

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.	ADVERTISMENT 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: 7 MEADOW CLOSE RUISLIP

Development: Change of use of existing single family dwellinghouse into 2 dwellinghouses with associated external and internal amendments (revised description 01.05.24)

LBH Ref Nos: **75385/APP/2024/878**

Drawing Nos: P.M.100 - The location plan
 Proposed Site Plan
 P.M.500 - Proposed Floor Plans
 P.M.300 - Proposed Elevations
 Design and Access Statement
 P.M.400
 P.M.600
 P.M.200

Date Plans received: 17-04-24 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 17-04-24

1. SUMMARY

The site lies in Flood Zone 2. Although the proposal was accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment, it has not been adequately demonstrated that there are no other sequentially preferable alternative sites for the proposed development. The proposal, therefore, does not pass the sequential test. The proposal would not comply with local, regional or national planning policy which seeks to steer new development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding. The proposal conflicts with Policy PT1.EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DME1 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy SI 12 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2023), in this respect.

It is therefore recommended that the application be refused on the ground set out in the following section of this report.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The Local Planning Authority considers that the applicant has failed to provide robust evidence to

demonstrate that there are no other sequentially preferable alternative sites for the proposed development besides the application site which lies in Flood Zone 2. The proposal, therefore, does not pass the sequential test. The proposal would fail to steer new development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding, contrary to Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMEI 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy SI 12 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2023).

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).

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 (2021) and national guidance.

DMH 1 Safeguarding Existing Housing

DMH 2 Housing Mix

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMEI 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality

LPP SI12 (2021) Flood risk management

NPPF11 -23 NPPF11 23 - Making effective use of land

NPPF12 -23 NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places

NPPF14 -23 NPPF14 23 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

NPPF15 -23 NPPF15 23 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

NPPF4 -23 NPPF4 23 - Decision making

NPPF5 -23 NPPF5 23 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

NPPF9 -23 NPPF9 23 - Promoting sustainable transport

DMEI 9 Management of Flood Risk

DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP SI7	(2021) Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a detached dwelling set within a spacious plot, located in the south-western corner of Meadow Close, a cul-de-sac. Planning permission recently granted the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a replacement dwelling, which has now been substantially complete.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance and comprises a mixture of property types. These are predominantly single storey, although there are some two storey and others that have benefitted from loft conversions to create one and a half storey properties, including No. 8 to the north. The application site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012). The site is also situated within Flood Zone 2 and has a PTAL score of 1a (poor).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of existing single family dwellinghouse into 2 dwellinghouses with associated external and internal amendments.

The associated changes are as follows:

- replicating front canopy with amendment to fenestration to facilitate another entrance
- internal division between dwellings including an additional set of stairs

3.3 Relevant Planning History

75385/APP/2023/2493 7 MEADOW CLOSE RUISLIP

Details pursuant to the discharge of Condition 11 (Flood Action Plan) of planning permission ref. 75385/APP/2023/1228 dated 18-07-23 (Minor material amendment (s73) to condition 2 (Approved Drawings), 3 (External Materials), 4 (Landscaping Scheme), 8 (Sustainable Water Management), and 10 (Construction Logistics Plan) of planning permission ref 75385/APP/2020/3879 dated 15-03-21 (Erection of a two storey 4 bed replacement dwelling with associated parking and amenity space) for alterations to external elevations (including provision of 2 rear/side dormer windows) and changes to the internal layout).

Decision: 09-10-2023 Approval

75385/APP/2023/1228 7 MEADOW CLOSE RUISLIP

Minor material amendment (s73) to condition 2 (Approved Drawings), 3 (External Materials), 4 (Landscaping Scheme), 8 (Sustainable Water Management), and 10 (Construction Logistics Plan) of planning permission ref 75385/APP/2020/3879 dated 15-03-21 (Erection of a two storey 4 bed replacement dwelling with associated parking and amenity space) for alterations to external elevations (including provision of 2 rear/side dormer windows) and changes to the internal layout.

