

## Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration

**Address** NINE ACRES, ASPREY LANE CAREW ROAD NORTHWOOD

**Development:** Retention of the part two storey, part single storey side / rear extension, and the increase in the height of the roof ridge. Proposed alterations to the roof, involving removal of the two rear gable windows and one rear dormer window, and replacement with new windows within the rear gable ends and a velux window.

**LBH Ref Nos:** 34289/APP/2018/1452

**Drawing Nos:** Drawing No 4  
Drawing No 2  
PA-02  
PA-03  
PA-04  
PA-05  
Drawing No 3  
Drawing No 5  
Nine Acres - Covering Letter - April 2018

**Date Plans Received:** 19/04/2018                      **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**  
**Date Application Valid:** 01/05/2018

### 1. CONSIDERATIONS

#### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey detached dwelling house located in a backland position to the North of Carew Road. It is accessed by a long private driveway (Asprey Lane) which runs between Viceroy Court to the South and the properties fronting Eastbury Road to the West. The properties fronting Kiln Way and Pines Close are situated on the Northern and Eastern boundaries. The property itself has been extensively extended under permitted development with a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension. There is also a part built detached garage to the front.

The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012). The site is also covered by TPO 150 and the Northwood Frithwood Conservation Area runs along the Western and Southern boundaries of the site.

#### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

This householder planning application is for the retention of the part two storey, part single storey side / rear extension, and the increase in the height of the roof ridge. The proposal also includes alterations to the roof, involving removal of the two rear gable windows and one rear dormer window, and replacement with new windows within the rear gable ends and a new velux window.

The application has been submitted following the appeal of an enforcement notice and has

been designed following the inspectorates review of the development undertaken.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

34289/APP/2014/2197 Carisbrooke Carew Road Northwood

Part two, part single storey extension to the front, single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as a garden room, detached double garage to rear and internal alterations (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

**Decision Date:** 22-09-2014      **Approved**      **Appeal:**

34289/APP/2015/277      Nine Acres, Asprey Lane Carew Road Northwood

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, installation of basement involving demolition of existing garage to side (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

**Decision Date:** 25-03-2015      **Approved**      **Appeal:**

34289/APP/2016/4394      Nine Acres, Asprey Lane Carew Road Northwood

Erection of double garage (Part retrospective)

**Decision Date:** 22-03-2017      **Approved**      **Appeal:**

34289/APP/2016/4627      Nine Acres, Asprey Lane Carew Road Northwood

Enlargement of roofspace to create additional habitable roofspace to include 1 rear dormer (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

**Decision Date:** 24-03-2017      **Refused**      **Appeal:**

#### Comment on Planning History

The application site is subject to a lengthy and complex history of planning applications as well as previous enforcement history.

34289/APP/2016/4627 - Enlargement of roofspace to create additional habitable roofspace to include 1 rear dormer (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development) - Application was refused as the cubic content exceeded the permitted 50 cubic metres.

34289/APP/2016/4394 - Erection of a double garage (Part retrospective) - Approved

34289/APP/2014/3577 - Installation of basement to the front of property - Refused

34289/APP/2014/3574 - Two storey detached outbuilding for use as a garage/annexe - Refused

34289/APP/2014/2197 - Part two, part single storey extension to the front, single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as a garden room, detached double garage to rear and internal alterations (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development) - Approved

By far the most important piece of planning history is the recent appeal decision connected to the retention of the dwelling as currently built. The part of the appeal decision which dealt with the merits of the case is copied in full below (the other parts of the appeal decision deal purely with procedural matters and other issues which did not affect the appeal

decision):

'The Appeal on Ground (a):

9. The main issue in respect of the appeal on ground (a) is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area, including the effect on the setting of the NorthwoodFrithwood Conservation Area (the CA).

10. The dwelling, currently known as Nine Acres, is situated on a backland plot with access to Carew Road via a long driveway which passes in between the rear gardens of the dwellings at Eastbury Road to the west and the side of Viceroy Court to the east. Kiln Way and Pine Close are immediately to the north and north-east and the site is surrounded on all sides by residential development.

