

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|------------|
| Item No. | Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration | | |
| Address | 26 BROADWOOD AVENUE RUISLIP | | |
| Development: | 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 (Retrospective). | | |
| LBH Ref Nos: | 16080/APP/2020/1579 | | |
| Drawing Nos: | 26BWA - 100 - Location Plan 26 Broadwood Avenue Rev. B 26WA - 100 - P1 - 100 Rev. C 26WA - 100 - P1 - 99 26WA - 100 - P1 - 101 Rev. C | | |
| Date Plans Received: | 21/05/2020 | Date(s) of Amendment(s): | 21/05/2020 |
| Date Application Valid: | 24/06/2020 | | 23/06/2020 |

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the north side of Broadwood Avenue and on the southern boundary of Park Wood. The application site comprises a 2-storey detached dwellinghouse with habitable accommodation within the roof and it benefits from a rear garden and a front garden which has been largely paved over.

The street scene is residential in character predominantly made up of large detached houses of varying architectural styles. River Pinn runs parallel to Broadwood Avenue on the south of the property. Rear to the property on the north is the Ruislip Woods, site of special scientific Interest, Nature Conservation site of Metropolitan or Borough Grade I Importance and is Ruislip National Nature Reserve.

The site is located in a Tree Preservation Area 277 and is within the Ruislip Motte and Bailey Archaeological Priority Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks a retrospective planning permission for 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.

Details of alterations include:

- A crown roof is to be installed and roof height is to be reduced by approximately 300-500mm. The current height of the building is 9040mm and following the reduction, the height is to be reduced to 8540-8740mm.
- The soffit is to be painted black with timber sections
- The introduction of a timber band above windows to give illusion of windows finishing

- higher and reduce view of section above window to front elevation
- Installation of timber band to reinforce horizontal axis and break vertical on first floor front elevation
 - The front elevation windows are proposed to be timber or UPVC casements with double glazing
 - the central front elevation window would move further up along the elevation

The eaves level is to remain unchanged at 5440mm.

The ground floor front elevation will be rendered and bricks on either side of the entrance door. First floor will consist of render and dark stained timber panelling pattern and the roof will have tile finish. The rear and side elevation will consist of render finish and roof tiling.

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:**

16080/APP/2017/1893 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

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

Decision Date: 03-10-2017 Refused **Appeal:** 06-SEP-18 Dismissed

16080/APP/2019/688 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

Alterations to front, flank and rear elevations to house and reduction of overall roof height

Decision Date: 16-08-2019 Withdrawn **Appeal:**

Comment on Planning History

The application site has extensive planning and enforcement history, the most relevant of which is summarised below:

Under Ref: 16080/APP/2017/1893 planning permission was refused for the following reason:

1. 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. 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.

In September 2018, both the planning application and enforcement case that were considered at Appeal under ref: APP/R5510/C/18/3198540 and APP/R5510/D/18/3193787 were dismissed.

In March 2016, a planning application was granted for the erection of the 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. The development went ahead, however it was built contrary to the approved plans under this application.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 24th July 2020

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

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 - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

24th July 2020

3. **Comments on Public Consultations**

38 neighbouring owners/occupiers and the Ruislip Residents Association was consulted. A site notice was displayed to the front of the property and expired on 27th July 2020. Four objections from two households were received. The comments are summarised below:

1. Ridge line of "pre-existing" site descend and follows the contour of Broadwood avenue.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 1.

"The ridge height is shown as true and in its current and correct position as taken from original survey drawings and current, there is a very small difference to the original ridge height of 70mm according to the previous existing drawing and the current. Unfortunately the statement above is also incorrect as the ridge height of 30 Broadwood Avenue is higher than 28 in the immediately adjacent plots."

2. Dimensions do not correlate with the marked up street view, difference in level of 710mm has occurred. It is stated only "70mm higher than original structure".

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 2.

"I have interrogated the drawings and these are the correct dimensions according to the original survey."