Decision: 18-07-2023 Approval

75385/APP/2021/2547 7 MEADOW CLOSE RUISLIP

Erection of 2 semi-detached dwellings with habitable accommodation within loft space incorporating dormers and rooflights, with associated parking and amenity space and installation of a vehicular crossover to front, following demolition of existing detached dwelling

Decision: 27-09-2021 Refusal **Appeal:** 13-05-22 Dismissed

75385/APP/2020/3879 7 MEADOW CLOSE RUISLIP

Erection of a two storey 4 bed replacement dwelling with associated parking and amenity space

Decision: 15-03-2021 Approval

75385/PRC/2020/41 7 MEADOW CLOSE RUISLIP

Demolition of existing dwelling and redevelopment to provide 2 residential dwellings

Decision: 07-04-2020 Objection

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history attached to this site is listed above.

Planning permission was granted by the Council on 16th March 2021 for the erection of a two storey 4-bed replacement dwelling with associated parking and amenity space under application

Following this, planning permission was sought for the erection of 2 semi-detached dwellings with habitable accommodation within loft space incorporating dormers and rooflights, with associated parking and amenity space and installation of a vehicular crossover to front, following demolition of existing detached dwelling (ref: 75385/APP/2021/2547) which refused for the following reason:

1. The Local Planning Authority considers that the applicant has failed to provide robust evidence to demonstrate that there are no other sequentially preferable alternative sites for the proposed development besides the application site which lies in Flood Zone 2. The proposal, therefore, does not pass the sequential test. The proposal would fail to steer new development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding, contrary to Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DME1 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy SI 12 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 159 and 162 of the NPPF (2021).

The application was later dismissed at appeal (13-05-2022).

Within the Appeal Decision, the Inspectorate decision states

4. Despite the current appeal proposal being for the construction of a pair of semi-detached dwellings rather than a single dwelling, the building footprint would be the same as that previously approved. Thus, the additional dwelling unit would be accommodated within the external building envelope of the dwelling previously approved with only internal alterations to facilitate the creation of two, rather than one, dwelling. This, the appellant contends, absolves the need for a further sequential test for the appeal proposal despite it resulting in the intensification of occupation of the site over and above that of the existing and recently approved levels.

5. However, a sequential test was not originally carried out for the development proposed. Instead, the initial sequential test was updated and maintains that as the Council are seeking to bring forward sites in areas at higher risk of flooding than the appeal site, then higher risk areas are required to meet housing targets and ensure the maintenance of a 5-year housing land supply.

6. However, having housing allocations on sites at a greater risk of flooding than the appeal site does not necessarily demonstrate that there are no other sites at lower risk of flooding than the appeal site, particularly when the proposal relates to just one net additional dwelling. Indeed, given the potential flexibility of sites in their capacity to accommodate a single dwelling, I concur with the Council's conclusion that it has not been adequately or robustly demonstrated that there are no available sites at lower risk of flooding.

Following this decision, planning permission was sought for some minor amendments to the originally approved scheme 75385/APP/2020/3879 (under ref: 75385/APP/2023/1228).

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

PUBLIC CONSULTATION:

Neighbours and Ruislip Residents Association were consulted by letter dated 22-04-24. 3 letters of objection were received citing the following concerns:

1. Previous refusal should be upheld
2. Not in keeping with the streetscene (only one semi-detached dwelling within the close)
3. Parking concerns
4. Concerns regarding sewage
5. Flood risk
6. Concerns regarding privacy (side windows to remain obscured)

PLANNING OFFICER COMMENT:

Point 1 is noted. Points 2, 3, 5 and 6 are discussed in the main report.

Concerns regarding sewage is not a material planning consideration (4).

INTERNAL CONSULTATION:

ACCESS:

This application follows a previous approval (ref: 75385/APP/2020/3879) for a replacement dwelling house. The proposal now is to subdivide the approved replacement house into two. No accessibility objection is 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. The measures implemented as approved shall be retained thereafter. 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.

PLANNING POLICY:

The proposed site is part within Flood Zone 3 and part within Flood Zone 2. The applicant's Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is from October 2020 and should be considered out-of-date. An example of this can be noted on Page 5, where an out-of-date flood map (Figure 3.1) has been used.

The Council therefore consider that the site it as high risk of flooding. The applicant's previous FRA acknowledged that the site was at high risk of flooding and undertook a sequential test accordingly. Noting that the latest mapping indicates it is at greater risk of flooding, it is assumed the applicant still agrees that a sequential test is required.

Policy EM6 of the Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) outlines that the Council will require new development to be directed away from Flood Zones 2 and 3 in accordance with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Policy DME1 9 of the Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) outlines that proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3a will be required to demonstrate that there are no suitable sites available in areas of lower flood risk. Where no appropriate sites are available, development should be located on the areas of lowest flood risk within the site.

