

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 ADJ. TO 33 HAZELWOOD DRIVE PINNER

Development: Erection of a single storey 2 bed house with associated parking and amenity space

LBH Ref Nos: **6342/APP/2020/1947**

Drawing Nos: 108_100
 Photomontage of Internal Room
 Photomontage of Rear Elevation
 Photomontage of Front Elevation
 108_101
 108-110
 Design and Access Statement
 108-210
 108-211
 108-120
 108-220
 108-130
 108-230
 108-121
 108-221

Date Plans received : 16/07/2020

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 16/07/2020

1. **SUMMARY**

The current application seeks planning permission for the construction of a single storey 2-bed dwelling house with associated parking and amenity space.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its siting (in a rear garden), design, layout, and site coverage, would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMH 6 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the NPPF (March 2012).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed side extension element to the existing dwelling, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, width, and projection forward of the return building line along Woodford Crescent, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap

characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed side extension element to the existing dwelling, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and width would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its layout results in a dwelling which would be inaccessible and not usable by disabled residents. The proposal would thus be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies and Policy 3.8 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 Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) 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.

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 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
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 7.4	(2016) Local character
LPP 7.5	(2016) Public realm
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

3 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. We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the south east side of Hazelwood Drive at its junction with Woodford Crescent with a site area of approximately 286 sqm. The site currently supports a three bedroom end of terraced property known as 33 Hazelwood Drive. To the rear of the subject site lies No. 2 Woodford Crescent, a detached property.

This is an established residential area which comprises a mixture of similar semi-detached properties together with detached dwellings and also single storey bungalows and terraced properties in Hazelwood Drive, Woodford Crescent and other surrounding roads all of varying design. However, a defining characteristic of the area is that the dwellings are set in fairly large plots, giving an overall sense of spaciousness to the area. The site is located on a prominent corner plot which does allow views out between the buildings towards the surrounding areas. The application site also lies within an area subject to surface water flooding.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The current application seeks planning permission for a 2-bed dwelling house with associated parking and amenity space.

The front element of the new dwelling, would be attached to the existing dwelling at 33 Hazelwood Drive, and would thus appear as an extension to it, would be built on ground level with a maximum height of 2.6m and the remaining rear element would be sunk into the ground by 1m leaving a maximum height of 1.5m height above ground. The dwelling would be single aspect at the rear and dual aspect to the front and side on the Hazelwood Road frontage. The living area would be located on the Hazelwood Road frontage with a

linked walkway leading to the rear elements and two bedrooms, bathroom and toilet facilities.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

6342/APP/2007/2547 33 Hazelwood Drive Pinner

ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT).

Decision: 09-10-2007 GPD

6342/APP/2012/2632 33 Hazelwood Drive Pinner

Temporary use of land as a contractor site compound to include installation of 2 x welfare cabins

Decision: 21-12-2012 Approved

6342/APP/2012/893 33 Hazelwood Drive Pinner

Single storey side extension with 3 x side rooflights

Decision: 19-06-2012 Refused

6342/APP/2014/1315 33 Hazelwood Drive Pinner

Single storey side extension

Decision: 26-06-2014 Approved

6342/APP/2019/3796 33 Hazelwood Drive Pinner

Single storey, 3-bed dwelling house with associated parking and amenity space

Decision: 30-01-2020 Refused

6342/E/97/1265 33 Hazelwood Drive Pinner

Conversion of existing garage into a shower/ bathroom and storage area

Decision: 05-02-1998 Approved

Comment on Planning History

6342/APP/2019/3796 - Single storey, 3-bed dwelling house with associated parking and amenity space - Refused 30/1/2020 for the following reasons

1. The proposed development, by reason of its siting (in a rear garden), design, layout, and site coverage, would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMH 6 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the NPPF (March 2012).

2. The proposed side extension/element to the existing dwelling, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, width, proximity to the side boundary and projection forward of the return building line along Woodford Crescent, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance.

The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

3. The proposed side extension/element to the existing dwelling, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and width would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

4. The proposed development, by reason of its layout results in a dwelling which would be inaccessible and usable by disabled residents. The proposal would thus be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies, Policy 3.8 of the London Plan and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon.

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

5 neighbouring properties and the local residents association were consulted by letter dated 20/7/2020. the consultation period expired on 10/8/2020. No local response.

