

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 69 HIGH STREET RUISLIP

Development: Extension at the front of the property above the shopfront to provide 1 x self-contained flat (Use Class C3) at second floor level and erection of a new three storey building at the rear of the property to provide 2 x self-contained flats (Use Class C3) above an open loading bay with associated bin and cycle store

LBH Ref Nos: **1983/APP/2021/550**

Drawing Nos: 746/001 Rev. A
 746/002 Rev. E
 746/003 Rev. F
 746/004 Rev. F
 746/005 Rev. F
 746/008 Rev. F
 746/007 Rev. F
 746/006 Rev. B
 746/009 Rev. D
 746/010 Rev. A
 746/011 Rev. A
 Design Statement
 Supporting Planning Statement

Date Plans received : 18/02/2021

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 18/02/2021

1. **SUMMARY**

The current proposal seeks planning permission for an extension at the front of the property above the shopfront to provide 1 x self-contained flat above (Use Class C3) at second floor level, and erection of a new three storey building at the rear of the property to provide 2 x self-contained flats (Use Class C3) above an open loading bay; with associated bin and cycle store.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development to the rear of the site, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk and design, would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original property, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed front extension, by reason of the design and use of materials of the rear elevation, would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original property and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by reason of the siting of the bedroom windows at first and second floor levels would be detrimental to the amenities of 1 and 3 Midcroft by reason of actual and perceived sense of overlooking of the private amenity spaces and loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by reason of the siting of the first floor kitchen/dining/living room windows and the use of enclosed private amenity space with high boundary treatment would result in the provision of habitable rooms with very poor levels of outlook and limited levels of natural lighting that would result in a substandard form of living accommodation and reliance upon artificial means of lighting which would fail to satisfy sustainability and energy efficiency objectives and would be to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D6 and SI2 of the London Plan (2021).

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 2	Housing Mix
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts

DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP SI2	(2021) Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
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- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

3 I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2016). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the north east side of the High Street close to its junction with Midcroft and Ickenham Road. The site benefits from an access to the rear in South Drive

The building forms part of a 1930s shopping parade with commercial units at ground floor and residential above. It is a two storey building characterised by its simple features and low pitch roof form. As existing, the rear aspect is predominantly used as a servicing area to the commercial units facing onto the High Street at ground level and some access stairs to the first floor accommodations.

The street scene is commercial in character and appearance comprising shopping parades with residential above. The site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The current proposal seeks planning permission for an extension at the front of the property above the shopfront to provide 1 x self-contained flat above (Use Class C3) at second floor level, and erection of a new three storey building at the rear of the property to provide 2 x self-contained flats (Use Class C3) above an open loading bay; with associated bin and cycle store.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

1983/APP/2020/2657 69 High Street Ruislip

Extension at the front of the property above the shopfront to provide 1 self contained flat above (use class C3) at second floor level, and erection of a new three storey building at the rear of the property to provide 2 x self contained flats (use class C3) above an open loading bay and associated bin and cycle store

Decision: 06-11-2020 Refused

1983/PRC/2019/267 69 High Street Ruislip

Addition of 2 floors to the frontage building and a detached four storey building to rear to provide a total of 5 additional residential units

Decision: 30-01-2020 OBJ

Comment on Planning History

The majority of the previous planning applications have been in relation to new shop fronts and adverts which are not relevant to the current application apart from the following

1983/R/89/1606 - Erection of a first floor rear extension to form storage area and change of use of flat to offices - refused 18/07/1990

1983/APP/2020/2657 - Extension at the front of the property above the shopfront to provide 1 self contained flat above (use class C3) at second floor level, and erection of a new three storey building at the rear of the property to provide 2 x self contained flats (use class C3) above an open loading bay and associated bin and cycle store - Refused 6/11/2020 for the following reasons

1. The proposed development to the rear of the site, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk and design, would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original property, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and the NPPF.

2. The proposed front extension, by reason of its design and use of materials, would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original property, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and the NPPF.

3. The proposal would provide inadequate outlook for the central bedrooms in the rear three storey element of the proposal and would therefore give rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers. The proposal is thus contrary to, Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 24th March 2021

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

7 neighbouring properties, the local residents association and the Ruislip Conservation Panel were consulted by letter dated 22/2/2021. The consultation period expired on 15/3/2021. No local response.

Conservation Officer:

Summary of comments: Amendments to upward extension to existing building - Objection to new building to the rear of the site

Historic Environment Designation (s)
· Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA)

Assessment - background/significance

The existing, 2-storey building dates from the 1930s and comprises of a commercial unit at ground floor and residential above. Unfortunately, the shop front at ground floor has been poorly modernised. To the rear it has benefitted from a substantial single storey addition, elongating the ground floor plan to the full depth of the site.

