

DELEGATED DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	☐
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	☐
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	☐
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	☐
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	☐
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	☐
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	☐
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	☐
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	☐

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses	☐
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	☐
14.	Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use.	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	☐
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	☐
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	☐
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	☐
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	☐
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	☐
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	☐
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	☐
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	☐
25.	WORKS TO TREES	☐
26.	OTHER (please specify)	☐

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control**

Address: 18 MEAD ROAD UXBRIDGE MIDDLESEX

Development: Division of site to construct new 2 bedroom dwelling

LBH Ref Nos: 68180/APP/2023/3376

Drawing Nos: 2381-PL-L&B
 2381-PL-101 REV A
 2381-PL-103
 2381-PL-102 REV B

Date Plans received: 23-11-23 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):** 22-11-23

Date Application valid 23-11-23 22-11-23

1. SUMMARY

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of 1x2 bed bungalow with amenity space. The development is proposed as car-free, in most circumstances the LPA would require the applicant to enter into a legal agreement in order to prevent future occupiers of the development from entering into the parking management scheme. However it is noted that a reason for refusal relating to the applicants failure to enter into a legal agreement for this reason was not upheld at appeal following the previous refusal.

As mentioned above a previous similar application was submitted in 2022 and refused (REF: 68180/APP/2022/1598), the applicant appealed this decision and the Planning Inspector dismissed this appeal. It was refused due to its uncharacteristic size, design and backland location the proposed development would form a harmful addition to the character of the area. It would also cause harm to neighbouring amenities and the amenities of future residents. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to planning guidance in the Local Plan and London Plan.

The planning inspectorate agreed that the dwelling would appear incongruous and would not safeguard the appearance and character of the local area and appear out of place . However, the inspector found limited reasoning in refusing on the grounds of harm to neighbouring amenities and the amenities of future residents along with issues relating to highways.

The inspector also made reference to no. 6 Press Road, a sizeable back-land residential development with direct access onto Press Road. It is agreeable that this development at no.6 is similar to what is being proposed here, officers however find that due to this application being at the end of a road on an open plot with no established row or terrace existing, this proposal would therefore appear incongruous and would not safeguard the character and appearance of the local area. Whereas No.6 is within the centre of a road and between existing dwellings which aid in it's integration to the street scene.

Notwithstanding the agreeable matters, the inspector concluded that the effect of the proposed dwelling would lead to a visual intrusion to the appearance and character of the local area. They portioned significant weight to this matter and noted that it far outweighs the areas they found favour in and therefore the scheme could not be allowed to succeed.

Officers find that this new proposal, albeit larger and of more architectural merit, does not resolve the matters of the previous refused submission and is found to be of an uncharacteristic size, design and backland location the proposed development would form a harmful addition to the character the area.

A detailed assessment of the application has been carried out below.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Due its irregular plot and siting, overall design and size the proposed dwelling would form an uncharacteristic and incongruous addition to the area, which would fail to integrate with the Press Road street scene and the smaller scale of other garden development in the area. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies, Policies DMH 6, DMHB 5, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).

INFORMATIVES

1. I52 Compulsory Informative (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. I74 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Refusing Consent)

This is a reminder that Under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), should an application for appeal be allowed, the proposed development would be deemed as 'chargeable development' and therefore liable to pay the London Borough of Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This would be calculated in accordance with the London Borough of Hillingdon CIL Charging Schedule 2014 and the Mayor of London's CIL Charging Schedule 2012.

For more information on CIL matters please visit the planning portal page at:
www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil

I53 Compulsory Informative (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 and national guidance.

DMH 6	Garden and Backland Development
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 5	Areas of Special Local Character
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP H2	(2021) Small sites
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP D1	(2021) London's form, character and capacity for growth
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development

NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The development site is located on the corner of Mead Road and Press Road. At present the site comprises one half of a semi detached chalet bungalow. The existing property is set back from the street and is finished in brick and render. It has a paved front drive and soft landscaped rear garden.

The surrounding area is residential comprising properties which are of similar design and scale to 18 Mead Road. Larger two storey semi detached properties and terraces also exist within the area, as do two storey detached dwellings. Properties are set back from the main road allowing for off road parking and landscaping. They are finished in mixtures of brick, render and hung tiling.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a 2 bed dwelling with associated amenity space.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

68180/APP/2022/1598 18 MEAD ROAD UXBRIDGE MIDDLESEX

Erection of a 1-bed bungalow with associated amenity space

Decision: 09-08-2022 Refusal **Appeal:** 06-06-23 Dismissed

Comment on Planning History

Relevant planning history for the site is detailed above.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: Not applicable

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

12 neighbours were directly notified of the proposed development on 07/12/2023. In response to consultation on the application, one letter of objection was received. The response has been summarised below:

- 1) The proposed development would be out of character and harmful to the area's appearance and be a form of overdevelopment
- 2) The proposed development would cause harm to neighbouring amenities
- 3) The proposed development will put pressure on existing utilities infrastructure
- 4) The proposal includes no parking and would be harmful to the local highways network

The North Uxbridge Residents Association were also consulted on the application but did not respond.