11. The house itself sits outside the boundary of the CA but the majority of the driveway is within it. The boundary of the CA has been drawn to include the attractive Edwardian and early twentieth century housing developments of Eastbury Avenue, Frithwood Avenue and Carew Road as well as the school buildings on Carew Road. For the most part, the later twentieth century housing, which has largely been constructed on sites to the rear of the above roads, is excluded from the CA, hence the somewhat convoluted form of the boundary as shown on plan. There are notable exceptions to that rule, including the relatively modern flats at Viceroy Court and the dwellings at Cullera Close which were added to the CA when the boundary was extended in 2009.

12. No Conservation Area Appraisal exists but the character of the CA is briefly defined within the leaflet produced by the Council. That refers to large, individually designed, houses in the Arts and Crafts style with references to the input of well-known architects. The tree lined and leafy character is also noted. Notwithstanding the presence of modern additions, the prevailing character

remains as described in the leaflet and, to a large extent, the significance of the CA is derived from the individual style and design of the dwellings and other buildings within it and the verdant character of the surrounding streets and open spaces. The Arts and Crafts style is the predominant influence on the character of the area, with the typical use of sweeping asymmetrical roofs and irregular patterns of fenestration but there are notable examples of early twentieth century classicism, particularly on Frithwood Avenue.

13. I could detect no views of the dwelling from either Carew Road, Eastbury Road or Frithwood Avenue and the prevailing pattern of development along those tree lined streets remains unaffected. Public views are limited to vantage points within Pines Close to the rear and from the tennis club and recreation ground to the east. From those vantage points the increased height and mass of the roof, when compared to the previous dwelling, has undoubtedly resulted

in a structure that is far more prominent.

14. That said, purely in terms of scale, the property, as extended, is not unduly large in the context of other adjacent buildings. Whilst the ridgeline is taller than the two storey properties at Pines Close and Kiln Way the dwelling is also set against the backdrop of the much taller building at Viceroy Court. In the context of the range of building heights there is nothing unusual or excessive about the height of the property in this instance.

15. Similarly, I am satisfied that the footprint of the dwelling is not disproportionate to the size of the plot. A number of dwellings within the CA benefit from generous gardens but there is no uniform pattern; the gardens of the dwellings on Eastbury Road backing onto the driveway to the site are substantial but the gardens of houses further to the north along Eastbury Road and along Frithwood Avenue are comparatively small. The gardens of dwellings at Pines Close and Kiln Way are modest in scale. In effect, the dwelling sits between the larger gardens to the west and the smaller gardens to the north and east. The available open space is somewhere between the two scales and is commensurate with

the size of the dwelling such that no discernible harm arises in that respect.

16. Consequently, whilst the extensions to the dwelling are significant the scale of the dwelling does not cause harm, of itself, to the character and appearance of the surrounding area or to the setting Conservation Area. To my mind, the principal issue is not whether the scale of the property has caused harm but whether the design and external appearance have caused harm, having regard to the established character of the area.

17. At the Hearing, the Council confirmed that it had no specific concerns regarding the design or appearance of the single storey side annex on the northern side of the dwelling or with the appearance of the west facing elevation which overlooks the entrance drive. The single storey extension is modest in size and appearance with a pitched roof terminating in a hipped gable adjacent to the boundary. It is essentially a stand-alone extension and no specific harm arises from it. Regardless of my conclusions in relation to the other extensions, there is no reason to withhold permission for that element in the absence of any identifiable harm.

18. Previously, the principal elevation of the dwelling faced to the south but the addition of the two storey wing on that aspect has effectively changed the orientation of the dwelling through 90 degrees. The main entrance is now to the west, facing onto the access drive. The proportions of that elevation are well balanced, as is the fenestration. The chimney stack and hipped roof on the pre-existing gable have been retained and the front facing gable on the new wing incorporates a matching hipped gable. The frontage is not unduly out of character with some of the neo-classical dwellings within the adjacent Conservation Area and, regardless of that point, that elevation is not visible from outside the confines of the site.