Whilst the altered shop front does take away from the character and style of the building, the first floor is notably well detailed with an attractive stone surround to the central window with corbels beneath an arched cornice. The modern windows either side are detailed with segmental flat arches with a central stone detail. The roof form comprises of a plain clay tiled, hipped roof however the pitch to the rear appears to be shallower create a longer profile. The roof is set behind a soldier course parapet with a simple stone cornice detail. The building is characterised by its red brick appearance which includes burnt headers laid in a Flemish bond.

As existing, the building fronting onto the High Street is a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the conservation area and street scene. It forms part of a wider parade of shops within the main shopping core of Ruislip. Whilst most buildings date from the early 20th century some have been built at a later date resulting in the varying appearance and styles of the buildings.

The scale of buildings along the street scene proportionately reflects the character of the High Street and it contributes to the undulating roofscape which adds interest to the appearance of the conservation area, as duly noted in the Ruislip Village Conservation Area Appraisal (July 2010). The properties either side of the site are two storeys in height. Three storey buildings predominantly exist to the south-east of the site. In some instances, the third storey is contained within a pitched roof with dormers along the front elevation.

The rear aspect of the site is served by a service road for the commercial units facing onto the High Street. The character and appearance of the road is defined by its function, with a range of infrastructure associated to the commercial units, including bin storage, parking, loading bays, access to first floor flats etc. Whilst many properties have been extended to the rear the majority do not extend up to the service road. Furthermore, residential blocks are not a feature directly along the service road due to the nature of the road and its original purpose.

This part of the conservation area would sensitively benefit from a tidy up, as existing it is recognised it somewhat detracts from the conservation area. Views of the service road can be seen from the adjacent Area of Special Local Character (ASLC) known as Midcroft, particularly from the private rear gardens of the residential properties that back onto the service road.

Assessment - Impact

Upward extension along High Street frontage

The proposal to add an extra storey to the building fronting onto the High Street would significantly alter its existing appearance. The existing pitched roof would be lost and resulting in a flat roof profile and boxy built form. Such forms are not uncommon within the conservation area however it would alter the original appearance of the existing building and its presence along the High Street.

It is recognised that the design of the additional storey would relate to the architectural language of the original building. The use of matching brickwork and replication of the parapet detail would ensure the articulation of the additional storey remains in keeping, whilst ensuring a definitive roof line. The proportionately smaller window openings and simple detailing would ensure the building maintains a sense of hierarchy and not draw undue attention to it within the street scene.

The same quality of the front elevation has been entirely lost to the rear. Whilst it is appreciated that the elevation would not be visible from a highly trafficked public facing environment the unremarkable appearance of the rear elevation, and the projecting window feature would be considered an out of keeping feature.

The entire site is located within a conservation area, the quality of the rear elevation should have the same value as a principal elevation with the aim to enhance and raise the quality of design within the service yard environment. The parapet detail with a stone cornice should be consistent across the entire building along all exposed edges. The application of render to the side and rear elevations would deviate from the predominant brick finish to buildings within the service yard. The proposed render finish would be considered unacceptable.

The addition would inevitably raise the height of the built form increasing its presence along the street scene which would be particularly evident via oblique views along the High Street particularly from the junction to the north-west of the site (Ickenham Road and High Street). It is inevitable the increase in height would dwarf the appearance of the immediate neighbouring buildings, Nos. 67 and 71 and there would be concerns that pressure would be placed upon the desire for these buildings to be extended upwards in the near future.

The quality of the development in terms of materials used and construction of the addition would need to be of a high standard. Brickwork would need to match the existing including burnt/glazed headers and laid in a Flemish Bond. The red brick flat arches above the windows would need to be carefully tuck pointed in order to match the existing. It is strongly advised that existing materials are salvaged and re-used as part of the development, notably brick work and the parapet detail. A sample panel of the brick work would be required prior to construction therefore should this application be determined favourably this shall be covered by way of a condition.

As existing, the first floor windows have been altered to modern pivot windows; it is highly likely the alteration was carried out without planning permission. Therefore, proposed windows should not match the existing and vertically sliding sash windows would need to be reinstated. Ideally they would need to be

constructed of timber and replicate traditional sash window joinery details, providing an enhancement to the appearance of the building. As before, should this application be determined favourably this shall be covered by way of a condition.

It is strongly recommended that the flat roof is amended to a green roof, introducing some greenery to the site and potentially enhancing the sustainable qualities of the building.

New residential block to rear of site

As per previous comments in relation to this site, the proposed 3 storey block to the rear of the site would be considered unacceptable. In comparison to the previously refused scheme, little has been altered, previous comments would still be relevant.

The addition of the block would intensify the use and developed nature of the site. A small strip would be retained along the boundary of the site and service road providing a very minimal 'buffer'. Residential buildings are not a feature along the service road and the proposal would create an isolated block. The location of the block would have an enclosing effect on the service road.