Officers comments: Issues regarding the development's impact on character of the area, parking provision, highway safety and neighbouring amenities have been addressed below.

Consultee Comments

Access Officer: No Objection. Their full comments have been outlined in section 7.5 of this report.

6. 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
PT1.H1	(2012) Housing Growth

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 6	Garden and Backland Development
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 5	Areas of Special Local Character
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP H2	(2021) Small sites
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP D1	(2021) London's form, character and capacity for growth
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

In addition: Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)
West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan (2021)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2023) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Local Plan Policy DMHB 11 sets out design guidance for all new development in the borough. Part B of the policy states 'development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space'.

Guidance for Policy DMHB 11 states 'The Council will aim to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents and it will resist proposals where there is an unreasonable level of overlooking between habitable rooms of adjacent residential properties, schools or onto private open spaces. A minimum of 21 metres separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain levels of privacy and to prevent the possibility of overlooking. In some locations where there is a significant difference in ground levels between dwellings, a greater separation distance may be necessary'.

Guidance for Policy DMHB 11 also states ' For the purposes of this policy, outlook is defined as the

visual amenity enjoyed by occupants when looking out of their windows or from their garden. The Council will expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook. Single aspect dwellings should be avoided'.

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states that development should 'create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Due to its size and separation distance from neighbouring sites the proposal is unlikely to cause any loss of light to neighbouring dwellings.

As mentioned in the previous refusal REF: 68180/APP/2022/1598, and is found to still be the case in this proposal in the opinion of the LPA, the proposal would lead to a loss of outlook from the rear windows and garden of No.18 Mead Road impacting adversely on the amenities of its occupiers. The building would result in a sense of enclosure and overbearing when viewed from the rear garden of No.18 given its close proximity and it would undermine the quality of that properties garden space. By reason of visual intrusion, loss of outlook, and overbearing presence the proposal is considered to be harmful to the amenities of No.18 Mead Road. However due regard has been given to the inspectors decision and in particular the fact that similar concerns had been raised when determining the previous application resulting in a reason for refusal subsequently not upheld by PINS in the appeal decision letter. As such whilst the developments impact upon neighbouring properties remains a concern due to the minor increase in the scale of development, it does not form a reason for refusal.

The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan (2020) and paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF (2021).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic policies states that a high quality design should be achieved in all new buildings, alterations and extensions, and states that schemes should not result in the inappropriate development of gardens and green spaces that erode the character and biodiversity of suburban areas.

Policy DMHB 5: Areas of Special Local Character A) Within Areas of Special Local Character, new development should reflect the character of the area and its original layout. Alterations should respect the established scale, building lines, height, design and materials of the area. B) Extensions to dwellings should be subservient to, and respect the architectural style of the original buildings and allow sufficient space for appropriate landscaping, particularly between, and in front of, buildings. C) The replacement of buildings which positively contribute to the character and local importance of Areas of Special Local Character will normally be resisted.

Local Plan Policy DMHB 11 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: 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 sizes 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; architectural composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views 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'.

Policy DMH6 states:

'There is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable, subject to the following criteria: i) neighbouring residential amenity and privacy of existing homes and gardens must be maintained and unacceptable light spillage avoided; ii) vehicular access or car parking should not have an adverse impact on neighbours in terms of noise or light. Access roads between dwellings and unnecessarily long access roads will not normally be acceptable; iii) development on backland sites must be more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties; and iv) features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat must be retained or re-provided'.

Table 3.2 of the London plan sets out design guidance for new housing development in the City. It states 'The layout of the scheme (including spaces between and around buildings) should form a coherent, legible and navigable pattern of streets and blocks'.

Paragraph 71 of the NPPF (2021) states inter alia:

"Plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area."

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF (2021) states:

"Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

- a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;
- b) local market conditions and viability;
- c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services - both existing and proposed - as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;
- d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and
- e) the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places."

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF(2021) states:

'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience'

The new dwelling would be 5.9m high, 6m deep and 8.9m wide. It would have a footprint of 71.2sqm and would be one storey structure with a pitched roof including a front dormer and two rooflights to bring light and amenity into the habitable space within the roof space. The building would be finished in brick and tiling. As such the dwelling would be broadly reminiscent of the 1.5 storey semi-detached dwellings which front Mead Road, including No.18 and is similar to the development at 6 Press Road noted within the PINS decision letter.