19. The most significant visual change has occurred on the eastern facing elevation; what has now become the rear of the dwelling. Of those changes it is the extension and alteration of the roofspace that has had the most noticeable impact from public vantage points. The box-like proportions of the dormer window are unlike any comparable design feature in the surrounding area and the feature neither reflects the more sedate and balanced proportions of the front of the house or the prevailing style of neighbouring properties within and without the CA.

20. The top of the dormer is roughly level with the top of the roof of the dwelling, there is a minimal set back behind the eaves, and its width spans the space between the two opposing gables. The use of white render draws the eye and the fascia and side cheeks appear disproportionately bulky in relation to the size of the glazing, adding to the box-like effect.

21. Similarly, the large windows that have been inserted into the two gable ends are an overtly modern addition that has little regard to the surrounding context. The proportion of the windows does not reflect the domestic scale of the original dwelling or the much smaller openings found within properties at Pines Close, nor does it reflect the prevailing Arts and Crafts style within the wider Conservation Area. The overall effect, in combination with the dormer window, is more akin to a commercial or religious building as opposed to a dwelling in a residential setting. As with the dormer, the rendered sections of wall surrounding the windows are bulky in appearance.

22. The effect of the alterations is such that very little of the roof itself is visible to the onlooker. The eye is drawn to the glazed sections, the large dormer and the rendered surrounds. That is uncharacteristic of the surrounding area in which the asymmetrical design of the roofs is an important design feature. The original dwelling had characteristics of that pattern with a variety of roof hips and an asymmetrical gable to the principal

elevation. The roof design as built pays little regard to those characteristics. The dwellings at Pines Close and Kiln Way are also designed to include a variety of roof pitches and hipped gables at first and second floor level and, although not within the CA, the roof design is an attractive and integral part of the character of the estate.

23. Similarly, although the development at Viceroy Court represents a modern addition to the Conservation Area, the sweeping roof pitches, smaller and sensitively designed dormer windows and the overall pattern of fenestration undoubtedly pays regard to the established pattern of development within the CA. For the reasons given, the same cannot be said of the appeal scheme.

24. Consequently, whilst the height of the roof, of itself, does not cause harm, that height, in addition to the incongruous design of the dormer and gable windows, results in an extremely unsympathetic addition when viewed in the context of the original dwelling, the prevailing pattern of development within the CA and the attractive roof design of the dwellings at Pines Close and Kiln Way. Whilst I can appreciate the appellant's desire for a dwelling of modern appearance the

site is within a sensitive location on the edge of the CA in an area with a welldefined character. Roof design is integral to that character. The design and external appearance of the third storey to the rear has no regard to that character and causes harm as a result.

25. I note the Council's concerns relating to the alignment of the rear fenestration and the proportion of windows at ground and first floor level. However, as Mr Rose correctly pointed out at the Hearing on behalf of the appellant, one of the characteristics of the prevailing Arts and Crafts style is the asymmetrical arrangement of roof pitches and fenestration. Thus, there is no particular reason why perfect alignment should be sought in this instance. Moreover, the

ground and first floor windows are not prominent from surrounding vantage points, unlike the roofspace which is a striking feature in the local context.

26. The harm is most acutely felt within Pines Close, when viewed from public vantage points but also from numerous private vantage points within the gardens and rooms of adjacent properties. Regardless of the effect on the setting of the CA, local and national planning policies set a requirement for good design.

27. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) (the LP) states that the Council will require all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and, amongst other things, achieve a high quality design in all new buildings and extensions. More specifically, saved Policy BE13 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary

Development Plan (1998) (the UDP) states that development will not be permitted if the appearance fails to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) considers it desirable to retain or enhance.

28. Similarly, policy BE19 notes that the LPA will seek to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. Whilst of some vintage, those policies remain consistent with the design related aims of section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), including paragraph 58 which, amongst

other things, states that decisions should ensure that developments respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials and paragraph 64 which states 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.

29. Due to the harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding

area, as described above, the development in this case is contrary to the aims of those policies. Similarly, it is contrary to the aims of policy BE15 of the UDP which states that extensions will be permitted where they harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building.

