

---

**HILLMORTON 11 ORLEY FARM ROAD, HARROW****2/24****P/894/03/CFU/RS**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION CONVERSION  
OF OUTBUILDING TO PROVIDE GRANNY ANNEXE,  
2 REAR DORMERS

SUREPLAN (SOUTH BUCKS) LTD for MR & MRS SONI

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Unnumbered locality plan; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton0a; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton1a; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton0h (amendment 02.11.03); HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton1h; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton2h; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton5h (amendment 02.11.03)

**GRANT** permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Restrict Use of Extension

**INFORMATIVES**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
  - 2 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
  - 3 Standard Informative 40 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals : (E5, E6, E38, E45), (SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17)
  - 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
- 

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS**

- 1) Use and Appearance of the Premises and Character of the Area
  - 2) Residential Amenity
  - 3) Parking/Highway Safety
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

This application was deferred at the Development Control Committee meeting of 10th December 2003 for a Member site visit. The visit took place on Saturday 10th January 2004.

**a) Summary**

UDP Key Policies:	E5, E6, E38, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17
Conservation Area	
Area of Special Character	
No. of Residential Units:	1
Council Interest:	None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- hipped-roof detached dwellinghouse on southern side of side-street off Orley Farm Road;
- to east: detached house;
- to west: cricket ground;
- to side/east of the house: detached pitched-roof garage with store to rear, along boundary with neighbouring property;
- gap of approx. 1.5m between house and outbuilding, but high-close-boarded gate between;
- neighbours have flat-roof extension to the side of their house that extends up to the shared boundary;
- some boundary vegetation is located forward of the structures;
- an area of hardstanding is located in front of garage.

**c) Proposal Details**

- construct two individual rear dormer windows (both featuring pitched/ hipped roof design);
- install two rooflights in the front roofslope;
- install a rooflight in each of the side roofslopes;
- construct a new front entrance porch, including pitched and tiled roof;
- construct an extension to the side of the dwelling, sited in the same location as the existing garage outbuilding, however the new extension would extend for the full width between the dwelling and side boundary. The extension would accommodate a recessed door to the front elevation, and would be internally linked to the main house. The design proposes a low pitched roof, whilst the external parapet wall of the extension has a maximum height of 3.0 metres;
- the extension is intended for use as a granny-annexe with the extension accommodating a single garage, shower, W.C, kitchen, bedroom and sitting room;

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: 1<sup>st</sup> Notification: design needs improving, bulk unacceptable, dormer too large & overpowering, balcony unsightly, velux windows on front elevation unacceptable, chimney to be removed, front door poorly designed, gap would be infilled, blank wall less than 1 metre from neighbouring property, concern that the annex could be sold off as separate unit which would be detrimental to character of conservation area, suggest legal agreement to prevent this from happening should the application be approved.

CAAC: 2<sup>nd</sup> Notification: does not meet previous objections, porch, dormer and balcony are totally unacceptable, annex is too large and unattractive, object to velux windows at front.

continued/

Item 2/24 - P/894/03/CFU continued.....

CAAC: 3<sup>rd</sup> Notification: dormers too large and should be set down from the ridge. Porch is poorly designed. Object to loss of gap between the buildings. Previous comments to earlier revisions of the proposal still apply where relevant.

<b>Advertisement</b>		Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 05-JUNE-03
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Notification</b>	Sent 5	Replies 4	Expiry 22-MAY-03

**Response:** Obtrusive, loss of space around building between buildings, works do not harmonise with existing building, out of character in the area, proposed hardsurfacing detrimental to visual amenities, proposed porch forward of building line and therefore out of character, roof dormer windows unsympathetic in terms of size, bulk and design, dormers overbearing and obtrusive, velux windows obtrusive, balcony obtrusive, proposal may be harmful to trees, demolition of building would require planning permission, overdevelopment, through-views would be lost.

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Notification</b>	Sent 8	Replies 2	Expiry 28-AUG-03
------------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Response:** Proposal would require demolition of existing garage and loss of open space to either side, this infilling of space is out of character of the area, would form an incongruous terrace with its neighbour, velux windows to the frontage would drastically change the appearance of the existing property and are obtrusive and out of character, although amended plans take into account some objections it however does not address the main issues of infilling of space and velux windows in the frontage roofslope. Other objections relating to hardsurfacing & character of area remain.

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Notification</b>	Sent 8	Replies 1	Expiry 09-DEC-03
------------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Response:** Objections on following grounds:  
Demolition of existing garage; loss of open space on either side of it; infilling of space between existing house and its neighbour; is out of keeping with the rest of road and the Conservation Area; would form an incongruous terrace; loss of views & greenspace; velux windows drastically change the appearance of the existing property and are both obtrusive & out of keeping; proposed porch is obtrusive; proposed loft conversion is out of keeping with present architecture of the house; only space to park one car in front of garage.

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Use and Appearance of the Premises and Character of the Area**

If question is to be raised about the loss of open space between buildings, it is highlighted that there is currently a single-storey building in the same location close to the plot boundary, filling almost the entire space between the dwelling houses. Therefore, there would only be a minimal and negligible loss of open space between the existing dwelling and neighbouring property if the proposed extension were constructed. Any concern regarding the prominence of the proposed extension has been reduced by the fact that it would be slightly set back from the front façade of the building (including a recessed front entrance door), and that the height of the extension has been minimised by proposing a low pitched roof. The associated parapet wall (with brick on edge and tile creasing), has been limited in height to 3.0 metres.

With respect of the use of the extension, this would be ancillary to the main dwellinghouse, ensuring that no separate residential unit would be created. A condition requiring the use of the extension to only be ancillary to the use of the main dwellinghouse will prevent it from being used a separate and self contained dwelling.

Although the rear dormer windows, are acknowledged as being quite prominent within the rear roofslope, they would nevertheless comply with design guidance and have space around them, whilst their design replicates the form and design of the existing roof.

The proposed front porch generally matches the style and design of the existing dwelling, and would not constitute an obtrusive addition to the front elevation of the existing dwelling.

Overall it is considered that the proposed scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

### **2) Residential amenity**

It is considered that the proposed building would not would not block out light to the neighbouring property or appear overbearing to the residents thereof. This conclusion is reached by virtue of the neighbouring property having been constructed up to the common boundary, whilst the design of the proposed extension has been limited in height by a low pitched roof and 3.0 metres external wall.

The proposed rear dormer windows would enable some increased overlooking of parts of the rear gardens of neighbouring residential properties. However, privacy could still be enjoyed given the proposal would not result in a level of overlooking and associated loss of privacy which would justify an objection to the scheme.

continued/

**3) Parking**

There would be a shortfall of one parking space with regard to the standards set out in the adopted UDP. Given the minor nature of this shortfall, the fact there are no on-street parking restrictions and that the proposal would meet the parking requirement set out in the deposit UDP, there is no objection to the scheme on grounds of inadequate on-site parking provision.

**4) Consultation Responses**

With respect of the demolition of the existing outbuilding, Conservation Area Consent would not be required as the building is under 115m<sup>3</sup>.