3. By reducing the roof height by circa 500mm (300mm on Page 5 Design & Access Statement proposed elevation) by introducing a crown roof section to the top of the main roof this will reduce scale and bulk of the building. This is contradiction of the Planning Inspectorate Point 5, 6, 9, 13. No evidence whatsoever of any reduction of the bulk and scale of the property or indeed the footprint.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 3. "The footprint of the building was approved under the original planning application and is not in question as far as I am aware. Bulk and scale is massing and by reducing the height via the crown roof the bulk and mass of the building is changed, this is a fact."

4. Photographs of Properties in Broadwood Avenue give the impression that the are next to each other. These photographs bear little relation to how the layout of how Broadwood Avenue appears. The incline runs East to West. These photographs imply that the houses are next to each other. The First two are on opposite sides of the road at different inclines, The second two are 3 properties apart - Inclines different, The 3rd set are on opposite sides of the road different inclines, The 4th opposite sides of the road also different inclines. Also the way the photo is taken ie zoom or not either exaggerates or minimise the actual size.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 4.

"This is clearly not the case, the point of these photos is to explain the varying styles of

buildings on Broadwood Avenue, page 3 has a street view of the property and the surrounding buildings south and north side. Which actually clearly show that ridge heights in the street vary both on the north and south side between buildings and typologies some having higher roofs than others, there is no overriding style or pattern in either building style or ridge height.

And that indeed even within the mock Tudor style of building that there is no consistency in either the timber patterns or whether there are gaps between eaves and windows or not. Both examples can be found on the street."

5. Plans submitted with the application do not reflect either the dimension or location of the original building that is acknowledged as having been demolished without permission nor accurately reflect the newly constructed building that has been built on the site without planning permission.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 5.

"It is quite easy to see that the plans are accurate within sensible building tolerances. The building is not a new build, the building contains original building fabric, should the owner have wished to do a new build new he would have applied for planning permission for a new build and avail himself of the VAT relief that you would get for doing so, which would be significant."

6. The planning history of this site would seem to fully match the circumstances set out in Section 70C of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the council would seem to be perfectly within their rights to continue with the Enforcement procedure and have the full protection of the law in doing so.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 6.

"Of course it is within the purview of the council to refuse to determine the planning application, however this statement is not helpful in coming to a conclusion to the enforcement and so we would consider it obstructive."

7. At the Committee hearing relating to an appeal against the refusal of a previous planning application on the site, the then representative of Mr Pogwizd acknowledged that the original house has been demolished and an enlarged house had been built without planning permission claiming this was the result of an error. As such, the current application would appear to be an application to extend and convert a building that no longer exists and accordingly you would expect such an application to fail on grounds of simple logic.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 7.

"The building is not a new build, the building contains original building fabric, should the owner have wished to do a new build new he would have applied for planning permission for a new build and avail himself of the VAT relief that you would get for doing so which would be significant. The building complies with building regulations and beyond that any refurbishment work which has been applied insensitively to the existing structure and was not a like for like replacement is the subject of discussions."

8. The dimensions and proportions are not reflected on the plans submitted with this

current application.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 8.

"As far as I am aware the dimensions on the drawings are accurate."

9. The application fails to deal with many of the other issues relating to the property such as permission to demolish the existing house, an extension to both the side and front of the property which are not reflected on the plans nor the extensive elevated rear patio.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 9.

"The purpose of the application is to deal with the enforcement notice, we consider that the building has planning permission and still avails itself of the planning applications which are valid and relevant, it is acknowledged that the current situation has an enforcement on it as the current state of the building is not 100% in line with the planning permission due to the reasons discussed and therefore the application seeks to address these areas of concern and regularise the situation."

10. The plans do not reflect any exterior lighting being fitted to the proposed property. The properties on this side of Broadwood Avenue back onto a site of special scientific interest and as such any planning permission that may be granted may need to consider provide conditions on the use of the site to mitigate any effects on the adjoining woodland.

11. The pictures in the Design and Access Statement and the plans which have been submitted with this application is misleading, they do not reflect the position of the current building, the historic building on the site nor the street scene. The document submitted as "Current Unlawful Plans" show the two rear dormers is sitting apart from each other when in fact they physically touch each other as currently built.

12. The pre-existing plans submitted appear to show an extension to the front of the building which never existed.

13. The plans as submitted also fail to show the extractor fans that sit on the rear extension that allows extracted air to flow directly into the adjoining property.

