

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 24 BEECHWOOD AVENUE HAYES

Development: Erection of a two storey, 2 bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space

LBH Ref Nos: **51562/APP/2019/2523**

Drawing Nos: F/1 Rev. B
 Design and Access Statement
 F/4 Rev. B (Proposed Site Plan Showing First Floor Plan)
 F/4 Rev. B (Proposed Site Plan Showing Ground Floor Plan)
 F/2 Rev. B
 F/22 Rev. B
 F/3 Rev. B
 F/10 Rev. B
 F/4 Rev. B (Proposed Site Plan)
 F/5 Rev. B
 F/6 Rev. B
 F/7 Rev. B
 F/8 Rev. B
 F/9 Rev. B
 E/1 Rev. B
 E/2 Rev. C
 E/7 Rev. B
 E/3 Rev. B
 E/4 Rev. B
 E/5 Rev. C
 E/6 Rev. B
 S/7 Rev. B

Date Plans received : 29/10/2019

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 29/10/2019

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks full planning permission for a two storey side extension to create 1 x 2-bed dwelling. The alterations to the property are considered not to respect the architectural integrity of the host building and would have a negative impact upon the visual amenity of the site and the surrounding area. As such, the proposed development would almost entirely infill the gap which would erode the positive contribution that the existing gap makes to the street scene. It would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and would be harmful for this reason.

In addition, the proposal has not demonstrated that sufficient off-street parking/manoeuvring arrangements would be provided, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, leading to on-street parking/queuing to the detriment of public and highway safety.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of its size, scale, bulk, depth, width, proximity to the side boundary and projection forward of the return building line along Lime Grove, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions and HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal has not demonstrated that sufficient off street parking/manoeuvring/access arrangements would be provided, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, leading to on-street parking/queuing to the detriment of public and highway safety and contrary to Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), to Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards as set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), Policy DMT 6 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, size, scale, bulk, width and design would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions and HDAS: Residential Layouts.

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

2 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.
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.
DMH 4	Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area

3. **CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 **Site and Locality**

The application site comprises a two storey semi detached dwelling located on the East side of Beechwood Avenue in Hayes. This is a residential area characterised by terraced/semi-detached properties with large back gardens. There are few flatted developments at present.

3.2 **Proposed Scheme**

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension to provide one 2 bed dwelling with associated amenity space.

It is pertinent to note that the current application is a re-submission of the previously refused planning application, planning ref: 51562/APP/2018/1353 which sought permission for 1 x 3 bedroom dwelling. It was refused on the following grounds;

1. The proposal by reason of its size, scale, bulk, depth, width, proximity to the side boundary and projection forward of the return building line along Lime Grove, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the

area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an over-development of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposal has not demonstrated that sufficient off street parking/manoeuvring arrangements would be provided, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, leading to on-street parking/queuing to the detriment of public and highway safety and contrary to policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), to Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards as set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

3. The proposal would provide a bedroom of insufficient size 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 Policy 3.5 and Table 3.3 of the London Plan (2016), the Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015).

In the current application, the applicant has reduced the width of the proposed dwelling with setback of 1m from the boundary; Also the number of bedrooms proposed within the dwelling has been reduced from three to two.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

51562/A/99/1262 24 Beechwood Avenue Hayes
Erection of two storey side extension with hipped roof

Decision: 05-08-1999 Refused

51562/APP/2018/1353 24 Beechwood Avenue Hayes
Two storey, 3 - bed, semi-detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front

Decision: 13-07-2018 Refused

51562/APP/2018/1931 24 Beechwood Avenue Hayes
Conversion of existing HMO into 2 No. separate 3 bed room dwelling houses

Decision: 09-07-2018 NFA

51562/APP/2019/1622 24 Beechwood Avenue Hayes
Conversion of existing HMO into 2 x 3-bed dwellings

Decision:

51562/APP/2019/942 24 Beechwood Avenue Hayes
New 2 bedroom property attached to side of 24 Beechwood Avenue

Decision: 10-07-2019 NFA

51562/B/99/1856

24 Beechwood Avenue Hayes

Erection of a two storey rear and single storey side extension

Decision: 24-11-1999 Approved

Comment on Planning History

51562/APP/2019/1622 : Conversion of existing HMO into 2 x 3-bed dwellings. PENDING

51562/A/99/1262: Erection of two storey side extension with hipped roof. Refused

51562/APP/2018/1931 : Conversion of existing HMO into 2 No. separate 3 bed room dwelling houses. Refused

51562/APP/2018/1353: Two storey, 3 - bed, semi-detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front. Refused

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

10 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 31-10-19. Site notice was displayed and expired on 02/12/2019. One representation was received on the following grounds;

1. Impact on neighbouring residential amenity in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy
2. Competition for car parking and danger to other road users.

