

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 30 - 32 CHESTER ROAD NORTHWOOD
Development:	Development of 29-bed Residential Care Home, alterations to access, to vehicular crossover and associated landscaping.
LBH Ref Nos:	13800/APP/2019/604
Drawing Nos:	SCH0718-13 SCH0718-15 SCH0718-14 SCH0718-02 SCH0718-03 SCH0718-04 SCH0718-05 SCH0718-06 SCH0718-07 SCH0718-08 SCH0718-09 (Rev.1) SCH0718-10 SCH0718-11 SCH0718-12 SCH0718-01

Date Plans received : 19/02/2019

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 19/02/2019

1. SUMMARY

This application follows on from a previous permission 13800/APP/2011/1140 for 'Demolition of 30-32 Chester Road and development of Residential Care Home, alterations to access and associated landscaping' which was granted on 22/02/12. This previous permission was for a 22 bed care home. The two semi-detached houses previously known as 30 - 32 Chester road have since been demolished and the site is now cleared.

As no construction works have taken place (other than demolition) at 30 - 32 Chester road, permission ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140 is considered to have expired.

This application now seeks permission for a 29 bed residential care home and whilst permission ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140 is considered to have expired, there has been little change in policy or site context since the previous permission was granted in 2012 and so the decision remains relevant.

This application seeks a similar development to that previously granted under permission ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140. There are, however a number of clear amendments. These are mainly:

- 1.) An increase in width of the rear projecting element which would extend approx. two thirds of the overall width of the building on the southern portion, rather than a central element which would extend approx. one third of the overall width of the building;
- 2.) An increase in the size of the basement and internal rearrangements to provide a larger lounge, dining and staff area and relocate the kitchen within the basement;

- 3.) An increase in width of two out of the four dormers in the front elevation and relocation of windows to lower in the roof;
- 4.) An increase in the number of windows/light wells in the flank elevations from six to nine;
- 5.) Changes to the roof size, pitch, height and design; and
- 6.) A overall increase in width of the building resulting in a decrease in the separation distances between adjacent properties.

The increase in the width of the rear projecting element from approx. one third to two thirds of the overall width of the building is considered to be over development of the site and would result in a flank wall measuring approx 21m.

The extent and proximity of the proposed rearward projection is considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the residents at no.34 due to over dominance, overshadowing, loss of outlook, sunlight and daylight.

The increase in the size of the basement is unlikely to have an effect on the overall visual appearance of the proposed development. However, the relocation of the kitchen towards no.28 Chester road raises concerns with regard to impact on residential amenity.

No details of how the kitchen area would be adequately ventilated have been provided and so it is assumed that the windows would be open whilst the kitchen is in use in order to provide natural ventilation. This could have a negative impact on the residential amenity currently enjoyed by the residents at no.28 with particular regard to noise, smell and odours and general disturbance.

In comparison to the previously approved scheme at no. 30-32 Chester road (ref.13800/APP/2011/1140), the proposed scheme is considered to have a detrimental visual impact on the street scene when viewed from Chester road. The proposed increase in the width of the dormer windows would alter the overall appearance as would the relocation of the dormers to lower in the roof space. The design of the roof and in particular the pitch has altered since the previous permission to the detriment of the overall appearance of the building.

Furthermore, the proposed scheme has increased in width which has resulted in a decrease in the separation distance between the proposed building and adjacent properties. This is something the Inspector raised as an issue on Appeal (ref.APP/R5510/A/10/2139386 application ref. 13800/APP/2010/623). The separation distance to no.28 has decreased since the Appeal was dismissed in 2010 and the separation distance to no. 34 has decreased since the application was granted in 2012.

It is considered that the accumulative effects of the proposed development with particular regard to the extensive rear element and the unacceptable separation distances from adjacent properties and changes in the overall appearance of the building has made the proposed scheme unacceptable in design terms. Furthermore some aspects of the scheme are considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would result in a row of three similarly designed blocks which would incorporate large mansard roofs with oversized dormers and would result in an extensive 50m wide frontage on Chester road, with only narrow, sub-standard undeveloped gaps to

break up the building mass. As such, the proposal would add another incongruous building to this part of Chester Road, the cumulative impact of which would result in a very cramped and overdeveloped street scene. The proposal therefore fails to harmonise with the mixed architecture and spacious character and appearance of the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character, contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and Policy DMHB5 of the draft Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by reason of its scale, bulk and proximity to the side boundaries would result in a closing of the visually open gap between it and the neighbouring properties at both no. 34 and 28 Chester road which would give rise to a cramped form of development, detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area and the character and appearance of the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character,. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy DMHB5 of the draft Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed rearward element by virtue of its size, scale, siting, bulk and proximity to no. 34 Chester Road would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 34 Chester road by reason of over-dominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of daylight and sunlight and loss of outlook. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE19, BE20, BE22, BE24 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy DMHB5 of the draft Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Due to the proximity of the proposed development to no.28 Chester road and the siting of the flank wall and the location of the proposed light wells serving the kitchen and activity lounge, the development would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 28 Chester Road by reason of outlook, noise, smell and odour and general disturbance. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE19, BE20, BE21, BE24 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy DMHB5 of the draft Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

5 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, in the absence of a Section 106 legal agreement fails to secure the development as C2 use class elderly accommodation. Given that a legal agreement to address this issue has not at this stage been offered or secured, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy R17 of the the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Revised Proposed Submission Version of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2019) , Policy DMH 8 of the Emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies and Policy 3.17 of the London Plan (2016).

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.

