

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

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration**

Address 174 AYLSHAM DRIVE ICKENHAM

Development: Two storey, 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space

LBH Ref Nos: **35924/APP/2018/960**

Drawing Nos: 5174/01/101
 5174/01/104
 5174/01/105
 5174/01/102
 5174/01/103
 5174/02/106
 5174/02/112
 5174/02/101
 5174/02/102
 5174/02/107
 5174/02/108
 5174/02/104
 5174/02/103
 5174/02/105
 5174/02/111
 Design and Access Statement
 5174/02/109
 5174/02/110

Date Plans received : 03/04/2018

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 03/04/2018

1. SUMMARY

The proposal involves subdivision of the plot and the erection of a part sunken two storey dwelling providing one bedroom at ground floor level and the living accommodation at lower ground floor, with the rear garden terraced to provide a patio and steps leading up to existing ground level. This is a further attempt to introduce an additional dwelling the previous schemes having been refused.

The principle of residential use in this sustainable location is considered to be acceptable. The existing dwelling has a large side garden and due to its location on a bend, there is a substantial gap between the application site and the nearest neighbour, No. 176 Aylsham Drive. This wide gap contributes substantially to the character of this estate. The site is partially screened by a mature hedge along the boundary. However, glimpses of the site are currently possible and the construction of the dwelling will result in removal of part of the hedge to accommodate both vehicular and pedestrian access and the proposed dwelling would be visible all year round both from the street and from neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed dwelling would substantially narrow the gap between Nos 174 and 176 Aylsham Drive. It is considered that the amended proposal, due to the proposed size, scale, siting and design, is out of keeping in relation to its surroundings, would in-fill a visually important gap between properties in a densely built up area and would result in a material harm to the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area. Moreover, it

is considered that the rear amenity space would provide an unacceptable level of amenity for occupiers by reason of an oppressive environment, due to its sunken nature and with stepped terraces which limit practical use.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of its size, scale, width, design and position would result in the in-filling of an important visual gap in a densely built up area which would unbalance the existing terrace of properties and detract from the general character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said unit. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future residents contrary to Policy BE23 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 proposal would provide a habitable room (Lower ground floor living area) with a poor outlook and levels of natural light and would therefore give rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

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 (2016). 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 - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM13	AM13 Increasing the ease of movement for frail and elderly people and people with disabilities in development schemes through (where appropriate): - (i) Dial-a-ride and mobility bus services (ii) Shopmobility schemes (iii) Convenient parking spaces (iv) Design of road, footway, parking and pedestrian and street furniture schemes
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.
H4	Mix of housing units
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
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 7.1	(2011) Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character
NPPF1	NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF6	NPPF - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF7	NPPF - Requiring good design

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. The Council's supports pre-application discussions. Whilst such discussions took place, it is considered that the application does not take sufficient account of the views made in pre-application response. It is considered that the changes required are material and would require a further application to be made.

5 174 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

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises an end terrace three bedroom property set forward of the adjoining property and situated on a triangular shaped plot. To the East of No.174 Aylsham Drive is open and abuts an electric sub station. No.174 is a two storey house with a side garage extension and a single storey rear extension. There is an existing vehicular crossover and the boundary to the front has mature hedges.

The street scene is characterised by terraced properties with gabled roofs in groups of four. The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal is for the subdivision of the corner of the plot and the erection of a partly sunken two storey dwelling providing one bedroom at ground floor level and the living accommodation at lower ground floor, with the rear garden terraced to provide a patio and steps leading up existing ground level. It would have a green roof. A separate side amenity space is also provided alongside No 174 Aylsham Drive.

The proposal is for a design which is seeking to overcome the refusals of planning permission for previous schemes.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

35924/85/0376 174 Aylsham Drive Ickenham
Householder dev. (small extension,garage etc) (P)

Decision: 20-03-1985 Approved

35924/APP/2012/2031 174 Aylsham Drive Ickenham

Two storey, 2-bed, detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space involving the enlargement of vehicular crossover to front and demolition of existing detached garage

Decision: 12-11-2012 Refused

35924/APP/2013/590 174 Aylsham Drive Ickenham

Two storey, 2-bed, detached dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and boundary treatment with gate, involving the enlargement of vehicular crossover and hardstanding to front and demolition of existing detached garage

Decision: 20-05-2013 Refused

35924/APP/2017/3931 174 Aylsham Drive Ickenham

Two storey, 2-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space

Decision: 01-02-2018 Refused

35924/PRC/2017/42 174 Aylsham Drive Ickenham

Subdivision of corner plot to incorporate a new single dwelling.

Decision: 15-06-2017 OBJ

Comment on Planning History

Planning application ref.35924/APP/2012/2031 was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal by reason of its size, scale, design and position would result in the infilling of an important visual gap in a densely built up area which would unbalance the existing terrace of properties and detract from the general character and appearance of the street scene. This would be exacerbated through the need to provide additional hardstanding and facilities such as cycle and refuse storage which are not demonstrated within the proposed plans. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposal would provide an indoor living area of an unsatisfactory size for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling, therefore giving rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future residents contrary to Policy 3.5 and Table 3.3 of the London Plan (2011) and Policy BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.