Paragraph 168 of the NPPF (2023) outlines that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new

development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. The sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding.

The proposal does not meet any of the definitions of 'minor development' in relation to flood risk that are outlined within the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Furthermore, this guidance is clear that the definition of householder development excludes any proposed development that would create a separate dwelling within the curtilage of the existing dwelling (e.g. subdivision of houses into flats) or any other development with a purpose not incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling. This is not considered to be altered by Footnote 60 of the NPPF.

It is therefore clear that a sequential approach still needs to be applied to the development, as acknowledged at previous appeal decisions (Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3292951)

Paragraph 43 of the NPPF (2023) outlines that the right information is crucial to good decision-making, particularly where formal assessments are required, such as flood risk assessments and sequential tests. To avoid delay, applicants should discuss what information is needed with the local planning authority and expert bodies as early as possible. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment from 2020 that formed part of a dismissed appeal on the grounds of failing to undertake an adequate sequential test (See Paragraph 10 of Appeal Report). It is clear that an appropriate and accurate sequential test has not been undertaken.

Officers would note that the Council has can demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites across the borough and it is not deemed necessary to approve schemes at risk of flooding.

HIGHWAYS:

Site Characteristics & Background

The address is located at the end of a residential cul-de-sac off Evelyn Avenue in Ruislip.

The site originally consisted of a detached bungalow which has been demolished and replaced with a consented 4-bedroom dwelling with two formal on-plot parking spaces granted in March 2021 (75385/APP/2020/3879).

A subsequent application for replacing the original bungalow with 2 semi-detached houses with two on-plot parking spaces per unit was refused on flood risk grounds in September 2021 (75385/APP/2021/2547) but not on transport/highway related matters. The decision was upheld on appeal in 2022.

A change of use of the substantial detached dwelling is now proposed with its conversion to two 3-bedroom dwellings with one parking space per unit accessed via an established carriageway crossing.

There are generous off-street parking facilities available for most of the surrounding residential properties in the area which assists in reducing general on-street parking demand. Parking controls are absent from the roadway. The site address exhibits a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 1a which is considered as very poor and therefore heightens 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.

The maximum regional standard requires up to 1.5 on-plot spaces per unit. A single space per unit is proposed which falls within the required banding and is therefore considered compliant with the standard. The arrangement and layout are considered satisfactory, but it is noted that owing to the depth of frontage, there is the physical prospect of two spaces being provided per unit arranged in a tandem fashion. As this level would only marginally exceed the aforementioned standard, this potential level of parking provision is also considered satisfactory particularly in the light of the reduction in the potential for untoward on-street parking displacement onto the immediate unrestricted local roadways compounded by the higher dependency on private motor transport due to the poor PTAL rating.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP's)

In line with the London Plan (2021), within any final parking quantum there is a requirement for a minimum 20% 'active' EVCP provision with all remaining spaces being designated as 'passive' provisions. In this case, each space per unit should be dedicated as 'active' which has not been acknowledged. Hence this aspect should be secured by way of planning condition.

Cycle Parking

In terms of cycle parking there would be a requirement to provide 2 secure and accessible spaces for each dwelling. Although the applicant confirms this quantum, relevant detail is not indicated on-plan. This detail can however be secured via planning condition.

Access Arrangement

Access via the established carriageway crossing to both units is considered fit for purpose.

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.

There is likely to be a small increase in vehicle bound activity as compared to the scale and single tenure of the existing dwelling however any rise would be anticipated to be marginal hence any generated activity can therefore be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Although no detail is shown, refuse collection will continue via Meadow Close as is the case at present. 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. This should be physically possible to achieve hence 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 Management Plan (2020) - Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management
PT1.EM11	(2012) Sustainable Waste Management
PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 1	Safeguarding Existing Housing
DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
NPPF11 -23	NPPF11 23 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12 -23	NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
NPPF14 -23	NPPF14 23 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF15 -23	NPPF15 23 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF4 -23	NPPF4 23 - Decision making
NPPF5 -23	NPPF5 23 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF9 -23	NPPF9 23 - Promoting sustainable transport
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking
LPP SI7 (2021) Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy

In addition: Development Plan:

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)
The West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan (2021)

Material Considerations:

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

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon 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. The supporting text of Policy DMHB 11 states that 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 or onto private open spaces. A minimum 21 metre separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain privacy. The Council will also 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.