AM14	New development and car parking standards.
AM15	Provision of reserved parking spaces for disabled persons
AM2	Development proposals - assessment of traffic generation, impact on congestion and public transport availability and capacity
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
BE16	New development on the northern frontage of the A4 (Bath Road)
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
BE39	Protection of trees and woodland - tree preservation orders
BE5	New development within areas of special local character
DMCI 4	Open Spaces in New Development
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 11	Protection of Ground Water Resources
DMEI 14	Air Quality
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMH 8	Sheltered Housing and Care Homes
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHB 5	Areas of Special Local Character
DMHD 3	Basement Development

DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.1	(2016) Ensuring equal life chances for all
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 5.1	(2016) Climate Change Mitigation
LPP 5.12	(2016) Flood risk management
LPP 5.13	(2016) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.3	(2016) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 6.13	(2016) Parking
LPP 6.9	(2016) Cycling
LPP 7.2	(2016) An inclusive environment
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF- 14	NPPF-14 2018 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment
NPPF- 2	NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE7	Development in areas likely to flooding - requirement for flood protection measures
OE8	Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures

3. **CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 **Site and Locality**

The application site is located on the southern side of Chester road, close to its junction with Kemps drive. It comprises a cleared site which previously accommodated a large pair of semi-detached houses with the last known use as a children's home.

Chester road forms part of a traditional residential area mainly dating from the Victorian and Edwardian periods with large detached and semi-detached houses of varied design, a number of which have been converted to flats with some plots having been re-developed with more modern flatted blocks and town house schemes. However, two-storey detached and semi-detached properties with small front gardens but overall generous plots tend to dominate. The overall impression is of an established traditional residential area, with individual detached and semi-detached properties, with a regular pattern and distinctive separation gaps between each building.

The adjoining site at no. 34 Chester road accommodates a three storey care home with the upper floor being accommodated within a mansard roof with dormer windows. This is

linked to 36 and 38 Chester Road, also a three storey care home with the upper floor being accommodated within a mansard roof with dormer windows.

Plots 30-32, 34 and 36-38 are all under the same ownership/management and Plots 34 and 36-38 are joined via a linked walkway.

The adjacent residential properties to the northwest at 26-28 Chester Road are a pair of two storey, semi-detached houses with accommodation in the roofspace.

The site forms part of the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application proposes to erect a 29 bedroom residential care home for the elderly.

The proposed three storey care home with the upper floor being accommodated within a mansard roof with dormer windows also incorporates a lower ground floor/basement level at the rear of the building. The design is of similar style to nos.34 and 38-36 which are also care homes and in the same ownership.

The building would be located along the frontage broadly in line with the existing buildings on either side at nos. 34 and 26-28 Chester road.

This application follows on from a previous permission 13800/APP/2011/1140 for 'Demolition of 30-32 Chester Road and development of Residential Care Home, alterations to access and associated landscaping' which was granted on 22/02/12. This previous permission was for a 22 bed care home.

This application seeks a similar development to that previously granted by the Council in 2012 under permission ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140. There are, however a number of clear amendments as set out below:

1.) An increase in width of the rear projecting element which would extend approx. two thirds of the overall width of the building on the southern portion, rather than a central element which would have extended approx. one third of the overall width of the building.

The previous scheme (ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140) permitted a central two storey (with rooms in the roof) rear wing that would have extended 7m. This current scheme proposes to increase the width of this two storey (with rooms in the roof) rear element so that it extends approx. two thirds of the width of the proposed building rather than a central element extending only approx. one third. This would result in a flank wall measuring approx. 21m. The proposed scheme also alters the roof design from the previously permitted scheme.

2.) An increase in the size of the basement and internal rearrangements to provide a larger lounge, dining and staff area and relocate the kitchen within the basement.

The basement is larger than the previous permitted scheme with an approx. increase of 90sqm from 120sqm to 210sqm. The basement would accommodate a kitchen and food store, a staff room and an activity lounge. There are no access doors proposed from the basement to the rear garden or any of the land surrounding the property. The basement does however have three windows which are recessed within a light well on the rear (south) and side (west) elevation adjacent to no.28. These would be secured by railings.

3.) An increase in width of two out of the four dormers in the front elevation and relocation of windows within this elevation.

The building would have a tiled, hipped roof with dormers, incorporating two flat roof elements. There would be four gable dormers on the front elevation and three on the rear elevation (one on the main building, and a further two on the rear of the projecting wing).

The roof design has changed since the previous permission (ref.13800/APP/2011/1140) as well as the size and location of the proposed dormers. Two of the four dormers in the front elevation are larger in terms of width and all are positioned lower in the roof. The pitch of the roof has also changed and appears steeper.

4.) An increase in the number of windows/light wells in the flank elevations from six to nine.

An additional window is proposed on each floor (ground, first and second) on the southeastern elevation (facing the care home at no. 34). Two of these windows serve two non-habitable rooms and one would serve a lounge/dining area (113sqm). This application also proposes three light wells in the southwest elevation adjacent to no.28. Two of these light wells would serve an activity lounge (25sqm) and one would serve the kitchen (40sqm).

5.) Changes to the roof size, pitch, height and design.

The roof design incorporates two flat roof elements. One is located at the front of the building below the principle pitch and one is larger and is located towards the rear of the building and is approx. 1.5m higher than the flat roof at the front.

6.) An overall increase in width of the building resulting in a decrease in the separation distances between adjacent properties.

The current application proposes a building 1.4m from the boundary with no.34 and 1.1m from the boundary with no.28.

Three off-street car parking spaces including a wheelchair accessible space are proposed to the front of the proposed building, with cycle storage proposed at the rear which could be accessed via the side of the building. Pedestrian access could also be provided either side of the building. Shared amenity space is provided in the rear garden.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

13800/A/96/1624 32 Chester Road Northwood

Change of use from Class C3 (Residential) to Class C2 (Children's Home)

Decision: 05-03-1997 Approved

13800/APP/2010/623 Land At 30 - 32 Chester Road Northwood

Demolition of 30-32 Chester Road and development of 24-bedroom residential care home, alterations to access and associated landscaping.