Despite it's revised larger design, the footprint the property would still be uncharacteristically small when compared with all other dwellings in the area, as would the plot and garden arrangement. The dwelling would have a similar height to other bungalows in the area, but would have a much smaller footprint and would therefore appear cramped and contrived given its sites orientation and openness. The building would be viewed against much smaller outbuildings which exist within the rear gardens of other properties in the area, it would appear over sized and out of character next to those buildings. Furthermore due to its backland garden location the proposal would provide no contribution to the Mead Road street scene unlike other properties in the area. Instead it would appear as an irregular and excessively large outbuilding when viewed from Press Road, harming the appearance of that streetscene.

Officers note there is an example of backland/gadren land development with close proximity to the site, this being the 1.5 storey dwelling at 6 Press Road. It is also noted that this was originally approved as a bungalow and then a loft extension approved as part of application ref: 27393/APP/2016/2610. Notwithstanding the similarities between the two, the scale of the proposed development would still be at odds with the two storey character of the immediate context. This proposal is not considered to address the previous reason for refusal.

For the reasons mentioned above the proposed development is considered to be significantly harmful to character and appearance of the North Uxbridge Area of Special Local Character and the general visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policies DMH 6, DMHB 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Polies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Policy DMT 2 states 'Development proposals must ensure that: i) safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided to the Council's standards; ii) they do not contribute to the deterioration of air quality, noise or local amenity or safety of all road users and residents; iii) safe, secure and convenient access and facilities for cyclists and pedestrian are satisfactorily accommodated in the design of highway and traffic management schemes; iv) impacts on local amenity and congestion are minimised by routing through traffic by the most direct means to the strategic road network, avoiding local distributor and access roads; and v) there are suitable mitigation measures to address any traffic impacts in terms of capacity and functions of existing and committed roads, including along roads or through junctions which are at capacity.'

Policy DMT 5 states 'A) Development proposals will be required to ensure that safe, direct and inclusive access for pedestrians and cyclists is provided on the site connecting it to the wider

network, including: i) the retention and, where appropriate, enhancement of any existing pedestrian and cycle routes; ii) the provision of a high quality and safe public realm or interface with the public realm, which facilitates convenient and direct access to the site for pedestrian and cyclists; iii) the provision of well signposted, attractive pedestrian and cycle routes separated from vehicular traffic where possible; and iv) the provision of cycle parking and changing facilities in accordance with Appendix C, Table 1 or, in agreement with Council. B) Development proposals located next to or along the Blue Ribbon Network will be required to enhance and facilitate inclusive, safe and secure pedestrian and cycle access to the network. Development proposals, by virtue of their design, will be required to complement and enhance local amenity and include passive surveillance to the network.'

Policy DMT 6 states 'Development proposals must comply with the parking standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1 in order to facilitate sustainable development and address issues relating to congestion and amenity. The Council may agree to vary these requirements when: i) the variance would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity.'

Officer Comments:

The proposed back-land site is located within an extensive residential catchment in Uxbridge south-east of Harefield Road. The site plot consisting of part of the rear garden of No. 18 Mead Road is to be populated by a new 2-bedroom detached dwelling devoid of on-plot parking. The main address would retain on-plot parking provision located on the house frontage off Mead Road.

The locality is encompassed by a controlled parking zone operating from Monday to Saturday - 9am to 5pm and the address exhibits a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 4 which is considered as 'good' and therefore suggests a lesser dependency on the ownership and use of private motor transport.

Parking Provision

Hillingdon 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.

London Plan (2021): Policy T6.1 (Residential Parking) requires that new residential development should not exceed the maximum parking standards as set out in table 10.3.

It is proposed to provide a new 2-bedroom dwelling on a 'car-free' basis. To comply with the adopted Hillingdon parking standard the maximum on-site requirement demands up to 2 spaces. However, by contrast for a PTAL rating of 4, the London Plan (2021) parking standard demands a lesser requirement of up to 0.5 to 0.75 of a space.

It is considered that, in the main, the surrounding roadways are extensively restricted which is likely to deter any potential untoward parking displacement associated with the proposal which therefore helps support a 'car-free' proposal.

In summary, this fact coupled with the good 'real-world' sustainable nature of the location which is likely to discourage ownership and therefore dependency on private motor transport in the first place together with the extensive parking controls in the local area, the absence of on-plot parking provision is considered acceptable and broadly in line with the lower regional London Plan standard. Based on the above reasoning, a similar stance is highly likely to be anticipated from the Planning Inspectorate if the application were to be refused on insufficient parking grounds and appealed thereafter.