The proposal would not involve any changes to the siting or dimensions of the dwelling approved under planning permission 75385/APP/2020/3879 and 26895/APP/2023/335. The external changes do introduce a canopy to the front, mirroring the existing canopy. Given the location, there are no neighbouring amenity concerns.

The side windows and roof lights are fixed shut and obscured glazed, as secured under the previous permission 75385/APP/2023/1228. It is therefore considered that the proposal would increase overlooking or loss of privacy to that normally experienced within an urban environment.

The number of occupants at the site would be similar to that of the existing family dwelling. It is therefore considered that the addition of 1 additional residential unit at the site would not result in

any over intensification of the sites use, or harmful increase in noise, disturbance or activity.

As such the proposal would comply with the requirements of policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE:

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extensions of dwellings should not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also requires that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers. This sets out the design criteria including external dimensions by which proposals are assessed with the general aim of ensuring that these are subordinate to the original building.

With regards to front extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

- i) alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor, and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused;
- ii) porches should be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building; pastiche features will not be supported; and
- iii) notwithstanding the above, at least 25% of the front garden must be retained.

Policy DMHB 12 advises that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area. It should ensure public realm design takes account of the established townscape character and quality of the surrounding area.

Given the nature of the proposal, the main external difference would be the proposed canopy and front door. The footprint of the canopy is modest and replicates the existing canopy and front door. The majority of the works associated with the conversion are internal works, which have no impact on the appearance of the dwelling or street scene. Property frontages within the area are full landscaped and fully hard surfaced and therefore the proposed frontage would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the area. The proposed external works to the dwelling (canopy, window alterations) would have no adverse impact on the appearance of the area or host dwelling and are therefore considered to be acceptable.

Overall the proposed works are considered to have an acceptable impact on the visual amenities of the area. The development would accord with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One -

Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

See 'Carparking & Layout' section.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

PARKING AND HIGHWAY SAFETY:

Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) 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.

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that all development is in accordance with the car parking standards set out in Appendix C, Table 1 unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

Parking Provision

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. The maximum regional standard requires up to 1.5 on-plot spaces per unit. A single space per unit is proposed which falls within the required banding and is therefore considered compliant with the standard. The arrangement and layout are considered satisfactory, but it is noted that owing to the depth of frontage, there is the physical prospect of two spaces being provided per unit arranged in a tandem fashion. As this level would only marginally exceed the aforementioned standard, this potential level of parking provision is also considered satisfactory particularly in the light of the reduction in the potential for untoward on-street parking displacement onto the immediate unrestricted local roadways compounded by the higher dependency on private motor transport due to the poor PTAL rating.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP's)

In line with the London Plan (2021), within any final parking quantum there is a requirement for a minimum 20% 'active' EVCP provision with all remaining spaces being designated as 'passive' provisions. In this case, each space per unit should be dedicated as 'active' which has not been acknowledged, this could be secured by way of planning condition.

Cycle Parking

In terms of cycle parking there would be a requirement to provide 2 secure and accessible spaces for each dwelling. Although the applicant confirms this quantum, relevant detail is not indicated on-plan. Therefore, this detail would be secured via planning condition.

Vehicular Trip Generation

There is likely to be a small increase in vehicle bound activity as compared to the scale and single tenure of the existing dwelling however any rise would be anticipated to be marginal hence any generated activity can therefore be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Although no detail is shown, refuse collection will continue via Meadow Close as is the case at present. 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. This should be physically possible to achieve hence 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 Management Plan (2020) - Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE:

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all new residential development and conversions will be required to provide good quality and usable private outdoor amenity space. Table 5.3 requires 2-3bed dwellings to be provided with at least 60sq.metres of private amenity space.

While there is no site plan to indicate the garden areas of each dwelling, given the size of the existing garden which would be divided, alongside the Design and Access Statement, it is considered each of the dwellings would have access to at least 60 sqm of private amenity space. The details of which could be secured by a condition.

The development therefore accords with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

RESIDENTIAL LIVING CONDITIONS:

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) sets out the minimum internal floor space standards required for residential developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for future occupants.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment.

The DCLG's Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard (2015) requires double bedrooms to have a floor area of at least 11.5 square metres, and for single bedrooms to have a floor area of at least 7.5 square metres.

