

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 18 LINKSWAY NORTHWOOD

Development: Erection of a detached 7 bed dwelling with basement and habitable roof space to include 4 rear dormers including demolition of existing dwelling, replacement new wrought iron gates and piers and removal of the front boundary brick walls

LBH Ref Nos: **2695/APP/2021/466**

Drawing Nos: 1366/P/3
 1366/P/4
 1366/P/5
 1366/P/6
 1366/P/7
 1366/P/8
 1366/P/10
 1366/P/11
 1366/P/9
 Design and Access Statement
 1366/P/2
 Arboricultural and Planning Integration Report
 Arboricultural Impact Assessment Rev. A
 Tree Constraints Plan Rev. A
 Tree Protection Plan Rev. E
 200 Issue A - Topographical Survey
 Basement Impact Assessment
 1366/P/1 Received 07-04-2021

Date Plans received : 16/02/2021 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 05/02/2021

Date Application Valid: 16/02/2021

1. **SUMMARY**

This proposal is for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a two storey and a half storey, 7 bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.

The proposed dwelling would be a large and incongruous addition which would fail to respect the visual amenity of the site and the surrounding area of special local character.

As such the proposal is recommended for refusal.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 **NON2** Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, size, scale and design, would fail to harmonise with the character and architectural composition of the original property and the historic character of the Copse Wood Estate, appearing as an overly large, incongruous and cramped form of development which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the

surrounding Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character, contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

INFORMATIVES

1 **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 comprises a large two and a half storey detached period property situated on the western side of Linksway. The existing property is set beneath a hipped roof with front and rear dormers and is characterised by a central hipped front projection. It has been substantially altered over the years with a single storey extension to one side/rear and a part single storey, part two storey addition to the other side/rear and a large conservatory in the centre of the rear elevation. The dwelling is set in a large plot with a landscaped front garden set behind a high brick wall and metal gates at either end of a gravelled through driveway. To the rear there is also an extensive rear landscaped garden.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising large detached residential properties set in spacious plots green plots.

The application site lies within the Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012). The site is also covered by TPO 393.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a two and a half storey, 7 bed detached dwelling with a basement and habitable roof space and associated parking and amenity space. The proposal also includes the removal of the front boundary brick wall and new wrought iron gates and pillars.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

2695/APP/2015/3496 18 Linksway Northwood

Two storey, 5-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, basement and associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling house

Decision: 20-11-2015 Approved

2695/APP/2016/1571 18 Linksway Northwood

Details pursuant to conditions 3 (Materials), 7 (Site Clearance), 8 (Landscape Scheme) and 9 (Sustainable Water Management) of planning permission Ref: 2695/APP/2016/79 dated 07/03/2016 (Two storey, 4-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roof space, basement and associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling house)

Decision: 17-06-2016 Refused

2695/APP/2016/79 18 Linksway Northwood

Two storey, 4-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roof space, basement and associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling house

Decision: 07-03-2016 Approved

Comment on Planning History

Planning approval for a replacement dwelling was approved in 2016.

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

7 neighbours and Northwood Residents Association were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 17 March 2021. Two responses were received raising the following issues:

- I object to the depth of the excavation to facilitate the proposal. This might effect the water table
- Potential impact on my property and foundations
- I object to the loss of trees and bushes and impact on the wildlife
- No assessment has been submitted with regard to the basement and the potential impact on drainage, flooding and structural stability

Officer response: Works on or near a boundary is a civil matter between interested parties and should be agreed through a Party Wall Agreement.

Thames Water - No objection

Conservation and Urban Design Officer:

The existing property is a vastly extended detached dwelling. The original property appears to date from the 1930's. It is defined by a traditional vernacular style, characterised by exposed red brick exterior and hipped plain tiled roof. There is a two storey projection to the front with a double height bay window, which relates to the original portion of the dwelling.

The original building was much smaller than the existing, allowing it to sit comfortably within its respective, spacious plot. Large gaps were retained on the site when first developed to allow the wooded backdrop and setting of the properties in the Copse Wood Estate to be appreciated.

Overtime the property was altered with additions on both sides and to the rear. It also

benefited from additions to the front at ground level. This has resulted in development extending across the width of the site and the loss of the spacious gaps that once contributed to the property's and ASLC's setting.

The Copse Wood Estate is an area that originally formed part of the ancient Ruislip woodland and overtime became known as Copse Wood. In the mid 20th century, this was developed for housing dramatically altering the rural appearance of the area. The development became known as the Copse Wood Estate and had been developed in a manner similar to Moor Park (Conservation Area located in a neighbouring authority). Dwellings were formed part of the mature garden setting, amongst retained trees in order to maintain some woodland character. They were positioned on spacious plots allowing ample views of the woodland beyond the properties, set well back from the road. Boundary treatments were non-existent providing a pleasant semi rural aesthetic.