Decision: 01-09-2010 Refused **Appeal:** 10-02-2011 Dismissed

13800/APP/2011/1140 Land At 30 - 32 Chester Road Northwood

Demolition of 30-32 Chester Road and development of Residential Care Home, alterations to access and associated landscaping

Decision: 02-02-2012 Approved **Appeal:** 15-02-2012 Withdrawn

Decision:

Comment on Planning History

Permission was originally granted at No. 30 Chester Road for a two storey side and rear extension to a residential home on the 2/6/89 under reference 4152/B/89/436. This was followed on the 05.03.97, when permission was granted to extend the home again, by allowing the change of use of the adjoining attached property, No. 32 Chester Road from Class C3 (residential) to Class C2 (children's home), incorporating an internal link (ref. 3800/APP/96/1624).

More recently, permission was granted by the Council at 30-32 Chester road (ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140) for 'Demolition of 30-32 Chester Road and development of Residential Care Home, alterations to access and associated landscaping'. This permission was for a 22 bed care home on 22/02/12. As no construction work has taken place this permission has now expired.

Prior to this (in September 2010) an application for the erection of a 24 bed residential care home (ref. 13800/APP/2010/623) was refused by the Council and subsequently dismissed at appeal (APP/R5510/A/10/2139386). Some of the Inspector's concerns have been set out in the following report where relevant.

Revisions were made to the scheme and permission ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140 was later granted by the Council on 22.02.12. This was for 'Demolition of 30-32 Chester Road and development of Residential Care Home, alterations to access and associated landscaping'.

Other relevant application and appeal decisions on the adjacent sites at no. 34 and 36-38 Chester road are set out below:

Application ref. 50613/APP/2004/1907 at 34-38 Chester road for erection of 43-bedroom residential care home (involving demolition of existing buildings) was refused 14.09.04

Application ref. 50613/APP/2005/758 at 36-38 Chester road for 'erection of 24-bedroom care home with refurbishment and alterations to no.34 Chester road and associated parking (involving the demolition of nos.36 and 38 Chester road)' was allowed on appeal 27.07.06

Application ref. 50613/APP/2006/2768 at 34 Chester road for 'erection of a three storey building with mansard roof to provide for 12 single en-suite rooms for use as a residential care home, with provision of associated car, motorcycle and cycle parking and landscaping (involving demolition of existing buildings)' was allowed on appeal 17.09.07

Application ref. 50613/APP/2014/4336 at 34 Chester road for 'glazed link walkway between existing dwellings' was approved 23.02.15

Application ref. 50613/AP/2011/397 (Appeal ref. APP/R5510/A/11/2158476) was allowed 25.01.12 and sought non-material amendments to a previous scheme at 36-38 Chester road.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 1st April 2019

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

34 neighbouring properties have been consulted. Six letters from local residents objecting to the proposal have been received as summarised below:

The designated Area of Local Character should be retained as it is

Over development with excessive width, height and bulk (x5)

Overlooking and loss of privacy (x4)

Height and impact of change in N/S and W/E levels (3)

Oppressive

Imposing

Intrusive

Overpowering

Out of keeping

Overbearing

No safe means of escape should there be a fire

Impact on the character of the local area

Light spill (as per adjacent care homes (x2))

Loss of trees (not reinstated at adjacent care homes as agreed (x5))

Increased surface water run off due to loss of trees and vegetation (x3)

Increase in staff and visitors as a result of increased no. of bedrooms

Impact on on-street car parking due to an increase in bedrooms (3)

Lack of screening to the rear

The Council need to consider this application in the context of the adjacent developments at 34 and 36/38 Chester Road

NORTHWOOD RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:

No comment

WARD COUNCILLOR:

No comment

THAMES WATER:

Waste Comments

As you are redeveloping a site, there may be public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you discover a sewer, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for->

The proposed development is located within 15m of our underground waste water assets and as such we would like the following informative attached to any approval granted. The proposed development is located within 15m of Thames Waters underground assets, as such the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures. <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk Phone: 0800 009 3921 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm) Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB

Thames Water would advise that with regard to waste water network and waste water process infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided

Water Comments

With regard to water supply, this comes within the area covered by the Affinity Water Company. For your information the address to write to is - Affinity Water Company The Hub, Tamblin Way, Hatfield, Herts, AL10 9EZ - Tel - 0845 782 3333.

TfL:

Having assessed the proposals, I can confirm that TfL Spatial Planning has no comments to make on this planning application other than to emphasise the development should comply with the transport policies set out in the draft London Plan.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES

URBAN DESIGN/CONSERVATION OFFICER:

It appears that the brick facade is being raised to increase the volume of the second floor roof accommodation in order to provide additional bedrooms. This will also see the increase in size of the outer dormers to accommodate twin windows similar to the recently built care home at 36-38 Chester Road.

The proposals will also see the increase in size of the rear wing to provide additional bedrooms, increase the size of the lounge area to the ground floor and staff training rooms etc to the lower ground floor.

There are concerns with the increase in bulk of the building. The consented scheme is already large and the proposals will increase its presence on the street. The increase in height of the brick elevations with the dormers breaking through the eaves line would be an incongruous element that would put more emphasis on the second floor at odds with the established character of the street scene where the dormers are contained on the roof slopes.

The large volume of the building will be appreciated from the street in oblique views through the gaps as well as from the rear gardens. The building would be significantly larger than the other houses within the street and as a consequence would draw undue attention. This coupled with the poor proportions and detailed design of the building would result in a lesser quality building than the period houses along the road and the buildings that have been demolished. The proposal would not preserve nor enhance the

area of special local character.

FLOOD RISK TEAM:

A surface water drainage strategy has been provided with the application to demonstrate that a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) can be provided within the development. Whilst the submitted report is comprehensive, there are aspects of that design that should be secured by way of a condition. The following wording is recommended:

Prior to commencement, (excluding demolition and site clearance) a scheme for the provision of sustainable water management shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall generally follow the strategy set out in the Surface Water Drainage Strategy produced by GeoSmart Information dated January 2019, Final Revision, however every effort should be made to reduce the need for a pumped drainage system.