3. The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said units. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future residents contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4. The proposed development fails to provide off street parking provision for the existing property and the proposed dwelling, and therefore the development is considered to be deficient in car parking provision with regard to the Council's approved car parking standards, leading to on-street parking, in an area where such parking is at a premium, to the detriment of public and highway safety and therefore contrary to policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the Council's Car Parking Standards (2007).

5. The proposal would fail to meet all relevant Lifetime Home Standards to the detriment of the amenities of future residents, contrary to Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (2011) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon.

35924/APP/2013/590 was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal by reason of its size, scale, design and position would result in the in-filling of an important visual gap in a densely built up area which would unbalance the existing terrace of properties and detract from the general character and appearance of the street scene. This would be exacerbated through the need to provide additional hardstanding and facilities such as cycle and refuse storage which are not demonstrated within the proposed plans. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposal would provide an indoor living area of an unsatisfactory size for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling, therefore giving rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future residents contrary to Policy 3.5 and Table 3.3 of the London Plan (2011) and Policy BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

3. The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said unit. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future residents contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4. The proposed development would result in a excessive width of crossover for the existing property, would result in the loss of existing on-street parking and would result in the location of a new crossover on a bend in the road thus resulting in vehicles manoeuvring onto the highway with limited visibility, all of which would result in conditions detrimental to public and highway safety, contrary to policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

35924/APP/2017/3931 was refused for the following reasons -

1. The proposal by reason of its size, scale, width, design and position would result in the in-filling of an important visual gap in a densely built up area which would unbalance the existing terrace of properties and detract from the general character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said unit. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future residents contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

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.
AM13	AM13 Increasing the ease of movement for frail and elderly people and people with disabilities in development schemes through (where appropriate): - (i) Dial-a-ride and mobility bus services (ii) Shopmobility schemes (iii) Convenient parking spaces (iv) Design of road, footway, parking and pedestrian and street furniture schemes
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.
H4	Mix of housing units
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
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 7.1	(2011) Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character
NPPF1	NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF6	NPPF - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF7	NPPF - Requiring good design

In addition:

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

Policies OE1, OE3 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) require the design of new developments to protect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring dwellings. Also the proposed development should not breach the 45 degree guideline when taken from the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling, ensuring no significant loss of light, loss of outlook or sense of dominance in accordance with Policy BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

HDAS; Residential Layouts, in relation to new dwellings, states all residential developments and amenity space should receive adequate daylight and sunlight, including habitable rooms and kitchens. The daylight and sunlight available to adjoining properties should be adequately protected. Where a two or more storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible over-dominance, and 15 m will be the minimum acceptable distance. The application would comply with this advice as there are no properties situated immediately to the rear, but garages. The proposed dwelling would be set back in relation to the existing property to which it would be applied and would not project beyond a 45 degree line of sight from the nearest first floor habitable room window of that dwelling and as such, is considered not to be over-dominant in relation to the same. Furthermore, due to the orientation of the site and the set down of the proposed dwelling, the proposal would not result in a loss of light, outlook or material loss of privacy to the adjacent property (No.176). Therefore it is not considered that there would be a significant and unacceptable impact on the occupiers of the adjacent properties.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design. Furthermore Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) resist any development which would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or would fail to safeguard the design of the existing and adjoining sites. HDAS: Residential Layouts advises that careful consideration should be given to the location of surrounding buildings, their orientation, building lines, frontages and entrances. Building lines within schemes should relate to the street pattern.

The adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Residential Layouts: Section 3.4 states this type of development must seek to enhance the character of the area. Section 4.10 of the SPD explains careful consideration should be given to the height of new buildings and the surrounding building lines, as a general rule the front and rear building lines should be a guide for the siting of new dwellings.

The site is located within the developed area as shown on the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Proposals Map. The subtext at paragraph 7.29 of the Hillingdon Local Plan.

The street scene is characterised by sets of two storey terraced properties of a similar design with pitched roofs, and three storey blocks of flatted developments, also with pitched roofs. This is a corner plot set between nos. 174 and 176 There is a electricity sub station situated in the gap opposite the junction with Cranston Close but this is a very small structure. The local topography includes some gentle changes in level; for example where the drives on numbers 93 and 95 rise up to their integral garages, but there are no dramatic changes in levels. The sub station which is set in a fenced compound is also screened at present by being set back from the pavement, and by intervening fences and established vegetation.

The site and floor plans indicate the attached garage of the host dwelling will be removed and a two storey dwelling set down within ground levels, would be erected adjacent to and level with the front of the sub station enclosure and at a 40 degree angle to no. 174. This would result in a gap of approximately 6 m between no. 174 and the proposed dwelling at the front, with the dwellings touching at the rear.