Case Officer's Comments:

The agent has provided the following response to point 13.

"Extractor fans are PD items, its not in a conservation area or has an article 4 directive so it has PD rights and the owner can avail himself of them."

14. Broadwood Avenue is built on a hill which runs downwards. In the street scene, the height of the houses follow the hill line downwards towards the middle of the road. The building line of each property is set back/forward from its neighbour further up/down the hill following the contour of the road to maximise each house's privacy. These plans fail to abide by this long established precedent.

15. This application would still be an overdevelopment of the site and be out of keeping with the existing street scene and the neighbouring properties.

16. The established building lines were very important to ensure that the light to each

house was not blocked or impaired by the house to its immediate right (i.e. number 30 would impinge on number 28, number 28 would impinge on number 26 etc.)

17. The Ground Floor Rear Extension to the main building is at least one metre higher than the building it replaced would block light into the adjacent property.

18. The left and right facing elevation, is longer and at least one metre higher than the building it replaced, the new building would block light into the adjacent property.

19. The newly constructed roof is at least one metre higher than the building it replaced. Even with the proposed adjustments to reduce the overall height, the new roof proposed would directly block light into the neighbours habitable rooms and impact on privacy.

20. The Velux windows, the rear and front windows, the side facing and rear facing dormers are now positioned much higher and deeper on the roof by comparison to the surrounding buildings. It will impact on adjacent neighbour's privacy.

Officer comment: The matters raised are addressed within the main body of the report.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES

FLOOD AND WATER MANAGEMENT OFFICER:

There are no objections to the proposals in principle, however the site lies in a Critical Drainage Area (CDA) identified in the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for Hillingdon. A CDA is the catchment area from which surface water drains and contributes to drainage problems.

All developments in this area need to contribute to manage the risk from surface water and groundwater, and reduce the runoff from their site.

The following information is recommended by the FWMO to be submitted as part of the application or the condition suggested but the FWMO will not comment on the discharge of the condition:

Prior to commencement, (excluding demolition and site clearance) a scheme for the provision of sustainable water management shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall clearly demonstrate how it incorporates sustainable urban drainage (SuDs) in accordance with the hierarchy set out in Policy 5.13 of the London Plan and will:

- i. provide information on all SuDs features including the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and:
- ii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development of arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. Including appropriate details of Inspection regimes, appropriate performance specification. The scheme shall also demonstrate the use of methods to minimise the use of potable water through water collection, reuse and recycling and will:
- iii. provide details of water collection facilities to capture excess rainwater; and how water

usage will be reduced in the development. Thereafter the development shall be implemented and retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence.

REASON

To ensure that surface water run off is controlled to ensure the development does not increase the risk of flooding and is to be handled as close to its source as possible and Conserve water supplies in compliance with:

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies Policy EM6 Flood Risk Management in (Nov 2012), Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies Policy DME1 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality (Jan 2020) London Plan Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management (March 2016) London Plan Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage (March 2016), and London Plan Policy 5.15 Water use (March 2016). National Planning Policy Framework (June 2019), and the Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Risk and Coastal Change March 2014).

Any work on a front drive should ensure it complies with the following general permitted development order, otherwise a separate planning permission may be required:

Where the area of ground covered by the hard surface, or the area of hard surface replaced, would exceed 5 square metres, either the hard surface shall be made of porous materials, or provision shall be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling house.

Guidance on how alter a front garden appropriately can be found on the RHS website: <https://www.rhs.org.uk/science/pdf/climate-and-sustainability/urban-greening/gardening-matters-frontgardens-urban-greening>

You should ensure that water from your front drive does not flow onto the Highway otherwise enforcement action could be undertaken to ensure this is rectified.

CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN OFFICER:

1. Summary of comments: Harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and area - Objection

2. Historic Environment Designation (s)
- Ruislip Motte and Bailey Archaeological Priority Area (APA)

3. Assessment - background/significance

The submitted application aims to regulate and remedy inappropriate works which have not benefitted from Planning Permission.