The dwellings were originally built in a similar manner in a traditional vernacular style with an Arts and Crafts influence, with the use of asymmetrical street scene elevations and traditional materials. Defined design characteristics of the area include half timbered/ rendered projecting gables, tile hung elevations, hipped roof forms, deep cat slides. Mock timber detailing, sprocketed eaves, corbelled eaves detail and traditional fenestration designs.

The proposed redevelopment would unacceptably alter the traditional character of the site. Whilst original properties within the Copse Wood Estate do slightly vary in appearance, their individual, traditional characteristics contribute to the interest of the ASLC.

The proposed building has been designed in a 'polite' manner. It has a prominent mock Georgian appearance, with some classical detailing and a strong symmetrical frontage, however, fails to truly invoke the principles of Georgian architecture. The design is rather confused and includes a number of conflicting features. The windows appear as Victorian style sash windows, constructed in a modern material. The rear door openings have a 1930s appearance with horizontal glazing bars, similar to Crittall-style fenestration. The annotation refers to rendered quoins however points to a Tuscan style column.

The large pediment at roof level would unacceptably draw undue attention to itself along the street scene.

The proposal would lack quality in terms of its materiality, particularly the cornice and string course detailing, which are proposed to be constructed in a GRP. The Design and Access Statement refers to the use of 'traditional materials' however GRP and aluminium framed fenestration are not considered to be traditional materials.

The proposed CGI's depict a grey roof, imitating slate. However the Design and Access Statement refers to the use of plain clay tiles. Whilst the use of plain clay tile would be admissible, the natural clay (reddish-brown) colour would relate to the surrounding area, not the depicted grey. As proposed it would not be considered acceptable.

The external rendered finish would be starkly contrasting to the existing appearance of the site. Whilst some properties within the ASLC benefit from a rendered exterior, it is not characteristic of the area, which was originally developed with a natural colour palette, with properties defined by a red/brown brick appearance. Some original properties included small panels of render however not the extent proposed.

The design approach of the proposed development would totally erase the Arts and Crafts aesthetic of the existing site, failing to relate to the significance of the ASLC.

The proposed development would extend across the great width of the site with small gaps retained along the side boundaries. Whilst the footprint may be slightly smaller than the existing building, the scale and bulk of the built form is vast and further accentuated by the design and detailing of the building. The proposed columns elongate the height of the building and the large crown roof exacerbates the bulk of the development.

The inclusion of the large areas of crown roof would continue a detrimental precedent within the ASLC. Crown roofs are not a traditional or original characteristic feature of the ASLC. New developments should be able to achieve fully hipped roof forms.

The replacement of the existing brick boundary wall for a hedge would enhance the appearance of the site and would be strongly supported. However the retention of the metal gates would not be considered entirely appropriate. Metal railings are not an original characteristic of the area, which is defined by its natural setting,

The loss of the existing building is disappointing. However it is understood previous applications for this site deemed such loss admissible.

The proposed redevelopment of the site would significantly harm the ASLC and the design form, scale and bulk would fail to relate or respect the original design of the existing dwelling and significance of the ASLC as a non designated heritage asset.

Para. 197 of the NPPF specifically relates to non-designated heritage assets and highlights that a balanced judgement needs to be made. However consideration must also be given towards the cumulative impact of such development within the ASLC, as duly noted under para. 28 of Historic England's Good Practice Advice Note 2. In establishing such a precedent for redevelopment within the Copse Wood Estate, it would encourage similar proposals for other sites, which would adversely affect the significance, character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset, inevitably diminishing its original principle for designation as a ASLC and eroding the integrity and authenticity of the place. This would result in substantial harm to the heritage asset. Cumulative loss of buildings and inappropriate developments within the ASLC would fail to adequately conserve and/or preserve the historic environment affected. Heritage assets, whether designated or non-designated are irreplaceable; any loss or harm requires robust, clear and convincing justification.

Para. 127 of the NPPF highlights that development should be sympathetic to local character. Whilst innovative or exemplary sustainable design can be appropriate, in this case the change would be out of place and visually separate from other dwellings amounting to significant harm.

Trees/Landscaping Officer:

This site is occupied by a substantial two-storey house located on the west side of Linksway. The front boundary is defined by a brick wall with two sets of gates accessing a carriage drive. The established garden contains a number of trees which contribute to the character and appearance of the Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character. Selected trees are also protected by TPO 393, an area order which protects all oak, hornbeam, Silver birch, Scots pine, Norway spruce and Lawson cypress.

The site has been the subject of a number of applications including ref. 2016/79, which was approved. The current proposal is similar to that approved, however, the width of the footprint has been slightly reduced, widening the gap between the houses - to the benefit of the streetscape. The brick piers and gates will be retained on the front boundary, however, the boundary wall will be removed and replaced with beech hedging - again to the benefit of the character and appearance of the area. The soft landscaped area within

the front garden will be increased, while retaining the carriage drive.