The following specialists were also consulted on this application and provided the following comments:

LANDSCAPING OFFICER

This site is occupied by the side garden of a two-storey detached house at the junction with Lime Grove. The only vegetation is a gappy, poorly maintained hedge along the Lime Grove boundary. There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site.

COMMENT: This site has been the subject of several recent applications, including application ref. 2019/2523, which was refused. No trees or landscape features of merit will be affected by the proposal. The boundary hedge will be removed to facilitate the development. This is a very tight site to accommodate a new dwelling. Contrary to the landscape statement in the D&AS, it appears unlikely that there will be space for any soft landscape within the front garden. Bin and bike storage should be discretely and securely sited in the rear garden and not in the small front area.

RECOMMENDATION: If you are minded to approve this application please add condition RES (parts 1, 2 and 5).

ACCESS OFFICER

Any grant of planning permission should include the following conditions: Prior to works

commencing, details of step free access via the principal private entrance shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall remain in place for the life of the building. REASON To ensure that an appropriate standard of housing stock, in accordance with London Plan policy 3.8(c), is achieved and maintained. The dwellings hereby approved shall be constructed to meet the standards for a Category 2 M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015, and all such provisions shall remain in place for the life of the building. REASON: To ensure that an appropriate standard of housing stock, in accordance with London Plan policy 3.8(c), is achieved and maintained.

HIGHWAYS OFFICER

Whilst no response was received in relation to the current application, the layout of the parking remains unaltered from the previously refused scheme, therefore the consultee comments issued against the previous scheme remain valid and are set out below:

The application site is located along the corner junction of Beechwood Avenue/Lime Grove and benefits from street lighting and pedestrian footway within the vicinity of the site. I note there are no waiting/parking restrictions in place.

This application proposes a 3-bed semi detached dwelling on land adjacent to 24 Beechwood Avenue. Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) seeks to ensure that all development is in accordance with the Councils adopted Car Parking Standards. In this instance, both the proposed dwelling and no. 24 Beechwood Avenue should to provide 2 parking spaces each.

Not only will the proposed dwelling make use of 1 parking space only, it is considered that the upon implementation of the proposals, parking and manoeuvring associated with no. 24 Beechwood Avenue will be restricted compared to that currently associated with the site.

In addition, whilst the submitted drawings depict an existing crossover to be utilised for future occupants upon access and egress. The length of this crossover does not accord with current guidance. It should be noted that the Highway Authority does not look favorably upon access points along junctions where a sufficient linear distance beyond the bellmouth's tangent point is not achieved.

Mindful of the above, I must recommend that this application is refused on highway safety grounds.

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

PT1.H1 (2012) Housing Growth

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.
DMH 4	Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area

In addition: Development Plan

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

1.2 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 - Saved UDP Policies (2012)

The London Plan - Consolidated With Alterations (2016)

1.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

Emerging Planning Policies

1.4 Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 states that 'Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

(a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

(b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and

(c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the

policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

Draft London Plan (Consolidated with Changes July 2019)

1.5 The GLA consulted upon a draft new London Plan between December 2017 and March 2018 with the intention of replacing the previous versions of the existing London Plan. The Plan was subject to examination hearings from February to May 2019, and a Consolidated Draft Plan with amendments was published in July 2019. The Panel of Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State issued their report and recommendations to the Mayor on 8th October.

1.6 The Mayor is currently considering the Panel report and recommendations and is preparing an 'Intend to Publish' version of the London Plan, which will be sent to the Secretary of State alongside with a schedule of the panel's recommendation and the Mayor's response to them. It is envisaged the Intend to 'Publish version' of the Plan will be sent to the Secretary of State by the end of the year.