The scheme shall clearly demonstrate how it manages water and demonstrate ways of controlling the surface water on site by providing information on:

a) Sustainable Drainage:

i. Pumped drainage system - collected surface water from impermeable surfaces to the rear of the development should be discharged, as a preference, to rain gardens or other suitable means integrated within the rear landscaping. The submitted scheme should provide adequate justification should a pumped system be retained.

ii. Runoff rates - surface water discharge from the site must be no greater than 2l/s at a variety of return periods including 1 in 1 year, 1 in 30, 1 in 100, and 1 in 100 plus 40% climate change. Any increases above greenfield rates must be adequately justified.

iii. Drainage calculations - include calculations to demonstrate the volume of storage and size of drainage features provided is adequate to control surface water for a range of storm duration and rainfall intensities for events up to and including the critical 1 in 100 plus 40% climate change rainfall event.

b) Long-term management and maintenance of the drainage system.

i. Provide a Management and Maintenance Plan for the drainage system that includes clear plans showing all of the drainage network above and below ground, and identifies the responsibility of different parties for each component of the drainage network.

ii. Include details of the necessary inspection regimes, maintenance frequencies and responsible authority (Private Management Company, homeowner, etc.).

c) Minimise water use.

i. incorporate water saving measures and equipment.

ii. provide details of how rain and/or grey water will be recycled and reused in the development.

Thereafter the development shall be implemented and retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence.

REASON

To ensure that surface water run off is controlled and to ensure the development does not increase the risk of flooding contrary to:

Policy EM6 Flood Risk Management in Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies (Nov 2012); Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Unitary Development Plan Policy OE8; Policy DME1 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality in emerging Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies; Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management of the London Plan (March 2016); To be handled as close to its source as possible in compliance with Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage of the London Plan (March 2016); Conserve water supplies in accordance with Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies of the London Plan (March 2016); National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018); and the, Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Risk and Coastal Change March 2014). Thereafter the

development shall be implemented and retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence.

Observations:

The applicant has submitted a Surface Water Drainage Strategy (GeoSmart Information dated January 2019, Final Revision) to accompany the application. The drainage strategy sets out the proposed method of disposing collected surface water for the development. Permeable paving will be used for the areas of hardstanding on the site, with geocellular storage beneath the permeable paving at the front of the property to provide sufficient attenuation volume. Roof drainage will be directed towards this storage beneath the permeable paving. A restricted connection is proposed from this to the surface water sewer in Chester Road at a maximum rate of 2l/s. Hardstanding to the rear of the development, including the lightwells and summer house, is currently proposed to be collected in a GRP pump chamber and pumped to the surface water sewer on Chester Road. This is not considered to be a sustainable method of draining these isolated areas of impermeable surface and the detailed design should consider at-source methods of surface water disposal, including rain gardens incorporated into the landscaping strategy. The proposals include the provision of water butts to reduce water consumption, which should be retained during detailed design. There is the potential for a development of this size with a shared landscaped garden to utilise a more formal rainwater harvesting system that can be used to irrigate the gardens.

Further comment:

Prior to the commencement of development (excluding site clearance and demolition), a Basement Impact Assessment shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall include:

the results of an appropriate site investigation that has identified the nature of the underlying geology and confirmed the depth of any groundwater beneath the site (taking into account the seasonal variability of groundwater);

an assessment to identify any mitigation measures that need to be put in place to maintain the passage of groundwater around the building without impacting local groundwater levels; and, shallow infiltration rates to inform the utilisation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) on the site. The development shall only be undertaken in accordance with those approved details, and the approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted and retained for the duration of the development.

REASON: The proposal could increase groundwater flood risk contrary to Policy EM6 Flood Risk Management in Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies (Nov 2012); Policy DMHD 3: Basement Development in emerging Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Main Modifications (March 2019); Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management of the London Plan (March 2016); National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019); and the, Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Risk and Coastal Change March 2014).

With the emerging Local Plan Part 2 (March 2019) now being given more weight, we are now putting more emphasis on obtaining reassurances for basements.

CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER:

Findings indicate overall land quality risks posed by the site are assessed as "LOW" the term low is defined within the report as follows:

"It is possible that harm could arise to a designated receptor from an identified hazard. It is likely that, at worst if any harm was realised any effects would be mild."

However, there is evidence that some contaminants may be present in areas within the site. The possible contaminants include asbestos containing materials (ACM) which may have been present in the structure of the demolished property. The ACM's are designated "moderate / low risk" within the PRA.

Therefore, it is recommended that the following condition (in two sections) and one informative be applied if the application is approved: -

1. Contamination (Site won and imported soils)

All soils used for open space purposes shall be clean and free of contamination.

(a) Existing and site derived soils used for Gardens and/or Soft Landscaped Areas shall be tested for chemical contamination, and the results of this testing shall be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority.

(b) No contaminated soils or other materials shall be imported to the site. All imported top-soils for gardens and/or landscaping purposes shall be clean and free of contamination, and they shall be tested for chemical contamination; the results of this testing shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

REASON: To ensure that the occupants of the development are not subject to any risks from soil contamination in accordance with policy OE11 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

2. Contamination Informative

There is a possibility of some contaminating substances being present in the ground. We have no information on the ground conditions. We would advise persons working on site to take basic precautions in relation to any contamination they may find. Remedial works may have been undertaken at the site, however the possibility of contamination being present at depth remains. Precautions should be taken to minimise the mixing of any excavated material with clean shallow soils that are to remain on site.

REASON:

You are advised the proposed development is on land having former residential use. The advice is provided on the grounds of Health and Safety of the workers on site and to ensure the appropriate restoration of the site once works are complete to minimise risk to the occupants of the site.

HEAD OF SERVICE FOR DIRECTOR OF CARE PROVISION:

I have been reviewing the weekly planning lists and note the above application which is for a 29 bed residential home, I am writing to advise that from a Social care view we would not support this application for a residential home. Our commissioning strategy is to support service users to remain as independent within their own homes and where this is not possible we would be looking at other resources such as Extra Care facilities in the first instance to provide care & support.

The current provision in the Borough for where a residential home is required is sufficient to meet the needs of those who are require this level of support and therefore we would not be commissioning these services.