The only parking requirement in this case is related to providing 1 secure and accessible cycle space to conform to the council's adopted cycle parking standard. The applicant has provided on plans the location of a secure two bike storage facility within the garden amenity space.

Vehicular Trip Generation

Local Plan: Part 2 Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 require the council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

As a consequence of the relatively small-scale increase in unit number and the 'car-free' nature of the proposal, any vehicular trip generation uplift is predicted to be negligible and therefore does not raise any specific highway concerns.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Refuse collection would be undertaken from the neighbouring highway.

In order to conform to the council's 'waste collection' maximum distance collection parameter of 10m i.e. distance from a refuse vehicle to the point of collection, arrangements should ensure that waste is positioned at a collection point within this set distance. No firm detail on this aspect has been presented hence this should be secured by way of planning condition. There are no further observations.

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 measurable highway safety concerns, in accordance with Local Plan: Part 2 Development Plan Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies T4 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).'

Taking into consideration the information submitted in support of the application, as well as the highways officers comments the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the local highways network, subject to conditions the application would be acceptable. Whilst it is noted that a legal agreement would normally be appropriate to secure an agreement to prevent future occupiers from applying to enter the local parking management scheme, the appeal inspector did not agree this to be necessary in determining the appeal against the previous refusal. As such the reason for refusal relating to the applicants failure to enter into a s106 is not carried forward to this application.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

See section 7.3 of this report.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

ACCESSIBILITY

The Boroughs Access Officer has been consulted on the proposed development and has provided the following comments:

"This proposal for the erection of a new two-bedroom dwelling has been reviewed with reference to London Plan Policy D7. No accessibility concerns are raised subject to the following Conditions attached to any approval: Prior to any works on site above damp proof course level, details of step free access via all points of entry and exit shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall remain in place for the life of the building. REASON To ensure housing of an inclusive design is achieved and maintained in accordance with Policies D5 and D7 of the London Plan (2021)." The dwellings hereby approved shall accord with the requirements of Policy D7 of the London Plan and shall not be occupied until certification of

compliance with the technical specifications for an M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015, has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. All such provisions must remain in place for the life of the building. REASON: To not only allow the Building Control body to require the development to comply with the optional Building Regulations standards, but to also ensure the appropriate quantity and standard of accessible and adaptable housing is constructed and maintained in accordance with policy D7 of the London Plan".

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of its accessibility, subject to inclusion of the mentioned conditions which would have been placed on the application had it been recommended for approval.

EXTERNAL LIVING ACCOMMODATION

Furthermore, the Council's Local Plan (2020) Policy DMHB 18 states that new residential developments should provide an adequate level of private amenity space for occupiers that is of good quality and usable. The policy advises that 2-3 bedroom properties should provide at least 60sqm of private amenity space for their residents.

The new 2 bed dwelling would have 75sqm of amenity space and the existing 3 bed dwelling would 94sqm of amenity space. As such adequate amenity space would be provided for future residents and existing residents (in terms of size). As stated in the previous application, the LPA consider the amenity space provided would be overlooked by the occupiers of No.18 and No.19 Mead Road due to the openness of the site and it's location despite the 1.8m fence proposed. Overlooking would discourage use of the space and would undermine its purpose of providing private amenity space for its new residents. It is therefore considered that the future occupiers of the new dwelling and the neighbours at no.18 and no.19 Mead Road would be provided with poor standard of external amenity space to the detriment of their amenities. In the appeal decision, the planning inspector dismissed these reasons for refusal and therefore they can not be sustained as reasons for refusal in this report. Although due to the new larger scale of the proposal, officers find it appropriate to mention as these effects mentioned are considered to exist if the proposal was to go ahead and should be duly noted.

INTERNAL LIVING ACCOMMODATION

London Plan Policy D6 advises that single storey, 2 bedroom, 3 person properties should provide 61 sqm of internal floorspace for future residents. 71.2sqm would be provided and therefore the dwelling would provide adequately sized internal accommodation for future residents. The proposed dwelling would be dual aspect with all the habitable rooms being served by principal windows in the front or rear elevations of the building, thus providing future occupiers with a reasonable level of natural light and outlook.

The proposal is therefore considered to be compliant to Policy D6 (D) of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF (2023).

7.6 Other Issues

CIL

The Council adopted its own Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on August 1st 2014 and the Hillingdon CIL charge for residential developments is £95 per square metre of additional floorspace. This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £60 per sq metre.

The proposed development is CIL liable.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)

The London Plan (2021)

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

Contact Officer: Daniel Ambrose

Telephone No: 01895 250230