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

PT1.H1 (2012) Housing Growth

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 17 Residential Density

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

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 7.4	(2016) Local character
LPP 7.5	(2016) Public realm
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 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), section B) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

The rear element of the new dwelling would be built up to the rear garden boundary of the neighbouring property at 35 Hazelwood Drive however, as this element would be set below ground by 1 metre, the height above ground would not exceed 1.5 m and would therefore not be visible above a boundary fence of 1.8m. In addition there are no windows proposed in this abutting rear elevation. It would be set in from the boundary with the neighbouring property at 2 Woodford Crescent by 1.5m and would have a maximum height of 1.5m above ground level.

The element to the front of the site on Hazelwood Drive would have the appearance of a 'side extension' to the adjoining dwelling at 33 Hazelwood Drive and would be flush with the front building line of the street

Therefore it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

This proposal would represent backland development to which there have been recent changes to policy, as contained within both the London Plan 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

In order to establish the acceptability of the principle of developing this site for residential purposes, it is necessary to take into account currently adopted planning policy.

The London Plan (2016) provides guidance on how applications for development on garden land should be treated within the London Region. The thrust of the guidance is that back gardens can contribute to the objectives of a significant number of London Plan policies and these matters should be taken into account when considering the principle of such developments. Policy 3.5 of the London Plan supports development plan-led

presumptions against development on back gardens where locally justified by a sound local evidence base.

The Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, March 2016 also provides further guidance on the interpretation of existing policies within the London Plan as regards garden development. Paragraph 1.2.44 advises: that when considering proposals which involve the loss of gardens, regard should be taken of the degree to which gardens contribute to a communities' sense of place and quality of life (Policy 3.5), especially in outer London where gardens are often a key component of an area's character (Policies 2.6 and 2.7). The contribution gardens make towards biodiversity also needs to be considered (Policies 7.18 and 7.19) as does their role in mitigating flood risk (Policies 5.12 and 5.13). Gardens can also address the effects of climate change (Policies 5.9 - 5.11).

London Plan Policy 3.5 states that 'Boroughs may in their LDFs introduce a presumption against development on back gardens or other private residential gardens where this can be locally justified.' This locally sensitive approach reflects paragraph 53 of the NPPF. Where planning permission is required, boroughs are advised to consider proposals for development in gardens in the light of local circumstances, taking into account the value gardens have in addressing the range of strategic policy objectives, particularly in terms of:

- defining local context and character including local social, physical, cultural (Policy 7.4, 3.5);
- providing safe, secure and sustainable environments and play spaces for children (Policy 3.6);
- supporting biodiversity, protecting London's trees, 'green corridors and networks' (Policies 7.19, 7.21);
- flood risk management and sustainable drainage (Policies 5.12 and 5.13)
- mitigating the effects of climate change including the 'heat island' effect and urban greening (Policies 5.1, 5.9, 5.10); and
- enhancing the distinct character of suburban London (Policy 2.6).

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) advises that new development, in addition to achieving a high quality of design, should enhance the local distinctiveness of the area, contribute to community cohesion and sense of place and make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, scale and materials and seek to protect the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential properties. Specifically, the policy advises that development should not result in the inappropriate development of gardens and green spaces that erode the character and biodiversity of suburban areas and increase flood risk

Policy DMH 6: Garden and Backland Development states that there is a presumption against the loss of back gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable, subject to the following criteria:

- i) rear garden land which contributes either individually or as part of a larger swathe of green space to the amenity of residents or provides wildlife habitats must be retained;
- ii) neighbouring residential amenity and privacy of existing homes and gardens must be maintained and unacceptable light spillage avoided;
- iii) vehicular access or car parking should not have an adverse impact on neighbours in terms of noise or light. Access roads between dwellings and unnecessarily long access

roads will not normally be acceptable;

iv) development on backland sites must be more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties; and

v) features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat, which are important to character, appearance or wildlife must be retained or re-provided.

Thus whilst taking into account site circumstances, there has been a general strengthening of the presumption against residential development within rear gardens at national, strategic and local level.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that all development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including: i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding: · scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; · building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns; · building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure; architectural composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views both from and to the site; and impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment. ii) ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes; iii) ensuring that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities; iv) protecting features of positive value within and adjacent to the site, including the safeguarding of heritage assets, designated and un-designated, and their settings; and v) landscaping and tree planting to protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) section C) Side Extensions states that i) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property; ii) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded; v) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary or in the case of properties in the Copse Wood and Gatehill Estates, at least 1.5 metres, but more if on a wider than average plot, in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses; v) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation.