1.7 Until the stages outlined above are passed, it seems that in general terms only limited weight can and should be attached to the new London Plan. Some greater weight at this stage can be attached to policies which have been found acceptable by the Panel (either expressly or by no comment being made) or are subject to only minor amendment. However, anything that remains subject to the Inspector's recommendations can arguably be said to still attract very limited weight until at least the Mayor has published his report. The weight will then increase as matters become clearer through the outstanding statutory steps being completed.

Proposed Submission Local Plan Part 2 with Main Modifications (March 2019)

1.8 The Revised Proposed Submission Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) documents (Development Management Policies, Site Allocations and Designations and Policies Map Atlas of Changes) were submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in May 2018.

1.9 The public examination hearing sessions took place over one week in August 2018. Following the public hearing sessions, the examining Inspector advised the Council in a Post Hearing Advice Note sent in November 2018 that he considers the LPP2 to be a plan that could be found sound subject to a number of main modifications.

1.10 The main modifications proposed by the Inspector were agreed by the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Recycling in March 2019 and were published for public consultation from 27 March to 8 May 2019.

1.11 The Council received the Inspector's Final Report on 22 October 2019. The Inspector concluded that, subject the Main Modifications set out in the Appendix to the report, the Local Plan Part 2 is a sound plan that can be adopted. The examination of the Local Plan is therefore now complete and the Council is in the process of progressing the Plan for formal adoption as part of the statutory development plan. This is scheduled for January 2020.

1.12 Taking paragraph 48 of the NPPF into account, the Council's general approach to the weight that should be afforded to the LPP2 until formal adoption will be that all policies, including those incorporating the main modifications hold substantial weight. This is due to the Plan being at the most advanced stage of preparation, the resolution of outstanding objections through the Inspector's Report and confirmation that the Plan is consistent with national guidance.

1.13 Notwithstanding the above, the starting point for determining planning applications remains the adopted policies in the Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies and the Local Plan: Part 2 Saved UDP Policies 2012 until the Local Plan Part 2 is formally adopted.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

Policies BE20, BE21 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) give advice that buildings should be laid out so that adequate daylight and sunlight can penetrate into and between them, and the amenities of existing houses are safeguarded.

Policies BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (Part Two) stress the importance of new buildings and extensions providing adequate amount of external amenity space, that not only protects the amenity of the occupants of the proposed development, but also of those of the surrounding buildings, as well as protecting both parties privacy.

Policy DMHB 11 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.

The proposal is designed as a two storey extension to the side of the existing house. The site is a corner plot with an angled shared boundary with 2a Lime Grove. The proposal will come close to this common boundary and will be to the East of number 2a. However, considering the existing relationship it is considered that the issue of overlooking would not be harmful to refuse the application on these grounds. Due to the distances involved and relationship the application site it is considered that the proposal would not have any significant impact on light and overshadowing to this neighbour.

Due to the site context and the proposed dwelling not being deeper than the existing dwelling and sufficient separation distances have been kept to other properties in the vicinity, it is considered that there are no significant residential amenity impacts on other neighbours.

It is considered that the proposed development, by virtue of its siting, size, scale, bulk, design and proximity, would not be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining properties especially occupier at 2a Lime Grove.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Local Plan Part 1 Policy BE1 requires all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods. Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) seek to ensure that new development complements or improves the character and amenity of the area, whilst Policy BE38 seeks the retention of topographical and

landscape features of merit and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.

Policy BE13 states that new development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area which the local planning authority considers it desirable to retain or enhance.

Paragraph 4.5 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions states "In order to appear subordinate, the width..... of the extension should be considerably less than that of the main house and be between half and two thirds of the original house width."

Paragraph 5.1 of the adopted HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008) requires all extensions and buildings of two or more storeys to be set back a minimum of 1 m from the side boundary of the property for the full height of the building. Paragraph 5.3 of the HDAS SPD specifies that where two storey side extensions are proposed in the case where the side of the house adjoins a road, there may be some scope for flexibility on the set-in. It further specifies that where an existing return building line exists, any extension should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and that the return building line is not exceeded.

Furthermore, Policy DMHD 1 (C) of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) states that side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property; ii) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded; v) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation;

Policy DMHB 11 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.

The application site comprises a detached house on a corner plot at the junction of Beechwood Avenue with Lime Grove.

