

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 LAND AT REAR OF 21 AND 21A HATHERLEIGH ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Erection of detached two storey, 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space provision, involving demolition of existing garages

LBH Ref Nos: **41627/APP/2020/648**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan (1:1250)
M4344/6
M4344/5 Rev. M
Planning, Design and Access Statement

Date Plans received : 04/03/2020

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 04/03/2020

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks planning permission for a two storey, 1 bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving demolition of existing garages.

Whilst the proposal would provide adequate living accommodation, amenity space and parking provision in accordance with adopted policy, the siting of the dwelling would fail to respect the established rhythm of the streetscene

The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

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.

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 Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2016). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

2 I71 LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Refusing)

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. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The proposed site comprises part of the rear garden area to 21 and 21A Hatherleigh Road 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 area of garden in question is a rectangular piece of land measuring approximately 173.4 sq.m located at the end of the garden with proposed access to Salcombe Way. 21A was formed in the original curtilage of 21.

The streetscene is characterised by similar two storey terraced residential properties, which predominately have off street for one car parking space. The site is located within the Developed Area as identified within the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012.).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposed includes the demolition of the existing single storey structure and the erection of a 1 bed detached two storey property, associated parking and amenity space.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

41627/88/0592 21a Hatherleigh Road Ruislip
Erection of an attached end-of-terrace house

Decision: 16-09-1988 Refused **Appeal:** 17-08-1989 Allowed

41627/A/89/0101 Adjoining 21 Hatherleigh Road Ruislip
Erection of a two storey side extension and conversion into two self contained flats.

Decision: 17-07-1989 Refused

41627/APP/2017/3189 Land At Rear Of 21 And 21a Hatherleigh Road Ruislip
Two storey, 2-bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving installation of vehicular crossover to front.

Decision: 14-11-2017 Refused

41627/APP/2017/618 21 Hatherleigh Road Ruislip
Two storey, 2-bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving installation of vehicular crossover to front

Decision: 05-05-2017 Refused

41627/APP/2019/3296 Land At Rear Of 21 And 21a Hatherleigh Road Ruislip
Erection of detached two storey, 1-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space provision, involving demolition of existing garages

Decision: 20-12-2019 Refused

41627/C/89/2454 Adjoining 21 Hatherleigh Road Ruislip

Details of parking arrangements in compliance with condition 2 of Secretary of State's appeal decision ref: T/APP/R5510/A/89/113763/P4 dated 17-08-89; Erection of an end-terrace dwelling

Decision: 20-07-1990 Approved

41627/PRC/2016/93 Land At Rear Of 21 And 21a Hatherleigh Road Ruislip

Erection of two storey, two bedroom dwelling

Decision: 12-10-2016 OBJ

Comment on Planning History

There have been three previous applications for erection of a residential unit on this site. All were refused on the basis of the siting and size resulting in a cramped form of development, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The proposals also fail to provide alternative off street parking for the existing properties at no. 21 and 21A.

A recent Certificate of Lawfulness was granted under application 74994/APP/2019/2507 - confirming the existing use as storage.

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

9 Neighbours and the Ruislip Residents Association were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 27 March 2020. A site notice was erected. Site Notice Expiry Date - 7/4/20. There were 7 responses raising the following issues:

- Overdevelopment
- Loss of existing parking
- A dominant feature at the end of the existing houses
- Closing of gap feature
- Loss of light
- Garden grab
- Loss of outlook
- Loss of privacy
- Error on plans identifies the adjacent property as no. 1 Salcombe Way but it is no. 2
- Overbearing
- Visually intrusive
- Restrict access and turning to the adjacent garages
- Out of scale in size the surrounding properties
- The existing gardens are not enclosed by high fencing so this will go against the areas open feel
- Impact on adjacent trees

Trees/Landscaping Officer:

According to the aerial photographs and 'Streetview' there are some small trees/shrubs close to the back of the garages which may be affected by the proposal. These are not considered to be a constraint on development. The loss of the garage parking spaces will result in displaced parking in a residential area where on-street parking is likely to be

limited? The area of private amenity/garden space for the new properties (and the two existing houses) should comply with Hillingdon's space standards. At least 25% of the front garden of the new dwelling should be soft / living landscape.

RECOMMENDATION: No objection subject to conditions

Access Officer: No objection subject to conditions.

Highways - The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are satisfied that the proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any highway safety concerns, in accordance with Local Plan Part 2 Development Plan Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies 6.3, 6.9, and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016).

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 4 Residential Conversions and Redevelopment

DMH 6 Garden and Backland Development

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 16 Housing Standards

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMT 1 Managing Transport Impacts

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP 3.3 (2016) Increasing housing supply

LPP 3.4 (2015) Optimising housing potential

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 3.8 (2016) Housing Choice

LPP 6.13 (2016) Parking

LPP 6.3 (2016) Assessing effects of development on transport capacity

LPP 6.9 (2016) Cycling

LPP 7.4 (2016) Local character

NPPF- 2 NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development

NPPF- 5 NPPF-5 2018 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

NPPF- 11 NPPF-11 2018 - Making effective use of land

NPPF- 12 NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places

In addition:

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

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 Impact on Street Scene

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 adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

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, in the main, characterised by terraced properties with hipped roofs. The proposal would involve a detached property. Concerns raised in the previous submission advised that the proposal would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area furthermore the proposed dwelling abuts the side and rear boundaries of the site, appearing cramped and would fail to respect the established layout of development within the locality. This proposal has been moved 1 m from the side boundary with the access road but remains against the rear boundary. This type and form of in-fill development was considered on appeal for a new dwelling at the rear of nos. 39 and 39a (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. The approved dwelling was set level with the existing building line of the adjacent properties in Kingswear Road as is the proposed dwelling currently under consideration. However 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. As such the proposed dwelling would be visually intrusive and out of keeping with the established streetscape rhythm within Salcombe Way. Therefore in principle this form of development is considered unacceptable.

As such the proposal would fail to comply with the requirements of Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

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.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

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 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.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

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 capable of providing adequate private amenity space in accordance with adopted policy.

7.6 Other Issues

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).

8. Reference Documents

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

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)

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: Accessible Hillingdon

National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

Telephone No: 01895 250230