The application relates to the side and rear gardens of No. 33 Hazelwood Drive, with the existing dwelling sitting on the corner at the junction with Woodford Crescent.

The site lies within a residential area, with bungalows dominating the northern side of Woodford Crescent. Beyond the houses of Nos. 2, 4 and 6 Woodford Crescent, bungalows also dominate the southern side of this section of the road.

Although the proposed dwelling is of an attractive design in its own right, it would sit between 33 Hazelwood Drive and 2 Woodford Crescent both of which are two storey dwelling houses. The positioning of the bungalow between the two houses would appear somewhat out of keeping, given that street scene comprises rows of houses or bungalows which is a noticeable feature that contributes to the overall character and appearance of the two roads. That said, it is acknowledged that the development on this 'backland site' is more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties.

The separation distance between the rear elevation of 33 Hazelwood Drive and the side elevation of the proposed dwelling would result in a substantial reduction in the depth of the rear garden of 33 and the result would be totally contrary to the overall pattern of development within the local area, which is defined by dwellings with long rear gardens.

The proposed bungalow would occupy a substantial percentage of the width of the subject site and although flush with front building line along Hazelwood Road, it would be forward of the established building line of Woodford Crescent.

Although it would not have a rear garden, there is a provision of 87 sqm of private amenity area to the front of the new dwelling. This is an uncharacteristic feature of the development in the area and while it is accepted that the lack of a rear garden may not be perceptible when viewed from the public realm, it remains a clear indication of the cramped nature of the development and the unsuitability of the site for the proposed development.

Consequently, the proposed development would fail to harmonise with or complement the character and appearance of its immediate surroundings, by reason of its siting (in a rear garden), design, layout, and site coverage, would result in a cramped development of the site, which would be visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area.

The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site, as well as the proposed loss of an existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding and therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMH 6 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the NPPF (March 2012).

The proposed single storey linked dwelling would straddle the site from front to rear and be accessed via an internal walkway. Whilst it is noted that the proposed linked dwelling would be single storey and therefore less visible from the public realm, the built form to the rear would remain within 1.5 m of the existing property at 2 Woodford Crescent. The element fronting Hazelwood Drive would be set in by 2 m from the side boundary along Woodford Crescent.

The front element would have a height of 2.6 m which would be less than the maximum permitted height of 3 m for single storey side extensions set under flat roofs. However, this element would appear as an extension to the existing property at 33 Hazelwood Drive and would have a width of 5.25 m. The existing property has a width of 5.75m, therefore the proposed 'side extension' would be almost as wide as the existing property, resulting in a development which by reason of its size, scale, bulk and width would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

The proposed 'side extension' would be set in by 2 m from the side boundary of the plot, the treatment of which is a 1.8m high close boarded timber fence. The junction of Hazelwood Drive and Woodford Crescent has a spacious quality and the space to the side of 33 Hazelwood Drive contributes to this quality, and reflects the space offered by

the front gardens of the houses fronting Woodford Crescent.

This openness is very apparent in views along Woodford Crescent. The proposed 'extension' would fill a large proportion of the available space to the side of the house. Whilst it is acknowledged that this re submission application has increased the set in from the side boundary from 1.5m to 2m, it would remain an intrusive feature in the street scene and there would be a pronounced adverse effect on the open character of the immediate surroundings.

Given the above assessment, the proposed 'side extension element' to the existing dwelling, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, width and projection forward of the return building line along Woodford Crescent, in this open prominent position, would result in the closing of an important gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an over development of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Highways & Transportation commented as follows: -

Site Characteristics

The application site comprises the front and side garden area of a corner terrace property (No.33) which fronts the cul-de-sac end of Hazelwood Drive and sides onto Woodford Crescent.

The proposal consists of a 'sunken' single storey 2 bedroom dwelling split into two segments connected by a 'link' corridor with one segment directly to the side of No.33's flank wall and the other positioned within the rear garden of the address.

