

MERCER PLANNING

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 SECTION 78
WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS APPEAL

APPEAL STATEMENT

On behalf of Hatherleigh Holdings Ltd

Against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon to refuse planning permission for
the *'Erection of detached two storey, 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and
amenity space provision, involving demolition of existing garages'*

at

Land at rear of 21 and 21A Hatherleigh Road, Ruislip, HA4 6AZ.

LPA Planning Application Ref: 41627/APP/2020/648

July 2020

CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. The Appeal Site and its Surroundings
3. The Appeal Proposal & Background to the Case
4. Relevant Planning History
5. Policy Considerations
6. The Case for the Appellant
7. Common Ground
8. Conclusion

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Copy of decision notice and plans Application ref. 41627/APP/2017/3189 - Two storey, 2-bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving installation of vehicular crossover to front.

Appendix 2: Copy of appeal decision and plans for APP/R5510/W/15/3016555 – Appeal allowed 21/08/15 - Land to rear of 39 & 39A Hatherleigh Road, Ruislip.

1. Introduction

On 29th April 2020 planning permission was refused by the London Borough of Hillingdon for the 'Erection of detached two storey, 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space provision, involving demolition of existing garages' on land at rear of 21 and 21A Hatherleigh Road, Ruislip, HA4 6AZ.

This statement represents the Appellant's case for the appeal.

2. The Appeal Site and its Surroundings

The appeal site is brownfield land and constitutes a separate planning unit, with an established class B8 storage use, situated to the rear of 21 & 21A Hatherleigh Road, Ruislip which are two storey terraced dwellings finished in red brick with a bay window on the ground and first floor, situated on the Southern side of Hatherleigh Road at the junction with Salcombe Way.

The site currently accommodates a single storey detached triple garage building with land to the side and rear and hardstanding to the front. The site (planning unit) is enclosed with timber fencing. The garages are accessed off Salcombe Way.

The surrounding area is residential in character and the streetscene is characterised by similar two storey terraced residential properties.

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

3. The Appeal Proposal & Background to the Case.

The application sought full planning permission for the demolition of the garages and the erection of a two storey detached one bedroom dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving the installation of a vehicular crossover to Salcombe Way.

The level of the development proposed is summarised below:

Amount: The proposed dwelling has a gross internal floor area of 58sqm, with an amenity area of 62sqm.

Layout: The proposal provides a detached two storey dwelling with living, kitchen, dining room and WC at ground floor level with a bedroom and bathroom at first floor level.

Scale: The scale of development and the plot proportions respect that of the adjacent and surrounding residential properties.

Landscaping: Soft landscaping is proposed within the front and side garden area. The front forecourt of the property will contain a paved area comprised of porous paving bricks.

Appearance: The proposal has been designed to match the adjacent property No.1 Salcombe Way in terms of the building line, scale, proportions and appearance, overall form, roof design, finished materials and fenestration detailing. The proposed dwelling is very much in keeping with the dwellings along Salcombe Way and would integrate satisfactorily within the street scene.

Access & Parking: Level access will be afforded to the new dwelling. The dwelling would benefit from a drive and parking to the side. Secure bicycle storage would be provided within the garden.

The appeal proposal follows the refusal of planning application ref. 41627/APP/2019/3296 (also the subject of an appeal – ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3254564). The proposed dwelling has been re-designed and slightly reduced in size so that the front elevation follows the building line along Salcombe Way.

The proposal also followed the issue of a certificate on 03/10/19 for an existing lawful B8 storage and distribution use of the land and garage building. The granting of the certificate demonstrates that the lawful use of the site is for class B8 purposes. The appeal proposal would not, therefore, result in the loss of residential garden or parking space for the residential properties Nos.21 and 21A Hatherleigh Road.

The Appellant contends that the proposal is an acceptable form of development and the previous reason for refusal of application 41627/APP/2019/3296 has been overcome in the appeal proposal.