Beechwood Avenue and Lime Grove are characterised by mainly terraced properties interspersed with some semi-detached dwellings, which have spacious front and rear gardens. Whilst some of the properties have been extended there is nonetheless a prevailing uniformity of space between and around the properties and the buildings follow a common building line. These positive attributes add distinctive character to the locality.

The application site represents a very prominent corner plot. The front and side of the property can be easily viewed from Beechwood Avenue and Lime Grove. The rear of the property is very conspicuous when driving down Lime Grove towards its junction with Beechwood Avenue. It is also clear that both sides of Lime Grove have a very clear and strong building line, which provides a sense of spaciousness to the road.

The proposed development, designed as a two storey side extension, would unacceptably break the aforementioned building line. Such development, which would be positioned very close to the boundary with the pavement, would appear dominant and

intrusive in the street-scene and would detract from the sense of open space which exists between the dwellings and the highway on this part of Lime Grove.

Notwithstanding the setback from the side boundary, the proposed dwelling would fill in a significantly large portion of the space to the side of the existing dwelling. Due to its siting, width and mass the proposal would significantly erode the space to the side of the dwelling and would be harmful to the spacious and open appearance of the street scene at this point. It is considered that the overall siting, massing and bulk of the proposed development detract from the identity of the street scene.

Overall, therefore the proposed development by reason of its, size, scale, bulk, width, depth and design, and the virtual infilling of the gap within this open prominent side plot, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the existing building within the immediate vicinity of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions and HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

N/A

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) considers 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 AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy DMT 6 of the Emerging Local Plan 2019 seeks to ensure that all development is in accordance with the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards where 2 car parking spaces are provided per dwelling.

The site has a PTAL value of 1 (poor) which means there will be a strong reliance on private cars for trip making. The existing site has parking space for 2 cars on site. There are no parking restrictions adjacent to the site. The proposals involve the creation of 1 x 2 bed dwelling and the retention of the existing 3 bed dwelling. Only 1 parking space is shown to be served by existing vehicular access, on the proposed plan, there is no indication as to how these spaces would be accessed or manoeuvring details etc. Furthermore, one space would not meet the Council's parking standards.

The car parking arrangements on this application reflect those of the previously refused scheme and therefore the Highway Officers previous objection remains pertinent in the determination of this application. The Highways Officer raises severe concern in relation to the proposed layouts and arrangements and recommends refusal.

Thus it is considered that the proposal has not demonstrated that sufficient off-street parking/manoeuvring arrangements would be provided, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, leading to on-street parking/queuing to the detriment of public and highway safety and contrary to Policy DMT 6 of the Emerging Local Plan 2019 and policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part

Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), to Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards as set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

On 25 March 2015, the Government introduced new technical housing standards in England, which comprise of new additional 'optional' Building Regulations on water and access, and a nationally described space standard (referred to as "the new national technical standards"). These new standards came into effect on 1 October 2015. The Mayor of London has adopted the new national technical standards through a minor alteration to The London Plan.

The Housing Standards (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) March 2016 sets out the minimum internal floor spaces required for developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants. The Housing standards require a 2 bedroom (4 people) 2 storey dwelling to provide 79 square metres and the proposal provides 89 square metres. Thus, the proposal would provide a satisfactory indoor living area for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

The proposal is thus comply to Policy 3.5 and Table 3.3 of the London Plan (2016), the Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015).

Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) recognises that new residential buildings should 'provide external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of the occupants of the proposed and surrounding buildings'. This is echoed in emerging Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019)

The submitted plans indicate the subdivision of the rear garden area to provide some 66 sq.m for the existing property, which is more than the 60 sq.m required and acceptable. Furthermore, the proposed development would have access to garden space in excess of 40 square metres and would meet the requirement of the above policy.

The proposal is therefore would accord with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

7.6 Other Issues

It is also noted that the proposal will require a CIL contribution. The Hillingdon Council have set the CIL level for this type of development at £95 per square metre. The Mayor CIL requirement for this type of development will be £35 per square metre. The proposed footprint is shown to be 89 sq.m. Presently calculated the amounts would

be as follows;

LBH CIL £11,344.68

London Mayoral CIL £5,340.00

Total CIL £16,684.68

8. Reference Documents

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

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications
(March 2019)
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: Batatunde Aregbesola

Telephone No: 01895 250230