The address has an expired 2014 planning permission (6342/APP/2014/1315) for a single storey side extension of smaller scale as compared to the current proposal. A similar and more recent planning application for a 3 bedroom house (6342/APP/2019/3796) to the rear of No.33 with 1 on-plot parking space was refused in January this year but not on highway related grounds.

Vehicular access to a single on-plot space for No.33 would remain unchanged and an existing carriageway crossing would serve as an access to a proposed single on-plot parking space for the new dwelling.

The surrounding road network road does not exhibit parking controls and has a PTAL rating of 1b which is considered as low and as a result heightens dependency on the ownership and use of the private motor vehicle. However surrounding residential properties do exhibit generous off street parking facilities which inherently reduces on-street parking pressure and demand.

Parking Provision

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 maximum requirement is for up to 2 spaces to be provided on-site to comply with the adopted parking standard. 1 space is shown for the new unit fronting Hazelwood Drive.

Although this deficit falls below the required standard, it is considered that an objection based on parking under-provision would not be sustainable given the marginal level of under-provision and the aforementioned generous off-street provisions available for most of the surrounding residential properties which significantly reduce on-street parking demand. On that premise there is no objection brought forward.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP's)

In line with the emerging London Plan, within any final parking quantum there is a requirement for a 20% 'active' EVCP provision with all remaining spaces being designated as 'passive' provisions. In this case, the new dwelling should incorporate 1 'passive' space. This aspect should be subject to a planning condition.

Cycling Provision

In terms of cycle parking there would be a requirement of at least 1 secure and accessible space for the new house in order to conform to the adopted borough cycle parking standard. It has been indicated that 2 such suitably placed spaces would be provided rendering the arrangement as acceptable.

Vehicular Trip Generation

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 this dormant site. However peak period traffic movement into and out of the site would not be expected to rise above 1-2 additional vehicle movements during the peak morning and evening hours. Hence this 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.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Refuse would continue to be collected from Hazelwood Drive. An indicative bin store location is depicted on plan close to the roadway which is welcomed as this positioning ensures that waste collection distances do not exceed 10m from the point of collection to the roadway thereby conforming to 'industry wide' good practice. There are no further observations.

Conclusion

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 measurable 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).

7.4 Carparking & Layout

As discussed above

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Access officer commented as follows:

This proposal for a single dwelling house raises accessibility concerns.

London Plan Policy 3.8(c) requires all new housing to be designed and constructed as accessible and adaptable in accordance with M4(2) as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition) (AD-M).

Although the internal passageways have been increased in width to 1200mm, the design still falls short of the technical standards as set out in AD-M for the following reasons:

1. The ramps shown on plan no. 108-210, dated 29/4/2020, are required to have an intermediary landing every 2 metres. The ramp flights are circa 5.5 m and 4.5 m and do feature a landing. It is deemed not possible to provide two compliant flights in the available space.
2. The main bathroom fails to comply with diagram 27 of AD-M, nor does it demonstrate how the associated clear access zones described in AD-M could be achieved.
3. Particular attention should also be paid to the entrance lobby, and to the spatial requirements within the bedrooms.

Conclusion: Unacceptable. The proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with London Plan policy 3.8 (c).

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

Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard requires that in order to provide two bed spaces, a double (or twin bedroom) has a floor area of at least 11.5m². The bedrooms in the proposal have floor areas of 15m² (two double bedrooms).

The Housing Standards (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) March 2016 sets out the minimum internal floor spaces required for developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants. The minimum floor area for a 2 bed/4 person single storey dwelling house is 70m² and the proposal exceeds this.

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) which states that: A) All new residential development and conversions will be required to provide good quality and usable private outdoor amenity space. B) Balconies should have a depth of not less than 1.5 metres and a width of not less than 2 metres. C) Any ground floor and/or basement floor unit that is non-street facing should have a defensible space of not less than 3 metres in depth in front of any window to a bedroom or habitable room. D) The design, materials and height of any front boundary must be in keeping with the character of the area to ensure harmonisation with the existing street scene.

The private amenity space would be in excess of 60m² and although provided to the front elevation of the dwelling, it would be contained behind a 1.8m high boundary fence on the Woodford Crescent frontage. The windows on this 'front' elevation would be set in from the boundary across the amenity space by 4.3m. The existing dwelling would retain some

59sq.m of amenity space which would fall marginally short of the required 60sq.m.

7.6 Other Issues

None

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: Diane Verona

Telephone No: 01895 250230