

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 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 Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval ☐
25. WORKS TO TREES ☐
26. OTHER (please specify) ☐

The delegation powers schedule has been checked. Director of Residents Services can determine this application.

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informatives 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 DATES SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS TO THE ODPM

Date Plans received :	08/01/2015	Date(s) of Amendment(s):	17/12/2014
Date Application Valid:	08/01/2015		05/01/2015
			06/01/2015
			23/02/2015

The property is located within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012). This proposal considers the demolition of the existing bungalow and erection of a two storey building providing 4 x 2 bed flats.

The proposed development is a significant addition to street scene which is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the area and has failed to demonstrate how it can meet all relevant Lifetime Home Standards, provide privacy to the future occupants of the ground floor flats and mitigate landscaping concerns in the parking areas to the front curtilage, contrary to the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) and the London Plan 2011 and is recommended for refusal.

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

The proposed development by reason of its size, scale, height and rearward bulk, would result in an overdevelopment of the site and be an over-dominant and visually intrusive development to the detriment of the visual amenity of the street scene and the surrounding area. As such, it would out of keeping with the character of the area and is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

The proposed development is considered to result in a large area of

hardstanding/parking within the front curtilage, and would not allow sufficient space to mitigate this impact by way of soft landscaping. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and character and appearance of the wider area, contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development comprises a communal amenity area, the use of which would lead to an unacceptable level of overlooking, noise and disturbance to the ground floor flats, which both have two bedroom windows facing this area. The proposal would thus, be detrimental to the residential amenity of future occupiers of the ground floor flats, contrary to Policies BE19, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - UDP Saved Policies (November 2012).

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal has failed to demonstrate that it would be able to meet Lifetime Homes standards to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers, contrary to Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (2011) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon.

INFORMATIVES

1 I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies. On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development (which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

2 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).

3 I53 Compulsory Informative (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 (July 2011) and national guidance.

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.

BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
LPP 3.3	(2011) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2011) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2011) Housing Choice
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 7.2	(2011) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006

3. **CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 **Site and Locality**

The application site is a reasonable sized plot, located on the south western side of Deane Avenue. It currently comprises a detached 2 bed bungalow with an attached garage an additional parking space to the front. It also benefits from a good sized rear garden. To the northern side there is a detached two storey dwelling and on the southern side there is a two storey semi detached property, both of which project further to the rear than the existing dwelling.

The street scene is generally residential in character and appearance comprising a mixture of two and single storey detached and semi-detached properties.

The site is located within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

3.2 **Proposed Scheme**

The proposal is to demolish the existing bungalow and replace it with a two storey, detached building to create 4 x 2-bed self contained flats with associated parking and amenity space.

3.3 **Relevant Planning History** **Comment on Planning History**

None

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

The following neighbours were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 30 January 2015 as follows: -

- 20 Deane Avenue
- 20A Deane Avenue
- 19Northholt Avenue
- 15 Deane Avenue
- 24A Deane Avenue
- 24 Deane Avenue
- 15A Deane Avenue

4 responses were received from adjoining neighbours, detailing the following issues:

- Why knock down a perfectly good bungalow for small flats. The flats will overlook my property and will not benefit the overall look of the Avenue - there are too many flats in the road already adding more issues with drainage and parking
- No objection in principle to the redevelopment of the site however 4 x 2 bed flats could be occupied by as many as 16 residents. The density of occupation on such a modest site could be potentially at least twice the density of any other independent property in Deane Avenue or the surrounding area. Surely this is excessive.
- 4 dwellings will need 4 car parking spaces on site as well as increasing the potential of 4 extra parking permits for that area of Deane Avenue, where there is currently only 1 bay/space available in front of 22. There is already considerable pressure and some conflict on resident only bays.
- Not clear on the amenity area for the occupants of the 4 flats.
- The building will cover the large majority of the site and it is inevitable that the amenity/garden areas of the two adjacent properties as well as the property to the rear would be considerably overlooked to the detriment of the quiet enjoyment of the existing privacy afforded to those properties.
- The proposed property goes back too far at the rear so is not in the same building line as all other properties. Too ambitious.
- The bin store behind the property will attract pests such as foxes and rodents which could also effect neighbouring properties. The smell from the enclosed bin store could also be unpleasant if refuse is not disposed correctly.

South Ruislip Residents Association: No response

Ministry of Defence: No objections

Access Officer: In assessing this application, reference has been made to London Plan July 2011, Policy 3.8 (Housing Choice) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document "Accessible Hillingdon" adopted May 2013. Compliance with all 16 Lifetime Home Standards (as relevant) should be shown on plan.

The Design & Access Statement reports on two centrally positioned parking spaces suitable for wheelchair users, and the development is understood to comply with the Lifetime Home Standards. However the plans demonstrate this is not to be the case in the following:

1. Level access should be achieved. Details of level access to and into the proposed dwelling should be submitted. A fall of 1:60 in the areas local to the principal entrance and

rear entrance should be incorporated to prevent rain and surface water ingress. In addition to a levels plan showing internal and external levels a section drawing of the level access threshold substructure, and water bar to be installed, including necessary drainage, should be submitted.

2. The bathrooms should be designed in accordance with Lifetime Home standards. At least 700mm should be provided to one side of the WC, with 1100mm provided between the front edge of the toilet pan and a door or wall opposite. The plans indicate floor gulley drainage.