4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 Land at rear of 21 & 21A Hatherleigh Road, Ruislip:

The subject of this appeal:

41627/APP/2020/648: Erection of detached two storey, 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space provision, involving demolition of existing garages. Refused 29/04/20 for the following reason:

'The proposed development, by reason of its siting, layout and site coverage would result in a visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. As such the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual amenities of this existing open area of the street scene and the residential area as a whole. The proposal is thus detrimental to the visual amenity and fails to respect the streetscape rhythm contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan and the NPPF.'

4.2 Other relevant planning history:

41627/APP/2019/3296: Erection of detached two storey, 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space provision, involving demolition of existing garages. Refused 20/12/19 for the following reason:

'The proposed development, by reason of its siting forward of the established building line of Salcombe Way, layout and site coverage would result in a visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. As such the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual amenities of this existing open area of the street scene and the residential area as a whole. The proposal is thus detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding and 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 UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policy 7.4 of the London Plan, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF.'

Planning appeal submitted – PINS Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3254564.

74994/APP/2019/2507: Use of garages for storage (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for an Existing Development). Certificate issued 03/10/19.

41627/APP/2017/3189: Two storey, 2-bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving installation of vehicular crossover to front. Refused 14/11/17 for the following reasons:

1) The proposed development, by reason of its siting (in a rear garden), design, layout, and site coverage, would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site to the level proposed, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual amenities of this existing open area of the street scene and the residential area as a whole. The proposal is thus detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding and 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 UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016), the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF (March 2012).

2) The proposed development fails to provide alternative off street parking provision for the existing properties at Number 21 and 21A Hatherleigh Road, 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 to the detriment of

public and highway safety and therefore contrary to policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's Car Parking Standards.

Copies of refused drawings and decision notice attached at Appendix 1

21 Hatherleigh Road Ruislip:

41627/APP/2017/618: Two storey, 2-bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving installation of vehicular crossover to front. Refused 05/05/17.

4.3 Land to rear of 39 & 39A Hatherleigh Road, Ruislip:

70507/APP/2014/4435: Two storey, 1-bedroom, detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space involving extension of vehicular crossover involving demolition of existing garage and outbuildings. Refused 17/02/15.

APP/R5510/W/15/3016555 – Appeal allowed 21/08/15.

Copy of the appeal decision and relevant plans attached at Appendix 2.

5. Policy Considerations

Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that all planning decisions are required to be made in accordance with the development plan for the area unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The appeal must therefore be considered within the context of the Statutory Development Plan for Hillingdon, which comprises:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019);
- The London Plan (2016); and
- The Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

The relevant planning policies applicable to this proposal are as follows:

National Planning Framework (March 2019)

Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in February 2019. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, requiring that development which accords with an up-to-date local plan should be approved without delay. The NPPF identifies a number of key issues for the delivery of sustainable development, those most relevant to this case are:

- Achieving sustainable development
- Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Promoting sustainable transport
- Achieving well designed places

Consolidated London Plan (MALP, March 2016)

3.3 Increasing housing supply
3.4 Optimising housing potential
3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
3.8 Housing choice
3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
5.1 Climate Change Mitigation
5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
5.3 Sustainable design and construction
5.13 Sustainable drainage
5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
5.17 Water capacity
6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
6.9 Cycling
6.13 Parking
7.4 Local character
7.6 Architecture

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG):

London Housing SPG (March 2016)
National Technical Housing Standards, 2015.
Suburban Design Guide SPD Adopted April 2019

Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007)

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: Layout and Appearance of New development
BE19: New development within residential areas - complementing and improving amenity and character of the area
BE20: Design of Extensions – daylight/ sunlight
BE21: Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions
BE22: Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys
BE23: External amenity space and new residential development
BE24: Design of new buildings – protection of privacy
BE38: Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals

Emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019)

DMH4: Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMH6: Garden and Backland Development
DMHB11: Design of New Development
DMHB12: Streets and Public Realm

DMHB14: Trees and Landscaping
DMHB16: Housing Standards
DMHB17: Residential Density
DMHB18: Private Outdoor Amenity Space

Supplementary Planning Documents

Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement (HDAS) adopted December 2008.