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) states that housing development should be of high quality design and provide adequately sized rooms. Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021) requires 3 bedroom, 6 person houses to have a minimum gross internal area of 102 square metres with 2.5 square metres of built in storage. Each of the proposed dwellings would have a gross internal area well in excess of 104.5 square metres, thus exceeding the minimum space standard set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan and Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

It is considered, that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the development would still maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

ACCESS

Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) states that suitable housing and genuine choice should be provided for London's diverse population, including disabled people, older people and families with young children.

The access officer has not raise an objection, subject to conditions regarding step free access and compliance with the technical specifications for an M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015, which could be secured by condition. The development would accord with the broad aims of Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021).

FLOOD RISK:

Policy EM6 of the Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) outlines that the Council will require new development to be directed away from Flood Zones 2 and 3 in accordance with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Policy DMEI 9 of the Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) outlines that proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3a will be required to demonstrate that there are no suitable sites available in areas of lower flood risk. Where no appropriate sites are available, development should be located on the areas of lowest flood risk within the site.

Paragraph 168 of the NPPF (2023) outlines that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. The sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding.

Policy SI 12 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should ensure that flood risk is minimised and mitigated, and that residual risk is addressed.

Policy DMEI 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3a will be required to demonstrate that there are no suitable sites available in areas of lower flood risk.

It is noted that planning application ref: 75385/APP/2021/2547 was refused due to failure to provide robust evidence to demonstrate that there are no other sequentially preferable alternative sites for the proposed development besides the application site which lies in Flood Zone 2. As such, the proposal did not pass the sequential test. This decision was upheld at appeal (ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3292951). The planning inspector acknowledged that the building footprint would be same as previous approved, however, they concurred with the Council's decision that it had not been adequately or robustly demonstrated that there are no suitable site available in areas of lower flood risk.

As mentioned previously the site is in Flood Zone 2. During the course of the application an updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by Lanmor Consulting Ltd was submitted. Paragraph 6.1.3 and 6.1.4 of the FRA states that "Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that applications for some minor development and for changes of use should not be subject to the sequential or exception tests but should still meet the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments. Footnote 60 states, This includes householder development, small nonresidential extensions (with a footprint of less than 250m²) and changes of use; except for changes of use to a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home or park home site, where the sequential and exception tests should be applied as appropriate. Therefore, it is concluded that the sequential test and exception test are not required for the subdivision of the existing dwelling into 2 dwellings, as it is a change of use."

However, it is considered that the proposal does not meet any of the definitions of 'minor development' in relation to flood risk that are outlined within the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Specifically, the guidance is clear that the definition of householder development excludes any proposed development that would create a separate dwelling within the curtilage of the existing dwelling (e.g. subdivision of houses into flats) or any other development with a purpose not incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling. This is not considered to be altered by Footnote 60 of the NPPF.

It is therefore clear that a sequential approach still needs to be applied to the development, as acknowledged at previous appeal decisions (Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3292951). It is clear that an appropriate and accurate sequential test has not been undertaken.

Officers would note that the Council has can demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites across the borough and it is not deemed necessary to approve schemes at risk of flooding.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the scheme has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate that there are no other sequentially preferable alternative sites for the proposed development. On this basis, the proposal does not pass the sequential test and would conflict with Policy DMEI 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy SI 12 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2023).

7.6 Other Issues

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT:

Policy H10 of the London Plan (2021) states that applicants and decision-makers should have regard to the need for additional family housing.

Policy DMH 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the net loss of existing self-contained housing, including affordable housing, will be resisted unless the housing is replaced with at least equivalent residential floorspace.

Policy DMH 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council will require the provision of a mix of housing units of different sizes in schemes of residential development to reflect the Council's latest information on housing need.

Both dwellings when subdivided could provide a family sized dwelling containing 3bedrooms and would therefore not undermine the Council's housing strategy which seeks to protect family sized dwellings.

The principle of converting the existing dwellinghouse into two separate dwellings is considered to be acceptable. The development therefore accords with Policies DMH 1 and DMH 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy H10 of the London Plan (2021).

REMOVAL OF PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS:

As the new dwellings would effectively be formed with extensions, to protect the character and appearance of the area, the amenity of residential occupiers and to ensure the retention of adequate private amenity spaces, a condition would be reasonable to restrict permitted development rights.

8. Reference Documents

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)

The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)

The London Plan (2021)

The National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

Contact Officer:

Emilie Bateman

Telephone No:

01895 250230