be detrimental to the street scene. They should generally be confined to the front entrance area. It is considered that the proposed porch will be subordinate the existing dwelling and is unlikely to detrimentally harm the wider character of the area.

The proposal is not considered to be appropriate in terms of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19 and HDAS.

#### AMENITY

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two-Saved UDP Policies seek to safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupiers by reason of their daylight and sunlight (Policy BE20), outlook due to bulk and proximity (Policy BE21) and privacy (Policy BE24). HDAS sets out the criteria by which these potential impacts are measured or assessed with regard to angles of light and the position of habitable room or kitchen windows.

The appeal Inspector under planning ref: 29143/APP/2014/3827 allowed at appeal considered the impact of the further rear single storey extension on both neighbouring properties (full quotation set out in Planning History) . It was concluded that the addition of a further two metres of flat roofed extension in a Northerly direction to the West of this neighbouring property would make very little difference to the benefits currently gained by the neighbouring resident's side window.

This application considers the impact of this application and the extension allowed at appeal. The side window at No 64 serves a kitchen and appears to be its only source of natural light. As such, in this case, and given the orientation of the building, it is considered that the substantial increase in height together with the addition of a dormer window facing towards No. 64 by reason of its overall size, scale, bulk, siting and length of projection, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 64 Fairway Avenue by reason of over-dominance, 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.

There is sufficient separation distances between the application property and No 68 Fairway Avenue and as such the proposal is unlikely to harm the amenity of occupiers at No 68.

## FLOOD RISK

Whilst the Flood Risk Management Officer has recommended refusal, officers consider that the proposed extensions and porch on the front elevation are of such modest scale that a reason for refusal on this basis could not be sustained at appeal; that some form of condition requiring measures to ensure that the porch/front extension is designed appropriately to mitigate risk from flooding will suffice in this case.

## CONCLUSION

It is considered that the development, particularly the proposed alterations to the roof form and the addition of the side dormer would be harmful to the character of the dwelling (No. 64), neighbouring property and the wider ASLC. It is also considered that the proposal would be harmful to the residential amenities of No. 64. The application is recommended for refusal.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

### **REFUSAL for the following reasons:**

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

The increase in height of the roof form and the addition of a bulky side dormer window would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of single-storey dwellings and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area which is within the Garden City West Drayton Area of Special Character. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, 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 would significantly increase the size, scale, bulk and height of the property and it is considered that this would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 64 Fairway Avenue by reason of over-dominance, 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.

## 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.
BE5	New development within 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.
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	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments

**Contact Officer:** Cris Lancaster

**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:

**66 Fairway Avenue**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON**  
**Residents Services**  
**Planning Section**  
 Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW  
 Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111

Planning Application Ref:  
**29143/APP/2017/3100**

Scale:  
**1:1,250**

Planning Committee:  
**Central & South**

Date:  
**November 2017**