30. The impact on the setting of the CA is limited in its extent due to the location of the property. There are no views of the unsympathetic elements of the scheme from the main thoroughfares of Carew Road, Eastbury Road and Frithwood Avenue. The prevailing character of those streets, which would appear to be the over-riding feature of significance, remains unaffected by the development. The harmful effects are noticed most strongly in views from Pines Close which is outside of the CA.

31. Nonetheless, views are available from within the tennis club which is within the boundary and, from that vantage point, the dwelling is seen against Pines Close in the foreground and mature trees within adjacent gardens in the background. I have no doubt that the rear elevation of the dwelling appears as an overtly modern and alien feature, especially for anyone with an appreciation of the prevailing characteristics and form of dwellings within the CA. Thus, to that very limited extent the extension has caused harm to the setting of the CA, contrary to the aims of policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) which states that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail. Similarly, paragraph 132 of the Framework notes that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets and that significance can be lost as a result of development within its setting.'

The inspector dismissed the appeal on the above grounds only.

## **2. Advertisement and Site Notice**

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 13th June 2018

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

## **3. Comments on Public Consultations**

Letters were sent to neighbouring properties and a site notice was displayed outside of the site for a period of 21 days. Both methods of consultation expired 13.06.2018

A total of 11 objections were received which in summary outlined concerns such as the impact the current development as built has on the properties within close proximity and the conservation area for which it borders. Some objections raised contained extracts or reference to the planning inspectors comments/report and these are addressed elsewhere in the report.

### **INTERNAL CONSULTEES**

Trees and Landscapes:

This site is occupied by a detached house, situated to the north of Carew Road, behind Viceroy Court. It is accessed via a long driveway to the west of Viceroy Court and is not visible from the public realm. The site lies within the area covered by TPO 150 and the driveway (only) is within a Conservation Area - a designation which protects trees. On this

site, two groups/hedges of Lawson cypress, G3 and G4 are protected by the TPO. Please note that these observations rely on a desk-based survey only. COMMENT According to the aerial photographs, the extension is well away from the boundary and all of the boundary vegetation, including the protected trees remain on site. No objection. the second part of the application proposes alterations to the roof - within the existing footprint of the building. No vegetation will be directly affected by the proposal. However, the potential indirect impacts of construction work on site should be controlled with tree protection measures in place. RECOMMENDATION No objection subject to landscape conditions RES8 and RES10.

Principal Landscape Architect

#### OFFICER NOTES:

The remedial works required are in relation to the dormers within the roof at the rear of the property therefore it has been agreed with the Trees and Landscapes Officer that no landscape conditions are required.

#### 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.

BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas

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 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 7.8 (2016) Heritage assets and archaeology

NPPF12 NPPF - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

#### 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 and provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property. There is no impact on parking provision as a result of this development.

The application site has been subject to an enforcement notice served by the council for which the applicant appealed. The appeal inspector has highlighted the revisions required and elements of the build which are considered to be acceptable

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) (the LP) states that the Council will require all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and, amongst other things, achieve a high quality design in all new buildings and extensions.

Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), states that new development within or on the fringes of conservation areas will be expected to preserve or enhance those features which contribute to their special architectural and visual qualities. There will be a presumption in favour of retaining buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area.

More specifically, saved Policy BE13 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (1998) (the UDP) states that development will not be permitted if the appearance fails to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) considers it desirable to retain or enhance.

Policy BE15 of the UDP which states that extensions will be permitted where they harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the original building. Similarly, policy BE19 notes that the LPA will seek to ensure that new development within residential areas complements or improves the amenity and character of the area.

Policy BE20, BE21, BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part two (Saved UDP Policies) states that buildings should be laid out to allow adequate daylight to penetrate and amenities of existing houses safeguarded. It is considered that the extension is of a size and scale which would not impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over-dominance

The proposed development is for the retention of the existing part two storey, part single storey side / rear extension, and the increase in the height of the roof ridge.