The application includes a tree report by GHA Trees. The report has identified and assessed the condition and value of 23 trees which are on, or close to, the site. No 'A' grade trees have been identified. 11 trees are category 'B' trees, whose value indicates that they are worthy of retention on development sites; T1, T3, T4, T6, T12, T16, T17, T18, T21, T22 and T23 on the schedule. The remaining trees are 'C' grade, of lower merit but, nevertheless, worth retaining if possible. There is 1 'U' grade tree which could be removed in the interests of sound arboricultural management. The tree report states (executive summary) that a small number of trees and shrubs will be removed to enable the development, however, at 6.1 it states that all trees will be retained. The latter statement appears to be supported by the Tree Constraints Plan, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the Tree Protection Plan.

No objection subject to pre-commencement conditions for tree protection.

Access Officer:

I have considered the detail of this planning application and deem there to be no accessibility issues raised by the proposal.

Highways Officer:

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 T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).

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.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 1 Safeguarding Existing Housing

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 5 Areas of Special Local Character

DMHB 6 Gatehill Farm Estate and Copse Wood Estate Areas of Special Local Character

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 16 Housing Standards

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 3 Basement Development

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm
LPP D10	(2021) Basement development
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
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
NPPF- 15	NPPF-15 2018 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

In addition: Development Plan
Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

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 - Development Management Policies (2020)

The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)

The West London Waste Plan (2015)

The London Plan (2021)

Material Considerations

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

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

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

The proposed development maintains the front building line as existing and would not significantly extend beyond the footprint of the existing extended dwelling. However the overall bulk of the proposal would be significantly increased to the rear, in comparison to the existing mix of subservient, one storey additions. To the south the proposed building would project approximately 4.45m to the rear of that property at the nearest point, set back by 7.5m. To the north the proposal would project approximately 8.3m to the rear of no. 16, set back by 12.15m. Although the proposal would exceed 4m advised within policy guidance the submitted plans indicate that the proposal would not compromise a 45 degree line of sight from either property. Therefore given the degree of separation from those properties it is not considered that the proposal would harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over-dominance.

The principle windows will face the front and rear gardens. The proposal does include side windows at first floor level but these will serve en-suite bathrooms or non habitable rooms and could be conditioned to be obscure glazed and non opening below 1.8m. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not significantly increase overlooking or loss of privacy to that already in existence.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

The NPPF notes the importance of achieving design which is appropriate to its context stating that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings and the public realm contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping.

Policy DMHB 12 advises that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area. It should ensure public realm design takes account of the established townscape character and quality of the surrounding area.

Policy DMHB 5 (Areas of Special Local Character) states that within ALSC new development should reflect the character of the area and its original layout. Alterations should respect the established scale, building lines, height, design and materials of the area. The replacement of buildings which positively contribute to the character and local importance of ASLC will normally be resisted.

Policy DHHB 6 advises that new houses within the Copse Wood Estate should be constructed on building plots of similar average width; be constructed on a similar building line and be of a similar scale, form and proportion as adjacent houses and reflect the materials, traditional roof design; design features and architectural style predominant in the area. It also advises that boundary treatments should be unobtrusive and in natural materials appropriate to the character and appearance of the estate. It should also preserve the mature trees including boundary planting to reinforce existing landscaping

and estate settings.

This application relates to the erection of a seven-bedroom detached house, comprising habitable loft accommodation and a basement. The property measures a maximum of 28m in width and 20.45m in depth, set beneath a large crown roof of 10.1m in height.

The dwellings throughout the Copse Wood Estate were originally built in a traditional vernacular style with Arts and Crafts influence, with the use of asymmetrical street scene elevations and traditional material. Defined design characteristics of the area include half timbered/rendered projecting gables, tile hung elevations, hipped roof forms, deep cat slides, mock timber detailing, sprocketed eaves, and traditional fenestration designs. The proposed development is a substantial addition within the street scene and more closely resembles the more recently redeveloped mock Georgian style properties adjacent than the prevailing Arts and Crafts influence of the wider area of special local character. As previously detailed the Conservation Officer has raised strong objections to the proposed development, raising concerns over the design and scale of the proposed dwelling. This is a substantial addition to the street scene and would fail to harmonise with design features, architectural styles and building heights predominant in the area. Whilst acknowledging that other properties within the street scene have previously been developed in a mock Georgian style, this was under the previously adopted local plan and the cumulative impact of further such development would continue to erode the original character of the wider area.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would fail to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding Copse Wood Area of Special Local Character, contrary to the requirements of Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

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.