6. The Case for the Appellant

The Council considered that the main issues to consider in relation to the proposal are:

- Principle of development;
- Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties;
- Impact on street scene;
- Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety;
- Car parking & Layout
- Urban design, access and security considerations.

The Council determined that the proposal would not compromise the aims and objectives of policies relating to the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties; traffic Impact/pedestrian safety; and urban design, access and security considerations. These issues are considered in Section 7 below.

The Council accept the principle of development is acceptable, the Officer's delegated report states:

'Principle of development

The NPPF has a requirement to encourage the effective use of land by re-using land. Following the approval of the Certificate of Lawfulness the established existing use of the land and garages is B8 storage. As such this is a developed area, which within planning considerations is considered to be a brownfield site.

The site also lies within an established residential area where there would be no objection in principle, subject to all other material planning considerations being acceptable, in accordance with the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).'

The Appellant's case in relation to the above and the reason for refusal is as follows:

6.1 Refusal Reason 1 (Impact on Street Scene)

The Council are concerned that the proposed development, by reason of its siting, layout and site coverage would result in a visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. As such the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual

amenities of this existing open area of the street scene and the residential area as a whole. The proposal would thus be detrimental to visual amenity and fails to respect the streetscape rhythm.

The Council rely on Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan and the NPPF to support the refusal reason.

The NPPF (2019) Section 12 'Achieving well-designed places' states that *"the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."* Paragraph 127 states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments, amongst other things, function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities) and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

London Plan policy 7.4 requires development to provide high quality design whilst also respecting and enhancing the local character and appearance in the borough.

London Plan policy 3.5 requires housing developments to be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context and to the wider environment.

Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) advise 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 adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

The proposed dwelling measures 6.6m wide by 5.12m long and has a hipped roof of 7.1m in height. The proposed dwelling incorporates a hipped pitch roof with a two storey front bay feature with gable end above. Following refused application ref. 41627/APP/2019/3296 the proposed dwelling has been reduced in size so that the front elevation aligns with No. 2 Salcombe Way. The Council accept that the design and finish of the proposed dwelling respects the character and appearance of the style of dwellings within the street scene.

The Council's delegated report states:

'The proposed dwelling measures 6.6m in width and 5.12m in depth with a hipped roof of 7.1m in height. In detailing the proposed dwelling incorporates a two storey front bay feature with gable end above, which respects the character and appearance of the style of dwellings within the street scene.'

Neighbouring buildings and the local area are characterised by terraced properties with hipped roofs. The proposal would involve a detached property which is located adjacent to the rear boundary of the site and 1m from the side boundary and is set in line with the front of the building line of Nos. 2 - 8 Salcombe Way. The proposal was amended following the refusal of the previous application which raised concern regarding the siting of the building 1.4m in front of the No. 2 Salcombe Way. The dwelling proposed in this appeal now aligns with the front elevation of No. 2 Salcombe Way.

It was accepted in the previous applications refs. 41627/APP/2017/3189 and 41627/APP/2019/3296 (currently being considered at appeal – ref. APP/R5510/W/20/3254564) that the siting of the dwelling was acceptable given that this type and form of in-fill development was considered on appeal for a new dwelling at the rear of Nos. 39 and 39a Hatherleigh Road (APP/R5510/W/15/3016551). Copies of the appeal decision and approved plans are attached to this statement at Appendix 2. That proposal was for a detached dwelling set back at the rear of the plot. In consideration of that proposal the Inspector advised that whilst the terraced form of housing remains a feature of the area, the appearance of the original dwellings and the streetscene have been altered considerably. The provision of a detached dwelling would sit comfortably at the end of the row of existing properties. Also although the site is visible from the surrounding area, the subdivision of the gardens would not result in a development that would appear cramped when viewed from the road or represent undesirable garden grabbing.