With regards to the retention of the raised ridge height application reference - Part two, part single storey extension to the front, single storey detached outbuilding to rear for showed the maximum height to be 8.35 metres. This application proposes to retain the as built ridge height which the as built plans demonstrate to be 8.7 metres and for which the appeal inspector stated "Whilst the ridgeline is taller than the two storey properties at Pines Close and Kiln Way the dwelling is also set against the backdrop of the much taller building at Viceroy Court. In the context of the range of building heights there is nothing unusual or excessive about the height of the property in this instance." Given the inspectors findings it is considered that the increase in roof ridge height is considered to be acceptable when viewed in context with those buildings within close proximity to the



application site.

With regards to the two storey side/rear extension the as built plans confirm the two storey side element as been built marginally larger than what was approved as part of application reference - Part two, part single storey extension to the front, single storey detached outbuilding to rear for . When measuring the approved plans in comparison to the as built floor plan Officers noted a increase in width of approximately 0.4 metres however this being said the appeal inspector states in appeal decision APP/R5510/C/17/3183097 "purely in terms of scale, the property, as extended, is not unduly large in the context of the adjacent buildings. Similarly I am satisfied that the footprint of the dwelling is not disproportionate to the size of the plot". The inspector adds "Consequently, whilst the extensions to the dwelling are significant the scale of the dwelling does not cause harm, of itself, to the character and appearance of the surrounding area or to the setting of the Conservation Area".

The application site has a complex history of planning applications of which include the re-positioning of the front entrance door which effectively changes the position of the front and rear elevations. The most significant visual change is to the eastern facing elevation which has bow become the rear of the dwelling. The alterations to this area of the dwelling include box-like proportions of the dormer window for which the appeal inspector states "are unlike any comparable design feature in the surrounding area and the feature neither reflects the more sedate and balanced proportions of the front of house or the prevailing style of neighbouring properties within and without the conservation area". This element of the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The proposed plans demonstrate the dormer within the centre of the roof is to be removed and replaced with a much smaller velux window to be obscure glazed below 1.8m height from the finished floor level. The large windows inserted into the two gable ends for which the inspector states "the proportion of the windows does not reflect the domestic scale of the original dwelling" and "is more akin to a commercial or religious building" are to be removed and replaced with much smaller windows and those of which are a common feature of properties within close proximity to the application site.

The impact on the setting of the CA is limited in its extent due to the location of the property. There are no views of the unsympthetic elements of the as built extensions from the main thoroughfares of Carew Road, Eastbury Road and Frithwood Avenue. The prevailing character of those streets, which would appear to be the over-riding feature of significance, remains unaffected by the development. It is considered that the proposed alterations would satisfy the appeal inspectors view of the development and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Recommendation: Approval

## 6. **RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVAL subject to the following:**

1 NONSC Non Standard Condition

The development hereby permitted shall be completed within six (6) months of the date of this permission.

REASON

To ensure the development complies with the provisions Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the London Plan (2016).

**2** HO2 Accordance with approved

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers Drawing No4, Drawing No3 and Drawing No2.

REASON

To ensure the development complies with the provisions of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the London Plan (2016).

**3** HO4 Materials

The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building and shall thereafter be retained as such.

REASON

To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to ensure that the proposed development does not have an adverse effect upon the appearance of the existing building in accordance with Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

**4** HO7 No roof gardens

Access to the flat roof over the extension hereby approved shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, balcony, patio or similar amenity area.

REASON

To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

**5** HO5 No additional windows or doors

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be constructed in the walls or roof slopes of the development hereby approved facing 12 Pines Close, 14 Pines Close, 7 Kiln Way and 6 Kiln Way.

REASON

To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (2012)

**INFORMATIVES**

- 1** 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, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely

to be considered favourably.