The gap between the existing properties is an important part of the overall character of the area. It provides the visual relief of open space and a view through the built development. Although this proposal would be lower than the previously considered applications, the wide flat roofed structure would still be clearly visible from the wider area, including from the street and the rear of a number of properties. It would have a maximum height of 2.7 metres which the Design and Access Statement suggests is characteristic of the area. It would also be clad in timber with the intention to reflect the character of local fences. At 2.7 metres high this structure is higher than the normal height of fences in the area, which appear to be in the order of 1.8 to 2.0 metres. It is also considered that contrary to the Design and Access Statement assertions, it is a bulky structure that will not be read as a fence, despite the intentions of the design philosophy. From certain angles within the street the amended scheme is still likely to be read as a large flat roofed and incongruous extension to the existing dwelling. It will also be highly visible from the top windows of a number of local dwellings where the incongruous nature of the design will be readily apparent. Although there would still be a hedge along part of the front boundary, the proposal requires a wide access to serve the existing and proposed dwellings and there is also a separate pedestrian access to the proposed dwellings. The result is a general opening up of the current soft frontage and the verdant character of the street would be compromised. As such, it is considered that the amended development would still be harmful to the character of the area.

In view of the above, it is considered the proposal would result in a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the street and the wider area, and as such would fail to comply with Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.3 Traffic Impact / Pedestrian Safety

The Highways and Traffic Officer has no objections. Sufficient car parking is provided for both the existing and proposed dwellings and vehicles can enter and exit the site safely. The development would not generate significant levels of traffic.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

As discussed above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Standard of Accommodation to be provided.

London Plan Policy 3.5 states that housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to the wider environment. It also states that Local Plans should incorporate minimum space standards and that these should conform to Table 3.3 of the plan. Paragraph 3.36 of the London Plan states:

"The Mayor regards the relative size of all new homes in London to be a key element of this strategic issue. Table 3.3 therefore sets out minimum space standards for dwellings of different sizes. This is based on the minimum gross internal floor area (GIA) required for new homes relative to the number of occupants and taking into account commonly required furniture and the spaces needed for different activities and moving around, in line with the Lifetime Home standards. This means developers should state the number of

bedspaces/occupiers a home is designed to accommodate rather than, say, simply the number of bedrooms. These are minimum standards which developers are encouraged to exceed."

Table 3.3 requires a 2 storey, 1 bedroom, 2 person dwelling, such as the one proposed by this application, to have a minimum size of 58 sq.m plus 1.5 sq.m storage. The proposed new dwelling would be approximately 72 sq.m and would be above the required standard resulting in a satisfactory residential environment for future occupiers. The development accords with Policy 3.5 and Table 3.3 of the London Plan and Policy BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

HDAS SPD: Residential Layouts states a minimum of 40 sq.m of private amenity space should be provided for one bedroom houses. The proposed private amenity space would be 42 sq.m in two sections, one to the side and one to the rear. The existing three-bedroom house would retain over 60 sq.m. However, the rear amenity space for the new unit would be sunk to a depth of some 2.6 m and would, itself, effectively act as a well with walls formed by the rear of the dwelling, retaining walls to the sides and a steeply stepped terrace to the rear. The living room windows would look out across the small patio to its surrounding wall and would face a steep series of terraces. Although the unit would also get natural light from the front and at ground floor, the rear sunken part would receive comparatively little. Moreover, with such a limited aspect and orientation to the South East which would limit sunlight penetration from the afternoon onwards, the outlook afforded to the occupiers would be poor with a distinct sense of enclosure due to the dwellings' setting partly below ground level. The application is accompanied by shadowing diagrams. However, these show shadowing on a month by month basis and do not indicate time of day or how shadowing will impact over the course of the day. The Design and Access statement is silent on this matter. As such, it is not been demonstrated that a suitable quality of amenity space will result.

The inadequate outlook from the living room windows would be significantly below the standard of living conditions that future occupiers could reasonably expect from a self-contained unit of residential accommodation. Any significant landscaping of the terraces or tiers would make this worse. There are no distant views possible from the lower floor windows. It is therefore concluded that, due to the limited outlook and a resultant sense of enclosure, the proposed dwelling's living conditions would not comply with the above guidance and Policies BE19, BE20, BE21 and BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Lifetime Homes

The plans indicate that the proposed development would be compatible with the London Plan Policy 3.8 (Housing Choice) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document "Accessible Hillingdon" adopted January 2010 requirement and the design standards set out in the above guidance document. The proposal is therefore acceptable from an accessibility standpoint.

7.6 Other Issues

Policy R17 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), requires that where developments generate the need for additional facilities, financial contributions will be sought. Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011. 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 £35 per sq metre.

It applies where a proposal would result in an increase in a gross internal floorspace of 100 metres square or more or where a proposal would create 1 or more residential units.

The proposal produces a net increase of 76.2 square metres. Presently calculated the proposal would attract a CIL Liability of:

Hillingdon CIL £9,535.27

London Mayoral CIL £3,733.54

Total CIL £13,268.81

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (September 2007)
The London Plan (2016)
The Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016)
Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016)
Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon
National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster

Telephone No: 01895 250230