PRINCIPAL LANDSCAPE OFFICER:

This site comprises a spacious double-width plot, on the south side of Chester Road, which has recently been cleared. The boundaries are currently secured with hoarding - no access was gained into the site. There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site, however, it is locally listed as an Area of Special Local Character.

The site was the subject of a previous application which was approved. The current application is similar to the approved scheme. A tree survey by Arbtech confirms that there are no trees within the site, however, it has identified and assessed seven trees /groups which are off-site, on the neighbouring boundaries to the south and west. There are no 'A' grade trees, but two are grade 'B' - T2 willow and T4 London plane. All other trees are 'C' grade - of no particular merit. The D&AS includes a section on landscape and amenity, which acknowledges the importance of providing an accessible, attractive and stimulating garden space for future residents.

The front garden is dominated by car parking and manoeuvring space and fails to meet the 25% soft landscape target promoted in Hillingdon's design guidance. Nevertheless, the boundaries will be planted and the arrangement is similar to that previously approved.

Tree protection measures should be submitted to ensure that the off-site / boundary trees are protected throughout the development of the site.

Recommendation:

No objection subject to pre-commencement condition RES8 and post-commencement conditions RES9 (parts 1,2,3,4 and 5).

HIGHWAY ENGINEER:

The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are satisfied that the proposal would not measurably exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any highway safety concerns, in accordance with policies AM2, AM7 and AM14 of the Development Plan (2012) and policies 6.3,6.9, and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016).

ACCESS OFFICER:

No Comment

WASTE SERVICES:

No objection

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.EM11 | (2012) Sustainable Waste Management |
| PT1.EM6 | (2012) Flood Risk Management |

Part 2 Policies:

- | | |
|------|---|
| AM14 | New development and car parking standards. |
| AM15 | Provision of reserved parking spaces for disabled persons |
| AM2 | Development proposals - assessment of traffic generation, impact on congestion and public transport availability and capacity |
| AM7 | Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments. |
| BE16 | New development on the northern frontage of the A4 (Bath Road) |
| BE19 | New development must improve or complement the character of the area. |

BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
BE39	Protection of trees and woodland - tree preservation orders
BE5	New development within areas of special local character
DMCI 4	Open Spaces in New Development
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 11	Protection of Ground Water Resources
DMEI 14	Air Quality
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
DMH 8	Sheltered Housing and Care Homes
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHB 5	Areas of Special Local Character
DMHD 3	Basement Development
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.1	(2016) Ensuring equal life chances for all
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 5.1	(2016) Climate Change Mitigation
LPP 5.12	(2016) Flood risk management
LPP 5.13	(2016) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.3	(2016) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 6.13	(2016) Parking
LPP 6.9	(2016) Cycling
LPP 7.2	(2016) An inclusive environment
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF- 14	NPPF-14 2018 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

NPPF- 2	NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE7	Development in areas likely to flooding - requirement for flood protection measures
OE8	Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures

In addition: 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)

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

The revised draft Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies were submitted to the Secretary of State for examination in May 2018.

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.

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.

Regarding the weight which should be attributed to the emerging LPP2, 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).

With regard to (a) above, the preparation of the LPP2 is now at a very advanced stage. The public hearing element of the examination process has been concluded and the examining Inspector has indicated that there are no fundamental issues with the LPP2 that would make it incapable of

being found sound subject to the main modifications referred to above.

With regard to (b) above, those policies which are not subject to any proposed main modifications are considered to have had any objections resolved and can be afforded considerable weight. Policies that are subject to main modifications proposed by the Inspector will be given less than considerable weight. The weight to be attributed to those individual policies shall be considered on a case by case basis considering the particular main modification required by the Inspector and the material considerations of the particular planning application, which shall be reflected in the report, as required.

With regard to (c) it is noted that the Inspector has indicated that subject to main modifications the LPP2 is fundamentally sound and therefore consistent with the relevant policies in the NPPF.

Notwithstanding the above, the starting point for determining planning applications at this time remains the adopted policies in the Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies and the Local Plan: Part 2 Saved UDP Policies 2012.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

In the previous permission (ref.13800/APP/2011/1140), the principle rear elevation of the proposed building would have aligned with the principle rear elevation of no.34 and no.28 with the addition of a central rearward projecting element as existing at no.34. In the current proposals the proposed central rearward projecting element would be replaced with a rearward element which extends approx. two thirds the width of the building thereby changing the principle rear elevation. This element would extend approx. 7m beyond the principle rear elevation of both no. 34 and 28 Chester road and would result in a flank wall measuring approx. 21m.

The increase in footprint, mass and bulk of this rearward element is expected to have a negative impact on the amenity of no.34 Chester road in terms of outlook, sunlight and daylight and would be overly dominant. No windows are proposed in the flank wall of the proposed building or the flank wall of the rearward projecting element of no. 34. However, the rearward projecting element of the proposed building would fall approx. 4m from and within 45 degrees of habitable room windows in the rear elevation of no.34 Chester road. This would be contrary to the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) SPD (2006) which seeks to ensure sufficient separation distances and adequate levels of daylight and sunlight to new and existing dwellings. Furthermore the proposed building would be located to the southwest of the rear elevation of the property at no. 34 so for the latter part of the day it is likely to overshadow the habitable windows in this elevation.

The current proposals also include a larger basement area than previously permitted and the introduction of three light wells at basement level adjacent to no.28 Chester road. Two of the light wells would serve an activity lounge (approx. 25qm) and one would serve the main care home kitchen (approx 40sqm). No details of how the kitchen would be ventilated have been provided so it is assumed these windows would be open for most of the time when the kitchen is in use. This would have a negative impact on the amenity currently enjoyed by the residents at no.28 Chester road in terms of noise, smells and odour and general disturbance. The exact use of the activity lounge is not clear but the Applicant has stated that the room would be multi-functional and may involve exercise classes etc. The light wells serving the activity lounge would face directly towards the rear garden of no. 28 Chester road and so could potentially harm the amenity currently

enjoyed by those residents in terms of noise and disturbance.