From the submitted information it cannot be completely ascertained whether the original building had been completely demolished however it is acknowledged that it has been mentioned in the past. In any instance a substantial portion of the original building is likely to have been demolished in order to carry out the evident additions and alterations, including but not limited to the rear elevation, entire first floor, roof form and internal walls. Therefore the site has been significantly redeveloped.

It is understood that the previous refusal and Enforcement Notice was upheld at Appeal (refs: APP/R5510/D/18/3193787 and APP/R5510/C/3198540).

The original property on the site dated from the mid-20th century and was a notably attractive detached dwelling. The property was characterised by a traditional design aesthetic with some Arts and Crafts influence, typical of the Ruislip area. It featured a slight projection to the front with a half-dormer at first floor, breaking up the eaves line along the front elevation. Two substantial chimney stacks were located along the eastern side elevation. The dwelling included mock Tudor timber frame detailing at first floor over a white rendered elevation. Exposed brick featured at ground floor level. The entrance door was subtly recessed to the side, defining the pleasant asymmetrical appearance of the property. The quiet roof form comprised of a traditionally hipped roof finishes in plain clay tiles, with deep eaves. It's former character and appearance was in keeping with the wider street scene, with many other properties characterised by similar features and was considered a positive contributor.

Broadwood Avenue is located along along the periphery of Ruislip's ancient woodland. The road was developed in a sensitive manner respecting the natural and historic environment beyond. Gaps between buildings allow for pocket a view of the woodland beyond which is an important street scene characteristic.

The approved scheme maintained the character of the original property to the front, ensuring harm to the street scene was kept to a minimum.

The unauthorised works to the building has dramatically altered the character, appearance and built form of the original dwelling. As existing the building is defined by many questionable elements, including its substantial hipped roof, symmetrical front elevation with a double door entrance, odd hipped roof element over a central feature window and new external finishes and materials.

4. Assessment - impact

The existing building fails to remain in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene. The works carried out to the building have totally deviated from the original permission and bears no resemblance to the original dwelling on the site.

The alterations have resulted in a disproportionate, bulky built form with an unacceptable, intimidating prominence within the street scene. This is further exacerbated by the articulation of the front elevation and choice of materiality. This was duly noted by the Appeals Inspector in their Decision. The massing of the property contributes to its bulky appearance. The quality of the materials used in the external construction of the dwelling has much to be desired and fails to reflect the character of the original buildings or neighbouring buildings.

The proposed application of mock Tudor timber detailing would to some degree relate to the original, former dwelling however it would be crudely detailed and applied. It would not reduce the building's physical, verticality, visual bulk and presence along Broadwood Avenue. The vertical timbers would accentuate its height alongside the windows at first floor appearing rather squat.

The odd floating roof element over the central window fails to replicate the original half dormer that had previously existing. Taking into account the width of the roof, the window

appears disproportionately too narrow. The roof alterations has resulted in the eaves and ridge height being raised, resulting in the first floor window sitting higher along the front elevation. It contributes to the stretched appearance of the building especially the front elevation, with a significant gap between the first floor windows and eaves line. The proposed introduction of a crown roof to resolve height issues would not resolve the issues in relation to the height of roof eaves, which sits uncomfortably above that of neighbouring properties. The raised height does have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties.

The cumulative impact of all the existing and proposed alterations to the site has had a detrimental impact on the street scene and detracts from the traditional aesthetic. The alterations proposed under this application would fail to address the points made in the Decision by the Appeal's Inspector.

Furthermore the development as a whole would be contrary to Local Plan Part 2 policy DMHB 11.

5. Conclusion: Harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and area - Objection

HIGHWAYS OFFICER:

Background

The site is located in a residential catchment in Ruislip. The address is to remain in a single tenure with the creation of a habitable area within a redesigned roof-space together with additional building extensions.

Parking Provision

Local Plan: Part 2 - Policy DMT 6 requires that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the Council's adopted parking standards unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

However these standards are not directly applicable to residential properties which are to be extended with (or without) an increase in the number of habitable rooms on the strict proviso that the address is not converted to multiple housing units and remains in single tenure. Hence there is no specific requirement to provide additional on-plot parking provisions for this proposal.