There will be no discernible difference in vehicle bound activity as compared to the scale and single tenure of the existing dwelling (which will remain for the replacement build) hence any generated activity can therefore be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

Vehicular Access Provision

There are two carriage crossing emerging onto 'Linksway' which serve the existing dwelling. These are to remain and are considered fit for purpose. If any minor alterations are required, then these would need to be undertaken post-permission to an appropriate Council standard under S184 of the Highways Act 1980 agreement (or suitable alternative arrangement) at the applicant's expense.

There should be conformity to the relevant mutual inter-visibility sight-line requirements, as per DfT (Manual for Streets (MfS) circa 2007) best practice for new development road and parking layouts guidance, between vehicles leaving the site and extraneous vehicles/pedestrians on Linksway. The removal of the high front boundary walls is therefore welcomed however in order to further assist with maintaining satisfactory sight-

lines at the site entrances for both vehicles and pedestrians entering and leaving the site envelope, it is recommended that a lower height of frontage wall is applied throughout or for at least 2.4 metres on either side of each entrance point. Ideally the height would not exceed 0.6m to achieve the aim of satisfactory visibility.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

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 for a 3 bedroom 'plus' dwelling is for up to 2 spaces to be provided on-site in order to comply with the adopted parking standard. The submission indicates an on-plot parking space provision consisting of several surface spaces on the generous frontage area plus 2-underground spaces facilitated by a 'car-lift' arrangement. This meets and exceeds the parking standard which is considered acceptable in this case as it reduces the potential for untoward on-street parking displacement resulting from the higher dependency on the private motor car due to the very low PTAL rating.

In terms of cycle parking there should be a provision of 2 secure and accessible spaces for this scale of rebuild in order to conform to the adopted borough cycle parking standard. Accommodation of these spaces has been indicated within a garden shed provision which is considered acceptable.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP's)

In line with the London Plan (2021), within the final parking quantum there is a requirement for a minimum 20% 'active' EVCP provision with all remaining spaces being designated as 'passive' provisions. In this particular case, the proposal should incorporate 1 'active' and 1 'passive' space. The applicant indicates a single 'active' space provision only which should therefore be remedied accordingly by way of imposed planning condition.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

London Plan Policy D6 seeks to ensure that all housing developments are of the highest quality, both internally and externally and in relation to their context and the wider environment.

Policy DMHB 16 also sets out the minimum internal floor spaces required for developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants. The standards require a twelve person 7 bed, 14 person dwelling over 3 stories should have a minimum internal floor area of 199sqm. This is a substantial property which would provide a floor area well in excess of this requirement.

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

Policy DMHB 18 advises that all new residential development will be required to provide good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space. In assessing the quality of all amenity space in development proposals, consideration will be given to the shape and position and whether the layout has regard to matters such as daylight and sunlight. Table 5.2 identifies a requirement of 100sqm for a 4+ bed property. The property would benefit from a large garden in compliance with the requirements.

7.6 Other Issues

Landscaping

Policy DMHB 14 advises that all development will be expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other features of merit. The Landscape Architect has advised that the proposal includes a tree report by GHA, which states in the executive summary that a small number of trees and shrubs would be removed; however 6.1 states all trees would be retained. The latter statement appears to be supported by the Tree Constraints Plan, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the Tree Protection Plan. Therefore there are no objections to the proposal subject to condition for tree protection measures and landscaping.

Access

The Access Officer has advised that the dwelling would be required to be constructed to meet the standards for a Category 2 M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations 2010 (2015 edition).

Operational Refuse Requirements

Refuse collection will continue via 'Linksway' as is the case at present. In order to conform to accepted 'waste collection distances' from the public highway, the storage area should be positioned within 10m of a refuse vehicle. It is accepted that if this is exceeded, it is highly likely that an informal on-plot management regime will be established to ensure that any refuse is positioned within the above distance parameter on collection days. Alternatively, a closer positioning of the bin storage area toward the public highway could be proposed to remedy this point.

Construction Logistics Plan (CLP)

A full and detailed CLP will be a requirement given the constraints and sensitivities of the local road network in order to avoid/minimise potential detriment to the public realm. It will need to be secured under planning condition.

Flooding and Drainage

Policy DMHD 3 for basement development advises that when determining proposals for basements the Council require an assessment of the scheme's impact on drainage, flooding groundwater conditions and structural stability. The Council will only permit basement development that does not cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity and does not result in flooding or ground instability. A Basement Impact Assessment has been provided by the applicant which advises that the risk of the proposed development causing flooding or drainage issues are negligible. The Flood and Water Management Officer has not responded to raise any objections.

CIL

The Council adopted its own Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on August 1st 2014 and the Hillingdon CIL charge for residential developments is £95 per square metre of additional floorspace. This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £60 per sq metre.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012).
Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).

The London Plan (2021).
Supplementary Planning Document 'Accessible Hillingdon'.
National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

Telephone No: 01895 250230