This appeal case is very similar to the development allowed on appeal, in terms of the location and size of the plot to the rear of dwellings on Hatherleigh Road at a road junction and adjacent to a terraced row. The development allowed at appeal is also directly to the rear of this appeal site. The layout and site coverage of the development is very similar to the allowed appeal and the Inspector determined in that appeal that the proposal was a visually acceptable form of development that harmonised with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not cause material harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of this existing open area of the street scene and the residential area as a whole.

The appeal scheme was set level with the existing building line of the adjacent properties on Kingswear Road. The refused application ref. 41627/APP/2019/3296 showed the new building set slightly forward of the building line along Salcombe Way and stepped back from 21a Hatherleigh Road. The Appellant considered this siting would provide a suitable transition of built form from the Hatherleigh Road junction to the properties on Salcombe Way. However the Council considered this was not acceptable and stated in the delegated report:

'this would be at odds with the Inspectors observations where the new dwelling is viewed in the context of the existing terraces in Kingswear Road. Any proposed development on this application site should relate to the context of Salcombe Way. Therefore whilst in principle this form of development may be acceptable, the proposed dwelling set forward of the building line of the properties in Salcombe Way, would not sit comfortably and the end of the row and would fail to respect the character of the street scene.'

The proposed dwelling was therefore reduced in size and the front building line of the dwelling now aligns with No.2 Salcombe Way. The Appellant assumed the Council would have no objection to the current proposal as the refusal reason had been overcome. However planning permission was refused again.

The Appellant contends the Council have not attached appropriate weight to the Inspector's decision for the approved development on land to the rear of 39 & 39A Hatherleigh Road in the consideration of this proposal and this is unreasonable. The Council are also adding further issues of concern to their case which is unreasonable.

In this appeal case there is no garden grabbing as the appeal site is an independent planning unit, which benefits from buildings and a use for class B8 storage and distribution purposes.

Following the refusal of application ref. 41627/APP/2019/3296 (currently being considered at appeal – ref. APP/R5510/W/20/3254564), given the comments raised in the officers delegated report the proposed dwelling has been re-designed and slightly reduced in size so that the front elevation follows the building line of No. 2 Salcombe Way and is set back from the building line to the side of 21a Hatherleigh Road.

The Appellant contends that this siting is acceptable and integrates well with the built form from the Hatherleigh Road junction to the properties on Salcombe Way. The front building line along Salcombe Way is staggered so whilst the property aligns with Nos.2 - 8 it will also sit well within the street scene occupying a similar position to the front boundary of the site. The dwelling also occupies a similar siting to the existing garage building on the land.

The Appellant accepts that this issue was raised as a concern in the previous scheme but that proposal was for a much wider, larger two storey dwelling which would have had a greater impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. The Appellant considers given the reduced size and width of the dwelling together with the re-design and siting of the front elevation in line with No.2 Salcombe Way has resulted in a proposal that harmonises with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area and the street scape rhythm.

In view of the above the Appellant contends that the proposal is of a high standard of design that would not cause material harm to the visual amenities of the street scene or the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal accords with the Council's adopted planning policies in this regard. Furthermore the proposal would remove an unrestricted intrusive Class B8 storage and distribution use from the area which has the potential to cause substantial harm to the visual amenities and character and appearance of the area.

The Council are concerned that the proposal would involve the erection of a detached property which they say would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area which is characterised by terrace properties with hipped roofs.

The appeal proposal has been designed with a hipped roof and gable to the front with same windows proportions and finishes to integrate with the dwellings along Salcombe Way.

The Council are concerned that the proposed dwelling abuts the side and rear boundaries of the site, which they say would appear cramped and set forward of the return building line in Salcombe Way, would fail to respect the established layout of development within the locality.