In addition to the light wells, the proposed care home would have two windows on the northeast elevation facing the property at no.28. One would be located on the ground floor and one would be located on the first floor. The ground floor window serves the central hallway and the first floor window serves a linen cupboard. These are therefore non-habitable windows and could be conditioned to be non-opening and obscure glazed to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

The proposed development would have five windows on the southeast elevation facing the care home at no. 34. Two would be located on the ground floor, two would be located on the first floor and one on the second floor. The ground floor window would serve the central hallway and the lounge/dining area, the first floor windows would serve a linen cupboard and a shower room and the second floor would serve a laundry room. The lounge/dining area also has two sets of doors to access to the rear garden. It is therefore considered that all the windows in this flank elevation could be conditioned to be non-opening and obscure glazed to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

In a previous application on the site (ref.13800/APP/2010/623 appeal ref. APP/R5510/A/10/2139386), the Inspector considered the impact of that development on the occupants of no.28 Chester road. At paragraph 20 he concluded that the proposal would impinge upon the living conditions of occupants of no. 28 Chester road, primarily due to the close proximity of the proposed flank wall. As a result the scheme was revised under permission ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140 and this was approved by the Council in 2012. The Appeal scheme would have provided a building 1.7m from the boundary with no.34 and 1.7m to the boundary with no.28. The current application proposes a building 1.4m from the boundary with no.34 and 1.1m from the boundary with no.28 which represents an overall reduction in the separation distances than were originally assessed by both the Inspector and the Council. The overall degree of separation has therefore been reduced in this current application from both permission ref. 13800/APP/2011/1140 and the appeal which was dismissed. This would be unacceptable as it would impinge upon the living conditions of occupants of no.28 Chester road as set out in the Inspectors decision.

With regard to the properties that front Roy Road, a garden depth of approx. 30m would be maintained from the rear of the proposed care home to the rear boundary. This is in excess of the Council's recommended 21m distance and remote enough for those properties not to be affected by overlooking. However, the proposed development has generated a number of objections from the residents at Roy road with regards to lack of vegetation and screening being either retained or reinstated as part of previous permissions. Furthermore concerns have been raised with regards to surface water run off. In this regard see the sections below which addresses flood risk and landscaping.

In summary, given the relationship to the adjoining property at no. 34, the proposed development and in particular the rearward element is considered to have an unacceptable impact in terms of over dominance and loss of outlook, daylight and sunlight to the habitable room windows located in the rear elevation of no.34.

The proposals are considered unacceptable due to the location of the light wells that would serve the kitchen and activity lounge being so close to the garden and property at no.28 Chester road and the potential disturbance this could cause that property with regards to noise, smells and odours and disturbance. Furthermore, the separation distance to the property at no. 28 has been reduced since the Inspectors comments which

stated that the proposal would impinge upon the living conditions of occupants of no. 28 Chester road, primarily due to the close proximity of the proposed flank wall. This remains unacceptable.

It is therefore considered that the proposal is likely to adversely affect the amenities of surrounding residential properties by reason of over development, loss of outlook, daylight and sunlight, and the potential for noise, smell and odours and general disturbance contrary to policies OE1, BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the saved UDP and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

IMPACT ON CA/LBs or AREAS OF SPECIAL CHARACTER

The application site is within the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character. Whilst it is noted that such a designation does not afford any statutory protection to the area, it does denote that the area is a designated heritage asset for the purposes of the NPPF. At Paragraph 193, the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

During the previous appeal (ref. APP/R5510/A/10/2139386 application ref. 13800/APP/2010/623), the Inspector made comment on the status of the area, its character, and the cumulative effect of the three consecutive developments. Notably the inspector raised concerns relating to the separation distances between no.30-32 Chester road and the adjacent properties as set out below.

In the last sentence of paragraph 7 of the decision (ref. APP/R5510/A/10/213938) the Inspector stated 'There is a notable variety in the design styles and details buildings albeit with a broad similarity in the scale; the separation gaps between buildings, particularly at first floor level, play an important role in the articulation of the streetscene, breaking up the form of the building and providing views though to the rear thereby enhancing the residential spaciousness of the locality.'

At paragraph 11 of the decision (ref. APP/R5510/A/10/213938) the Inspector stated 'The proposal would have an essentially two storey mass with accommodation in the mansard roof. Whilst following the established front building line, the proposal would create deep, two storey flank walls facing each side boundary that would uncharacteristically narrow the degree of separation between buildings and the property boundaries. Paragraph 12 goes on to say 'The proposal would have only a narrow separation from its side boundaries, particularly towards the building proposed at no.34 at first floor level and, although less obvious, towards no.28 at the rear. Unlike the current scenario, the degree of separation would be narrow and rather tunnel like, extending at full height for the full depth of the new building. Whilst the allowed building at no.34 was found to be adequately separated from its neighbour, the current appeal scheme would alter this situation further; I am not persuaded that the proposal before me would have anything other than a cumulatively corrosive effect upon the locally distinctive spacious residential character of the locality'.

The scheme proposed in the appeal would have provided a building 1.1m from the boundary with no.34 and 1.7m from the boundary with no.28.

Since the Inspector's comments on 13800/APP/2010/623 in September 2010, the scheme was revised so that it reduced the overall width of the building, thereby increasing the separation distances. This approved scheme would have provided a building 1.7m from the boundary with no.34 and 1.7m from the boundary with no.28.

The current application proposes a building 1.4m from the boundary with no.34 and 1.1m from the boundary with no.28 which represents an overall reduction in the separation distances than were originally assessed by both the Inspector and the Council. The concerns raised by the Inspector are therefore considered relevant.

It should also be noted that the flank wall adjacent to no.34 would be increased by 7m from what was previously consented resulting in a flank wall length of approx. 21m. This will increase the tunnel effect referred to by the Inspector as discussed above.