Notwithstanding the above, the conversion of the loft space to a habitable area and proposed extensions are not expected to materially alter the parking scenario at this address especially as a generous parking area on the frontage is to remain which thereby reduces the likelihood of undue parking displacement onto the public highway.

Conclusion

The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are satisfied that the proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any highway safety concerns, in accordance with Local Plan Part 2 Development Plan Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies 6.3 and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016).

TREES/LANDSCAPE OFFICER:

This site is occupied by a two-storey detached house on the north side of Broadwood Avenue, which has recently been converted with windows in the roof. The site lies within the area covered by TPO 277 and there is a protected oak (T13 on the schedule) in the back garden (north-east corner). . COMMENT This retrospective submission follows a number of previous applications including 2019/688 and 2017/1893 which was refused at Appeal. The alterations appear to have been undertaken within the existing footprint of the building and should not have involved any impact on trees or external space. - The issue of tree protection now is now irrelevant if all works are complete? RECOMMENDATION No objection and no need for landscape conditions.

4. **Local Plan Designation and London Plan**

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

5. **MAIN PLANNING ISSUES**

The main issues for consideration in determining this application are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the residential area, the impact on residential amenity and whether the proposed works satisfies the issues raised by the Inspector from the Appeal Decision dated 6/9/2019.

Design and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

Policy BE1 of The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) requires all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods, where people enjoy living and working and that serve the long-term needs of all resident.

Policy DMHB 11 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states A) All development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings, will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding:

i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding: scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot size and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns; building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure; architecture composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views from both from and to the site; and impact on

neighbouring open spaces and their environment. ii) ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes; iii) ensuring that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities.

The applicant proposes to remodel the front elevation of the property. The proposal seeks to incorporate dark stained timber panelling and pattern against a rendered background on the first floor elevation while the ground floor will consist of brick and render finish. The render finish will extend to the side and rear of the property. As noted in the Design and Access Statement, the black timber cladding seeks to alter the proportions of the building and remove the vertical emphasis of the existing construction to create horizontal plains and sections of the building.

In September 2018, an Appeal was dismissed under ref: 16080/APP/2017/1893. In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector's Report noted:

"The increased height of the eaves and ridge of the appeal property has added considerably to its mass and bulk resulting in an overly strident building in comparison with neighbouring properties to either side along this northern side of the road. When viewed from the street the house has a bulky, box-like form topped with extensive slopes of its pitched roof. When looking along the street the building appears excessively dominant and out of proportion with the adjoining properties to either side. The impact is exacerbated when looking from the east in a westerly direction as the closest part of the adjoining property no. 28 is set back behind the front building line of the appeal property so exposing more of the flank and roof to view

The overbearing nature of the building in the street scene is further increased by a combination of the starkness of the materials used and the lack of detailing apparent on the front elevation in comparison to the unimposing charm of neighbouring properties. This has the effect of drawing attention to the box like nature of the resulting structure and the substantial mass of roof. Whilst I have no doubt that the approved extensions would have increased the visual presence of this house in the street, the increase in height and mass over and above that approved has an unacceptable additional impact.

I conclude that the building as extended damages the Broadwood Avenue street scene and in so doing harms the character and appearance of the residential area. Whilst Appeal A on ground (a) is to retain the development as built, Appeal B incorporates alterations to the front elevation. The dark brick on the central projection would be replaced with red brick at ground floor to match that which was pre-existing and at first floor level the projection would be rendered with timber features re-introduced. The render on the front and side elevations would be painted white. Whilst those suggested changes would add detail to the front of the building, it would not reduce the apparent bulk or mass which makes the building stand out when seen in context with its neighbours. The changes proposed would not overcome the harm identified."

Under this application the applicant has sought to address the previous reasons for refusals and reason for dismissing the appeal. The Council's Design Officer has assessed this application and raised objection to the proposed development. The Design Officer notes that although the mock Tudor timber detail would to some degree relate to the original, former dwelling, the timber cladding would not reduce the building's physical, verticality, visual bulk and presence along Broadwood Avenue but rather, the vertical timbers would accentuate its height alongside the windows at first floor appearing rather

squat. The central window fails to replicate the original half dormer. The dormer of the original dwelling has the same size window as the side window, now the current central window is disproportionately narrow and long.