However as discussed above the dwelling has a similar siting to the detached dwelling to the rear allowed at appeal at the rear of Nos. 39 and 39a Hatherleigh Road (APP/R5510/W/15/3016551). That proposal was for a detached dwelling set back at the rear of the plot. In consideration of that proposal the Inspector advised that whilst the terraced form of housing remains a feature of the area, the appearance of the original dwellings and the streetscene have been altered considerably. The provision of a detached dwelling would sit comfortably at the end of the row of existing properties. Also although the site is visible from the surrounding area, he did not consider the subdivision of the gardens would result in development that would appear cramped when viewed from the road or represent undesirable garden grabbing.

Following the previously refused scheme the dwelling has been reduced in size so it aligns with No.2 Salcombe Way which replicates the dwelling approved by the Inspector which was set level with the existing building line of the adjacent properties in Kingswear Road.

However, the Council are now concerned that whilst the dwelling approved by the Inspector

'was set level with the existing building line of the adjacent properties in Kingswear Road as is the proposed dwelling currently under consideration..... it is noted that 1a Kingswear Road is situated facing a triangular area of open space on the corner of Hatherleigh Road and Kingswear Road, with other terraces also facing this area. The current application site although of similar siting and area, sits opposite the end of the rear gardens of the adjacent terrace.'

The Council, in all of the previous cases, have never mentioned that the development of this site is unacceptable as it is located opposite other terrace properties which face the site. This is in fact not correct, opposite the site is the end of the rear gardens of Nos. 19 & 19a Hatherleigh Road and an access track to garages to the rear of properties along Hatherleigh Road. The terrace property opposite the site, No.1 Salcombe Way, actually directly faces No.2 Salcombe Way. The Council also comment that whilst the site is of similar siting and area to the allowed appeal on Kingswear Road it also sits opposite the end of rear gardens of the adjacent terrace. This situation is identical to the appeal site which sits opposite the rear gardens of Nos. 39 & 39a Hatherleigh Road. The Appellant contends the Councils case is wholly unreasonable, the proposal is very similar to the development allowed at appeal and the Council have not attached sufficient weight to

the appeal decision. In considering this proposal, the local planning authority is also required to have regard to delivering a wide choice of homes and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF places significant weight on housing delivery and focuses on the roles that intensification and small sites in particular can play in helping to resolve the current housing crisis. The proposal provides a detached dwelling with parking and amenity space that integrates within the surrounding context, preserves the local character, does not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity and provides a suitable standard of accommodation.

In view of the above, the Appellant contends the proposed development is acceptable in design terms and integrates well within the street scene harmonising with the established streetscape rhythm within Salcombe Way and the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The proposal would not be detrimental to visual amenity and would not cause harm to the character of the surrounding. As such the proposal complies with the requirements of Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

The Appellant contends that the refusal reason is unreasonable and the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to any conditions the Inspector deems reasonable and necessary.

7. Common Ground

Areas of common ground between the Council and the Appellant are:

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

The Council and Appellant are in agreement that the proposal would not impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by neighbours. The Officer's delegated report states:

'Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should also not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. The Council will aim to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents and it will resist proposals where there is an unreasonable level of overlooking between habitable rooms of adjacent residential properties or onto private open spaces. A minimum of 21m separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain privacy. The Council will also expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook.

The proposed dwelling would maintain sufficient flank to rear separation distances with Numbers 21 and 21A Hatherleigh Road to ensure that there would not be an unacceptable loss of light or outlook to the occupants of these properties. Furthermore the principle first floor windows would be restricted to the front elevation, with the side windows serving non habitable rooms, which could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and non opening below 1.8m to ensure that there is no loss of privacy. The proposal would

not therefore result in an unneighbourly form of development.'

7.2 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

The Council and Appellant are in agreement that the proposal provides adequate off street parking provision and would not be detrimental to existing highway conditions locally. The Officer's delegated report states:

'Local Plan Part 2 Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 require the Council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.'

The proposal would clearly increase traffic generation from what is a relatively dormant site. However, statistically, peak period traffic movement into and out of the site would not be expected to rise beyond a single vehicle movement during the peak morning and evening hours. This potential uplift is considered marginal in generation terms and therefore can be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

There is no objection to the principle of the new carriageway provision. It should be dimensioned accordingly in line with the Council's carriageway crossing standard i.e. 2.44m at the back of footway and 5.78m (with taper kerbs) at the edge of kerb. Differing dimensions have been indicated on plan which should be remedied. Final provisions would be implemented to the Council's construction standard at the applicant's expense.