Although the proposal would be adjacent to and of a similar design to the care homes that have been allowed at appeal on nos. 34 to 38 Chester road. It is considered that the simple repetition of what has been allowed in the past is not always appropriate and can raise additional cumulative impacts. Additionally, this would create an extensive 50m frontage of built form which would not be broken up by adequate undeveloped gaps between the buildings. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the Area of Special Local Character.

The Council's Urban Design and Heritage officer has been consulted on the application and raised concerns as set out below.

It appears that the brick facade is being raised to increase the volume of the second floor roof accommodation in order to provide additional bedrooms. This will also see the increase in size of the outer dormers to accommodate twin windows similar to the recently built care home at 36-38 Chester Road.

The proposals will also see the increase in size of the rear wing to provide additional bedrooms, increase the size of the lounge area to the ground floor and staff training rooms etc to the lower ground floor.

There are concerns with the increase in bulk of the building. The consented scheme is already large and the proposals will increase its presence on the street. The increase in height of the brick elevations with the dormers breaking through the eaves line would be an incongruous element that would put more emphasis on the second floor at odds with the established character of the street scene where the dormers are contained on the roof slopes.

The large volume of the building will be appreciated from the street in oblique views through the gaps as well as from the rear gardens. The building would be significantly larger than the other houses within the street and as a consequence would draw undue attention. This coupled with the poor proportions and detailed design of the building would result in a lesser quality building than the period houses along the road and the buildings that have been demolished. The proposal would not preserve nor enhance the area of special local character.

The proposed building is therefore considered to be excessive in bulk and poorly designed so that it would exaggerate its presence in the street scene.

For all the above reasons, the proposed development is considered to be unacceptable as it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Old Northwood

Area of Special Local Character and the general street scene contrary to policies BE5, BE13, BE19 and BE22 of the saved UDP, BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) and DMHB5 of the draft Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

A Transport Statement (2018) has been provided by the Applicant. The Transport Statement has raised no concerns with regard to highways safety, congestion and parking as a result of the proposed development. The Council's Highways team have been consulted on the proposed development and have provided the following comments.

'The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are satisfied that the proposal would not measurably exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any highway safety concerns, in accordance with policies AM2, AM7 and AM14 of the Development Plan (2012) and policies 6.3, 6.9, and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016)'.

With regard to highway and parking issues the Inspector's previous comments were as follows:

'The Supplementary Transport Assessment submitted by the appellant identifies the existing parking arrangements along Chester Road, the availability of public transport, the proximity of services and facilities and the absence of prescriptive parking standards within the development plan for the proposed use. This evidence, which considers the individual and cumulative effects of the proposal and includes the results of a parking survey, is persuasive. I therefore find, with due regard to the advice of Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport', that the proposal would be sustainably located, reasonably well served by public transport with adequate arrangements for parking such that the scheme would not harm highway safety. I find no conflict with UDP Policies AM7 and AM14.'

There has been no significant change to either planning policy or the local context to imply that the Inspector's comments are no longer relevant. Therefore taking account of the Inspector's comments and Highways officer's comments, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable on highways grounds.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

The proposed development would provide three off street car parking spaces to the front of the property. One would be wheelchair accessible. Secure cycle storage would be provided to the rear. As set out above the Council's highways team have been consulted on the scheme and have raised no objections. The proposed development is therefore considered acceptable in terms of car parking and layout.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

URBAN DESIGN

The Council's Design officer has raised concerns relating to the overall appearance of the proposed development. Design issues have been considered above.

ACCESSIBILITY

The proposed development includes one wheelchair accessible parking space to the front of the property and an internal lift serving all floors. The external garden area would be accessed via a decked area and ramp at a gradient of 1:15. Access to the rear of the property can also be gained via the side access.

The Access Statement, submitted in support of the proposed development identifies that the proposal would comply with the criteria set out in the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and also the Building Regulations and this is considered acceptable. The Council's

access officer has made no comments on the application.

The proposed development is therefore considered acceptable with regards to Accessibility.

LIVING CONDITIONS FOR FUTURE OCCUPIERS

The residents' bedrooms would be of a reasonable size and each has a window which faces either to the front or the rear of the building so that they would have an adequate outlook and natural lighting. A good sized dining and lounge area would be provided on the ground floor, together with an activity room, staff area and kitchen in the basement.

The development would also retain an extensive rear garden approx. 30m in length and approx. 560m² in area. Although there are no adopted standards for care homes, the shared amenity space requirement for 29 one-bedroom flats would be 580m².

It is therefore considered that the proposal would provide suitable accommodation for its residents.

7.6 Other Issues

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Paragraph 3.3 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Layouts advises that in order to safeguard the traditional residential character of residential roads, it is unlikely that proposals will be acceptable where more than 10% of the houses in a street have been converted or redeveloped to provide flats or other forms of more intensive housing, including care homes. Chester Road already greatly exceeds this figure, being at approximately 25%. However, it is considered that as the last known use of the site was as a children's home, the proposal would not therefore result in an increase in the proportion of properties which have been converted or redevelopment for flats or being used for other uses such as care homes.

The principle of redevelopment of the site for use as a care home (Use Class C2) was considered acceptable in 2012 when permission for a similar scheme was granted by the Council. There have been no significant changes in planning policy since that time and so it is considered that the principle of redevelopment of the site for use as a care home has been accepted and established. Furthermore, the last known use of the site was a children's home (also Use Class C2).

For the reasons set out above, the principle of redeveloping the site as a care home is considered acceptable and established.

DENSITY

Not applicable to this application.

TREES LANDSCAPING AND ECOLOGY

There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site. However, the site falls within an Area of Special Local Character.

The Council's tree officer has been consulted on the proposed development and has not raise any objection to the proposed development. The Council's tree officer provided the following comments:

The site was the subject of a previous application which was approved. The current

application is similar to the approved scheme. A tree survey by Arbtech confirms that there are no trees within the site, however, it has identified and assessed seven trees /groups which are off-site, on the neighbouring boundaries to the south and west. There are no 'A' grade trees, but two are grade 'B' - T2 willow and T4 London plane. All other trees are 'C' grade - of no particular merit. The D&A includes a section on landscape and amenity, which acknowledges the importance of providing an accessible, attractive and stimulating garden space for future residents.