The existing plans indicate the ridge height is currently 9.04m towards the front of the house and reduces to 8.5m on the side and part rear extension. The applicant proposes to reduce the ridge height by 300-500mm by removing the ridge to create a crown roof, which means the overall height to the front elevation would appear slightly reduced and result in having the front elevation ridge line 200mm higher than the side and rear or would match the adjoining ridge line. Although the reduction in height of the dwelling is welcomed and have to some extent addressed the Inspector's concern however, the continuous roofline to the side and rear would further emphasise the bulk and mass and the box-like form of the building.

No changes to the levels of the eaves have been proposed therefore it remains higher than the adjacent dwellings. Even though the soffit is proposed to be painted black and a timber band is added above windows to give illusions of windows finishing higher and reduce the view of section above window, however the difference in the eaves levels remains apparent when viewed from the streetscene when compared to the immediate neighbouring properties. In addition, the central window is to be relocated upwards to be in line with the soffit, as such, this further draws attention to the raised eaves.

The cumulative impact of the existing and proposed alterations to the site would result in a detrimental impact on the street scene. The alterations proposed under this application would fail to address the matters raised in the Appeal Inspector's decision. The building would appear out of keeping with the street scene and therefore, by reason of size, scale, bulk and design, it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed fails to comply with Policy BE1 of The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Policy DMHB 11 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses and two storey extensions should not extend into an area provided by a 45-degree line of sight drawn from the centre of the nearest ground or first floor habitable room window of an adjacent property and should not contain windows or other openings that overlook other houses at a distance of less than 21 metres

The height of the original dwelling is 8.97m and following the proposed height reduction of this application, the ridge height will reduce to 8.74m, which is 0.23m lower than the existing building height. A 1m setback from the side boundaries is proposed on both sides of the property. The proposal is in accordance with Policy DMHD 1 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

The side dormer facing onto no. 24 Broadwood Avenue is unlikely to impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties as there is no direct line of sight onto existing habitable rooms. There are however, existing rooflights on the roofslope of no. 24, which the Inspector was satisfied that the proposed development would not materially effect outlook or result in overlooking, on this basis the proposed side dormer is considered acceptable. The rear of the property faces onto the Ruislip Woods hence the two rear dormer would not raise any issues in terms of overlooking or privacy.

There is one side window on the first floor east elevation and a side window on the ground floor of the west elevation that faces onto the boundary fence. Both of these windows would unlikely to cause privacy concerns as they are not in direct line of side to any adjacent windows from the neighbouring dwelling, however, should the application be approved, a condition is recommended to ensure the side facing windows at first floor level are obscure glazed and fixed shut.

The ground floor rear extension is 4.6m in depth and the partial first floor rear extension is 3.6m, measured from the double storey rear elevation. The double side extension is measured 2.5m wide and extends 11m in depth. A plan with a 45 degree line of sight from the nearest first floor window is provided. The proposed 2 storey extension would not compromise the 45 degree line of sight from the nearest first floor window and would comply with Policy DMHD 1 of The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)

Conclusion

The proposal has failed to overcome the concerns raised in the Appeal Inspector's decision. The proposed extension by reason of its position, size, scale, bulk, design and massing would result in overly dominant and incongruous additions, detrimental to the architectural composition, form, character and appearance of the original property and the visual amenities of the streetscene, contrary to Policy BE1 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB12 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). This application is therefore recommended for Refusal.

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extension by reason of its position, size, scale, bulk, design and massing would result in overly dominant and incongruous additions, detrimental to the architectural composition, form, character and appearance of the original property and the visual amenities of the wider streetscene. The proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to Policy BE1 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB12 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

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 Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMHB 1 Design of New Development

DMHB 1 Streets and Public Realm

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

- 3 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.
- 4 On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2016). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm
LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

Contact Officer: Rebecca Lo

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 2020 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

**26 Broadwood Avenue
Ruislip**

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

Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
Telephone No.: Uxbridge 01895 250111

Planning Application Ref:

16080/APP/2020/1579

Scale:

1:1,250

Planning Committee:

North

Date:

August 2020



HILLINGDON
LONDON