## Standard Informatives

- 1 The decision to GRANT 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 GRANT 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.   |
| BE4      | New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas   |
| 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  | (2016) Quality and design of housing developments  |
| LPP 7.8  | (2016) Heritage assets and archaeology   |
| NPPF12   | NPPF - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment   |

- 3 You are advised this permission is based on the dimensions provided on the approved drawings as numbered above. The development hereby approved must be constructed precisely in accordance with the approved drawings. Any deviation from these drawings requires the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

- 4 You are advised that if any part of the development hereby permitted encroaches by either its roof, walls, eaves, gutters, or foundations, then a new planning application will have to be submitted. This planning permission is not valid for a development that results in any form of encroachment.
- 5 Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the relevant provisions of the Building Regulations, the Building Acts and other related legislation. These cover such works as - the demolition of existing buildings, the erection of a new building or structure, the extension or alteration to a building, change of use of buildings, installation of services, underpinning works, and fire safety/means of escape works. Notice of intention to demolish existing buildings must be given to the Council's Building Control Service at least 6 weeks before work starts. A completed application form together with detailed plans must be submitted for approval before any building work is commenced. For further information and advice, contact - Planning, Environment and Community Services, Building Control, 3N/01 Civic Centre, Uxbridge (Telephone 01895 250804 / 805 / 808).
- 6 You have been granted planning permission to build a residential extension. When undertaking demolition and/or building work, please be considerate to your neighbours and do not undertake work in the early morning or late at night or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Furthermore, please ensure that all vehicles associated with the construction of the development hereby approved are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage of mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway. You are advised that the Council does have formal powers to control noise and nuisance under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other relevant legislation. For further information and advice, please contact - Environmental Protection Unit, 4W/04, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW (Tel. 01895 250190).
- 7 The Party Wall Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify, and obtain formal agreement from, any adjoining owner, where the building owner proposes to:
  - carry out work to an existing party wall;
  - build on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
  - in some circumstances, carry out groundworks within 6 metres of an adjoining building.Notification and agreements under this Act are the responsibility of the building owner and are quite separate from Building Regulations, or Planning Controls. The Building Control Service will assume that an applicant has obtained any necessary agreements with the adjoining owner, and nothing said or implied by the Council should be taken as removing the necessity for the building owner to comply fully with the Party Wall Act. Further information and advice is to be found in "the Party Walls etc. Act 1996 - explanatory booklet" published by the ODPM, available free of charge from the Planning, Environment and Community Services Reception, Civic Centre, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW.
- 8 Your attention is drawn to the fact that the planning permission does not override property rights and any ancient rights of light that may exist. This permission does not empower you to enter onto land not in your ownership without the specific consent of the owner. If you require further information or advice, you should consult a solicitor.

9 Nuisance from demolition and construction works is subject to control under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other related legislation. In particular, you should ensure that the following are complied with: -

A) Demolition and construction works should only be carried out between the hours of 08.00 hours and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08.00 hours and 13.00 hours on Saturday. No works shall be carried out on Sundays Bank and Public Holidays.

B) All noise generated during such works should be controlled in compliance with British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228: 1984.

C) The elimination of the release of dust or odours that could create a public health nuisance.

D) No bonfires that create dark smoke or nuisance to local residents.

You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Protection Unit, 3S/02, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW (Tel.01895 277401) or to seek prior approval under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act if you anticipate any difficulty in carrying out construction other than within the normal working hours set out in (A) above, and by means that would minimise disturbance to adjoining premises.

10 You are advised that care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to avoid spillage of mud, soil or related building materials onto the pavement or public highway. You are further advised that failure to take appropriate steps to avoid spillage or adequately clear it away could result in action being taken under the Highways Act.

11 To promote the development of sustainable building design and construction methods, you are encouraged to investigate the use of renewable energy resources which do not produce any extra carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, including solar, geothermal and fuel cell systems, and use of high quality insulation.

12 You are advised that care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge or footpaths during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to the public footway. Any damage will require to be made good to the satisfaction of the Council and at the applicant's expense. For further information and advice contact - Highways Maintenance Operations, Central Depot - Block K, Harlington Road Depot, 128 Harlington Road, Hillingdon, Middlesex, UB3 3EU (Tel: 01895 277524).

**Contact Officer:** Christopher Brady

**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 2018 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

**Nine Acres, Asprey Lane**

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

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

Planning Application Ref:

**34289/APP/2018/1452**

Scale:

**1:1,250**

Planning Committee:

**North**

Date:

**July 2018**

