

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER 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 Planning, Environment and Community 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

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning & Enforcement Services**

Address 14 MILL ROAD WEST DRAYTON

Development: Installation of vehicular crossover and hardstanding to front

LBH Ref Nos: **68283/APP/2011/3134**

Drawing Nos: Block Plan to Scale 1:500
 Location Plan to Scale 1:1250
 Un-numbered Site Layout Plan to Scale 1:100 Received 15th March 2012

Date Plans Received: 30/12/2011 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 30/12/2011
Date Application Valid: 31/01/2012 30/01/2012
 15/03/2012

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a two storey mid-row terrace dwelling, located on north-western side of Mill Road, a classified road.

The external walls of the building have been coated in rough render, with the roof of the building made from red concrete interlocking tiles.

The building is set 7.9 metres back from the highway, with a large area in front of the principal elevation being covered in concrete paving stones, for which planning permission has never been sought.

To the rear of the dwelling is a private garden area, which acts as the amenity space of the occupiers of the property.

The site is situated within a Developed Area and within the West Drayton Green Conservation Area as identified in the policies of the Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and also within Flood Zone 3.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application is for planning permission for the erection of a vehicle crossover at the site.

The crossover would measure 3.05 metres in width at the rear of the footway, tapering to 4.58 metres at the kerbline and would provide access to park one car within the curtilage of the site.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

No previous planning applications at the application site.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 29th February 2012

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- 29th February 2012

3. Comments on Public Consultations

Site Notice: Erected 8th February 2012 Expired 29th February 2012

Press Advertisement: Printed 8th February 2012 Expired 29th February 2012.

9 neighbouring dwellings were notified of the proposed development on 1st February 2012, including Nos.16 & 12 Mill Road who share a boundary line with the application site. One response in support of the proposed development has been received. They supported the application on the grounds that it would reduce the number of vehicles requiring on-street parking, leading to an improvement in highway safety.

An objection to the scheme was received from the West Drayton Conservation Area Advisory Panel who objected to the scheme on the following grounds:

- Two neighbouring dwellings already have dropped kerbs.
- The front wall has already been demolished and concrete hard standing laid over the front garden some time ago.
- The applicant states the concrete will be new and that the parking arrangement would be new, which is at odds with the proposed scheme.
- Impact of numerous dropped kerbs to wheelchair users.

Case Officer Comments: The applicant is applying only for the dropped kerb and makes no reference to the hardstanding in front of the dwelling. Whilst this is required to be regularised, this can be completed using a further application for either a Certificate of Lawfulness or Planning Permission. Therefore, the application is correct that the new materials relate to the crossover and not the hardstanding in front of the dwelling. The creation of a further crossover would not be considered harmful to wheelchair users using the footway.

Internal Consultees:

URBAN DESIGN AND CONSERVATION: No Comments to make

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION:

The existing proposal would be contrary to the Council's Standards and would fail to provide suitable pedestrian refuge between the proposed crossover and existing crossover servicing No.16 Mill Road.

I am of the view that our standards can be met by getting the applicant to make slight alterations by positioning the proposed access to start from the pedestrian path and reducing the access width to 2.5m at the back of the footway.

Subject to the above revision being made, I have no objection on the application. The following condition and informatives should be applied on any permission:

Condition

1. The access for the proposed car parking shall be provided with those parts of 2.4m x 2.4m pedestrian visibility splays which can be accommodated within the site in both

directions and shall be maintained free of all obstacles to the visibility between heights of 0.6m and 2.0m above the level of the adjoining highway.

Informatives

1. It is contrary to section 163 of the Highways Act 1980 for surface water from private land to drain onto the highway or discharge into the highway drainage system.
2. The applicant is advised to contact the Councils Highways Team in respect of the construction of the vehicle crossover.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Policies:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
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.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE7	Development in areas likely to flooding - requirement for flood protection measures
LPP 5.12	(2011) Flood risk management
LPP 6.13	(2011) Parking
PPS25	Development & Flood Risk

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of surrounding area, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, the impact to highway and pedestrian safety and development within a Flood Zone.

A number of dwellings on both sides of Mill Road have vehicle crossovers which allow the occupiers to park in front of their principal elevations. Therefore, the provision of an additional vehicle crossover at the site would be considered to not cause significant harm to the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area, in terms of appearance, for a dwelling of this plot width. Therefore, the development would comply with Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and B19 of the adopted UDP (Saved Policies September 2007).

The crossover and the resultant additional parking space within the curtilage of the site, would cause no significant harm to the residential amenity of any neighbouring dwelling in terms of increased noise disturbance, loss of light, loss of privacy or loss of outlook. Therefore, the development would comply with Policies OE1, BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the adopted UDP (Saved Policies September 2007).

The proposed development would provide access to one off-street parking space for the use by the occupiers of the application property, whilst resulting in the loss of one on-street parking space. As the development would result in a zero-sum impact on parking in the area and would result in a reduction in cars using on-street parking, it would be considered to have an acceptable impact on highway safety.

However, the proposed crossover would result in a 9.58 metre section of dropped kerb, as it would be connected to the existing crossover servicing No.16 Mill Road. Whilst a 1.5 metre separation would be provided at the rear of the footway between the two crossovers, this would not provide an acceptable area for pedestrian refuge. Therefore, the development would be considered to increase in the potential for harm to occur to pedestrians using the footway and would be contrary to Policy AM7 of the adopted UDP (Saved Policies September 2007).

The proposed development would be considered not to cause any significant additional potential for flooding within the Flood Zone. Therefore, the development would comply with Policy OE7 of the adopted UDP (Saved Policies September 2007), Policy 5.12 of the London Plan 2011 and PPS25.

Due to the potential harm to pedestrian safety which may arise due to the development, it is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed crossover in combination with the existing crossover servicing 16 Mill Road would result in a combined crossover of an excessive width which would make inadequate provision for pedestrian refuge to the detriment of the safety of pedestrians and vehicles using the highway. The proposal is thus contrary to policy AM7 of the Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

Standard Informatives

- 1 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
- 2 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) set out below, and to all relevant material considerations, including Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Policy No.

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
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.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE7	Development in areas likely to flooding - requirement for flood protection measures
LPP 5.12	(2011) Flood risk management
LPP 6.13	(2011) Parking
PPS25	Development & Flood Risk

Contact Officer: Alex Smith

Telephone No: 01895 250230