Recommendation:

No objection subject to pre-commencement condition RES8 and post-commencement conditions RES9 (parts 1,2,3,4 and 5). Subject to appropriate conditions, the scheme is acceptable in terms of Saved Policy BE38 of the UDP.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The application relates to the construction of a residential care home (Use Class C2), the care provision package to secure the premises as C2 would otherwise have been secured via a legal agreement had the development been deemed to be acceptable to ensure the use of the premises as C2, rather than C3.

It is noted that the Draft New London Plan does not seek to differentiate between Class C2 and C3 uses in relation to Affordable Housing, and it supports the provision of Affordable Housing in specialist older persons accommodation (policy H15). However this is only a draft document and the more up to date NPPF at paragraph 64 is a material consideration, and it seeks to preclude specialist housing for the elderly from a requirement to provide Affordable Housing, as such, it is considered that the NPPF is accorded more weight in this instance than the Draft New London Plan and an affordable contribution is not required. It should be noted however that should an appeal be lodged at the time the London Plan is adopted, the Council may reconsider this element of the scheme, subject to the final wording of draft policy H15 of the emerging London Plan. The scheme may therefore be liable to delivery of affordable housing.

SUSTAINABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT

A bin store is proposed at the front of the property. No comments have been provided by the Council's waste team. A condition could be attached requiring appropriate facilities for the secure and covered storage for waste recycling.

RENEWABLE ENERGY / SUSTAINABILITY

Strategic Policy SP7 (Climate Change and Transport) and Policy CC1 (Renewable Energy, Energy Conservation and Sustainable Construction) seek to minimise the impact of climate change by (amongst other things) promoting the inclusion of provision for renewable energy, energy conservation and waste management facilities in new developments.

London Plan policies 5.1 (Climate Change Mitigation) and 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) seeks to achieve an overall reduction in London's carbon dioxide emissions by setting out the following energy hierarchy: Be lean: Use less energy; Be clean: Supply energy efficiently; and Be green: Use renewable energy.

The NPPF emphasises the concept of sustainable development by encouraging local authorities to adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

An updated Energy and Sustainability Assessment has been submitted with the planning application which demonstrates how the development has been designed to exceed Part

L1B building regulations requirements. The reports states that in line with the London Plan three-step energy hierarchy, carbon dioxide emissions from the development will be reduced by 82% once energy efficiency measures and clean measures are taken into account.

This is considered acceptable and in line with the above policies. No comments have been provided by the Council's sustainability officer.

FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

The proposal could increase groundwater flood risk contrary to Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies (Nov 2012), Policy DMHD 3 in the draft Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies with Main Modifications (March 2019), Policy 5.12 of the London Plan (March 2016), the NPPF (2019); and the Planning Practice Guidance (Flood Risk and Coastal Change March 2014).

The Council's Flood risk team have been consulted on the application. Given the extent of the basement and the potential implications on flood risk a Basement Impact Assessment would be required prior to any development. This could be secured by way of condition.

NOISE AND AIR QUALITY

The proposed development as a care home for the elderly within an established residential area does not raise any in principle issues in terms of noise or air quality. However, as set out above in the section relating to neighbouring amenity the location of kitchen and activity room does raise concerns with regard to ventilation, noise, smells and odours and general disturbance.

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

The Council's S106/CIL officer has been consulted on the application and has confirmed that the proposed development as a care home (use class C2) is not expected to generate planning obligations. However, the Council would have sought a legal agreement to secure the level of care at this site as falling within C2 use class, to avoid the premises becoming a C3 development.

CONCLUSION

The increase in the width of the rear projecting element from approx. one third to two thirds of the overall width of the building is considered to be over development of the site and would result in a flank wall measuring approx 21m.

The extent and proximity of the proposed rearward projection is considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the residents at no.34 due to over dominance, overshadowing, loss of outlook, sunlight and daylight.

In comparison to the previously approved scheme at no. 30-32 Chester road (ref.13800/APP/2011/1140), the proposed scheme is considered to have a detrimental visual impact on the street scene when viewed from Chester road. The proposed increase in the width of the dormer windows would alter the overall appearance as would the relocation of the dormers to lower in the roof space. The design of the roof and in particular the pitch has altered since the previous permission to the detriment of the overall appearance of the building.

The increase in the size of the basement is unlikely to have an effect on the overall visual appearance of the proposed development. However, the relocation of the kitchen towards no.28 Chester road raises concerns with regard to impact on residential amenity. No details of how the kitchen area would be adequately ventilated have been provided and so it is assumed that the windows would be open whilst the kitchen is in use in order to provide natural ventilation. This could have a negative impact on the residential amenity currently enjoyed by the residents at no.28 with particular regard to noise, smell and odours and general disturbance.

The proposal would be adjacent to and of a similar design to the care homes that have been allowed at appeal on nos. 34 to 38 Chester Road. However, the simple repetition of what has been allowed in the past is not always appropriate and can raise additional cumulative impacts. Additionally, this would create an extensive 50m frontage of built form which would not be broken up by adequate undeveloped gaps between the buildings.

This point was raised by the Inspector in a previous Appeal and since that time the proposed separation gaps have been reduced further. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the Area of Special Local Character.

It is considered that the accumulative effects of the proposed development with particular regard to the extensive rear element and the unacceptable separation distances from adjacent properties and changes in the overall appearance of the building has made the proposed scheme unacceptable in design terms. Furthermore some aspects of the scheme are considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

For the reasons set out above, the application is recommended for refusal.

8. Reference Documents

London Plan (2016)

Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (2007)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)

Council's HDAS: Residential Layouts (July 2006) & Accessible Hillingdon (2010)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019)

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

Contact Officer: Faye Mesgian

Telephone No: 01895 250230