Conclusion revised plans should be requested as a prerequisite to any planning approval. In any case an additional Condition regarding level access should be attached to any planning permission.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION

Level access shall be provided to and into the dwelling houses, designed in accordance with technical measurements and tolerances specified by Part M to the Building Regulations 2010 (2004 edition, incorporating 2010/13 amendments), and shall be retained in perpetuity.

Highways: Please consult Highways Street Lighting section to assess the feasibility of relocating the lighting column affected by the proposed crossover.

Environmental Protection: No objection subject to control of environmental nuisance from construction work informative.

6. **UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan**

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
LPP 3.3	(2011) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2011) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2011) Housing Choice

LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 7.2	(2011) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006

In addition: None

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) SPD: Residential Layouts advises all residential developments and amenity space should receive adequate daylight and sunlight. The daylight and sunlight available to adjoining properties should be protected with adequate distance maintained to overcome possible domination. The SPD states that as a guide, the distance between habitable room windows should not be less than 21m.

The existing rear building line of the adjacent properties is set back further to the rear than the original bungalow. The proposed building will project 1.7m beyond that line, with a further projection positioned in the middle of the rear elevation extending 4.1m into the rear garden and set back from the boundary by 2.9m. The plans indicate this will not compromise the 45 degree line of sight from the adjacent habitable rooms. It is further noted that the rear projection is significantly lower than the main building. It is considered that the proposed building would not result in an unacceptably oppressive and overbearing outlook to the occupants of these properties.

Two properties to the rear of the site currently benefit from existing rear gardens of approximately or in excess of 12m. The distance from the rear projection of the proposed building to the site boundary is a further 8.7m, giving a minimum distance of 20.7m, fractionally less than recommended by the guidance. This is not significantly short of the guidance and suitable landscaping could help to mitigate any harmful impact.

In order to protect privacy, the design of the dwelling should avoid creating significant opportunities for direct overlooking from any upper floor windows into the private garden, kitchen or any habitable room windows of the neighbouring properties. The proposed building would have bedroom windows at first floor level which face the garden area of the application site. It is acknowledged that the addition of first floor bedroom windows over the current single storey building would appear to increase potential for overlooking, but it is not considered that this increases overlooking to any greater extent than that already experienced from the adjacent two storey buildings.

The impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties is therefore considered to be satisfactory.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings and the public realm contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place. Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that the layout and appearance of new development should "harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area." The NPPF (2011) notes the importance of achieving design which is appropriate to its context stating that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities

available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'

There are a diverse range of styles, designs and materials in the makeup of the existing properties within the street scene. This comprises one, one and a half and two storey properties, varying in height from approximately 5.4m (the height of the existing bungalow) to 8m (at the opposite end of the road), with the adjacent properties 7.5m in height. The proposed building extends across the whole plot, excluding the 1m set back on either side and is significantly larger with a height of 9.4m. The overly large addition in the street scene would appear dominating and overbearing and not in accordance with the rhythm of the adjacent properties.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would fail to complement the character of the surrounding area. As such the proposal fails to comply with Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) considers whether the traffic generated by the proposed development is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

Policy AM14 states that new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards. These require a provision of 1.5 spaces per dwelling.

The application site has a PTAL rating of 2, which is considered poor for public transport accessibility. However it is noted that there is an existing bus stop at the end of the road and Ruislip tube station is located approximately 500m to the north. There is also a range of local shops and services all within easy walking distance. Therefore a potential reduction in the car parking standards to provide only one space per residential unit may be acceptable. However HDAS advises that the loss of significant vegetation to accommodate car parking is likely to make a proposal unacceptable, as it can significantly diminish environmental quality. The frontage of the property measures 13m in width, which is currently mainly laid to lawn with established hedges on either side boundary. The proposal reduces the soft landscaping to a 0.9m wide flowerbed along each side boundary. There is no scope to improve the soft landscaping and provide 4 parking spaces. It is therefore considered that the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

It is also noted that there is an existing street light on the pavement directly in front of the bungalow. No reference has been made within the context of this application with regard to relocating the light to ensure the crossover to the parking space can be achieved.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

As above

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

The issue of urban design and access has been covered elsewhere in this report.

A Secured by Design condition could be added to any approval to ensure the development complies with such principles should the application be acceptable in all other respects.

7.6 Other Issues

The Access Officer has raised concerns relating to Lifetime Home Standards and to achieving level access. He requested details of level access to and into the proposed dwellings should be submitted. He also requested the bathrooms should be designed in accordance with Lifetime Home standards. At least 700mm should be provided to one side of the WC, with 1100mm provided between the front edge of the toilet pan and a door or wall opposite. The plans indicate floor gulley drainage. Revised plans have been submitted showing details for the level access. The agent has raised assurances that as a team of designers and developers, they are well versed with Lifetime Homes Standards, and their working drawings will cover the full aspect of compliance. However the bathroom plans appear to show 800mm clearance to the side but only 840mm clearance to the front and they do not identify the gulley floor requested, indicating they have not provided the detail requested by the Access Officer.

There are no trees within or adjacent to the site. While landscape design details have not been specified, the layout plans indicate that there is some space and opportunity to provide landscaping. The 25% landscaping requirement for front gardens would not be met however. The proposal fails to comply with Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012).
Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2.
The London Plan (July 2011).
Supplementary Planning Document 'Accessible Hillingdon'.
National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

Telephone No: 01895 250230