In safety terms effort should be made to maintain a low frontage wall treatment onto Salcombe Way in order to help ensure conformity to the relevant mutual inter-visibility sight-line requirements, as per DfT (Manual for Streets (MfS) circa 2007) best practice for new development road and parking layouts guidance, between vehicles leaving the site and extraneous vehicles/pedestrians on Salcombe Way itself. In order to assist with improving sight-lines at the site entrance for vehicles and pedestrians, it is therefore recommended that the front boundary wall height should not exceed 0.6m to achieve the aim of improved visibility. This aspect can be secured via planning condition.

7.3 Car parking & Layout

The Council and Appellant are in agreement that the proposal provides adequate off street parking provision and would not be detrimental to existing highway conditions locally. The Officer's delegated report states:

'Local Plan Part 2 Policy DMT 6 requires that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the Council's adopted parking standards unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.'

The Council's maximum standard requires up to 2 spaces to be provided on-site for the

unit. One space is proposed to the side of the new build hence the provision is below standard. However there is now no net loss of on-plot parking facilities for No's 21/21a owing to the issue of the CLD in 2019 which allowed the garages to be used for B8 use storage purposes and encompasses the full site envelope subject of this current application.

As a consequence, the prior highways refusal reason related to the aforementioned application (41627/APP/2017/3189) based on the loss of on-plot parking for the existing addresses cannot be applied. This was also the case for a more recently refused 2019 application (41627/APP/2019/3296). Another contributory factor in determining a whether a lower on-plot parking provision is acceptable or otherwise, is linked to the relatively generous off-street provisions available for most of the surrounding properties which inherently reduces overall on-street parking demand and creates additional spare capacity. On balance the current proposal is therefore considered acceptable on parking grounds.

In terms of cycle parking there should be a provision of at least 1 secure and accessible space for the new unit in order to conform to Hillingdon's cycle parking standard. 2 spaces suitably located have been depicted hence this provision is considered acceptable.'

7.4 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

The Council and Appellant are in agreement that the proposal would provide a high quality development with adequate amenities, which would provide a high standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The Officer's delegated report states:

'Residential Amenity of future occupiers London Plan Policy 3.5 seeks to ensure that all housing developments are of the highest quality, both internally and externally and in relation to their context and the wider environment.

Policy DMHB 16 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 standards require a two person 1 bed property over 2 floors should have a minimum internal floor area of 58sqm. The proposal has a floor area of approximately 58sqm in accordance with policy requirements.

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the extension, would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Policy DMHB 18 advises that all new residential development will be required to provide good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space. For a 1 bed property a minimum of 40sqm should be provided. The proposal includes a side garden area of approximately 62sqm, which would be cable of providing adequate private amenity space in accordance with adopted policy.'

8. Conclusion

For the reasons detailed above, the Appellant submits that the principle of development is acceptable. The Appellant contends the proposed development is acceptable in design terms and integrates well within the street scene harmonising with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The proposal would not be detrimental to visual amenity and would not cause harm to the character of the surrounding. The proposed development provides a good residential environment for the future occupiers and would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of surrounding occupiers or on local highway and parking conditions. The proposal represents an acceptable form of development that complies with the Development Plan for Hillingdon and the previous reasons for refusal have been overcome.

As such the proposal complies with the relevant policies of the development plan and in particular Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan and the NPPF (2019).

Accordingly the Appellant requests that the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted subject to any conditions deemed reasonable and necessary.

M. MERCER BSc MA MRTPI

MERCER PLANNING LTD.



16

Castle Hill House
12 Castle Hill
Windsor

Michaela Mercer BSc MA MRTPI

07904 362 576
info@mercplan.co.uk
mercplan.co.uk