The height of the block would appear to match that of the proposed development to the front of the site. The overall scale, bulk and mass of the building would not respect the original building, failing to appear as a subservient or secondary built form. The appearance of the block is likely to be visible from within the ASLC, particularly from the residential rear gardens. Vegetation should not be relied upon as a means to obscure poor design or inappropriate developments. Trees and mature vegetation can disappear due to natural causes and/or human intervention.

As proposed, it is not of any exceptional design quality and lacks the potential to provide an enhancement. The addition of the block to the site would be considered harmful to the conservation area. It would need to be duly noted that the conservation area is not designated as a series of street scenes. The alterations and additions to the rear would be visible from neighbouring sites, rear garden etc. These form part of the environment in which the heritage asset is experienced and just because they are not public views does not lessen the requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the conservation area.

Harm

In isolation, the proposed upward extension of the existing building, fronting onto the High Street is likely to maintain the character and appearance of the conservation area resulting in limited harm. However, the cumulative impact of similar developments along the High Street would have a significant impact on the overall appearance of the street scene and conservation area, which could be detrimentally harmful. As noted under paragraph 28 of Historic England's Good Practice Advice Note 2 (GPAN2) consideration must also be given towards the cumulative impact of such development within the conservation area.

The proposed rear block would however be considered unacceptable, and the extent of harm at the very least would be less than substantial. The cumulative impact of similar development should also be considered.

Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) would be relevant in this instance.

In determining this application duties under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 would also need to be considered by the decision maker.

Conclusion: Objection to rear block - amendments to the proposed addition to the existing building.

Highways Officer:

Site Characteristics

The application site is located on the north east side of the High Street in Ruislip. The site location exhibits extensive parking controls and a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 4 which is considered as good thereby discouraging dependency on the ownership and usage of the private motor car.

This is a 'car-free' proposal which would supply 3 new residential flats (3x2 bedrooms) with 1 flat within a second floor extension to the existing build which consists of a retail component (Vodafone) at ground level with an existing flatted provision on the first floor and a new 3 storey build to the rear of the site located adjacent to the rear service road which would contain 2 flats.

A recent application for a comparable scheme (1983/APP/2020/2657) was refused for a number of reasons in late 2020 but not on highway related grounds. Henceforth, the previously supplied comments are reprised below.

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.

It is proposed to provide 3 new residential units with zero on-plot parking provision. The standard requires a maximum of 3-5 on-plot spaces. However, it is noted that in recent years a number of comparable residential planning permissions in the vicinity, which were subject to appeal processes, have incorporated 'car-free' status. This has been mainly due to the sustainable nature of the location together with extensive parking controls in the immediate and wider area which inherently deter private car ownership and usage. It is therefore acknowledged that the Planning Inspectorate has trended toward this line of approach on a number of other appealed sites with similar 'car-free' and demographic scenarios.

As part of an earlier pre-application enquiry on a flatted proposal at this address (1983/PRC/2019/267) the applicant was advised in January this year that if a 'car-free' development is pursued it would be recommended that on-street parking stress surveys are undertaken within the locality in order to catalogue the levels of parking demand in all roads within a walking distance of 200m of the site. However as subsequent events related to the pandemic have affected working and parking patterns, such an exercise is unlikely to produce true or representative data and hence is no longer a requirement at this time. Notwithstanding this point, it is noted that the applicant has made effort to execute this exercise and has observed an element of spare on-street capacity which can be legitimately used on the surrounding roadways.

Hence for all of the reasons outlined above, it is not anticipated that any measurable undue parking displacement would result due to the absence of parking provision. The 'car-free' proposal is therefore considered acceptable as presented.

Cycling Parking Provision

In terms of cycle parking there is a requirement to provide 1 secure and accessible space for each residential unit in order to accord with the Council's standard. 4 spaces are provided to the rear of the site within the loading under-croft area which is considered

acceptable in principle.

Operational Servicing/Refuse Requirements

Refuse collection would continue in conjunction with collections undertaken from the existing first floor flat. However, a new bin store is to be provided within the ground floor rear under-croft servicing area which would cater for the proposal. It should be ensured that waste collection distances to a maximum of 10m from the collection point to the service road are achieved and applied by the new occupiers. The arrangement as proposed satisfies the above parameters hence there are no further observations.

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 a suitable planning condition.

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

Access Officer:

This proposal has been reviewed against the requirements of the London Plan policy D7 which should not be applied to the extension and conversion of this existing development.

Conclusion: no objections raised from an accessibility perspective.

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 2 Housing Mix

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 16 Housing Standards

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMT 1 Managing Transport Impacts

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP SI2	(2021) Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
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- 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

The main planning issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original building, the street scene and the level of impact on the residential amenity and light levels of the adjoining neighbours, and provision of off-street parking provision.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that: B) Development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity of adjacent properties and open space. Section 5.38 states that 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, schools or onto private open spaces. A minimum of 21 metres separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain levels of privacy and to prevent the possibility of overlooking. In some locations where there is a significant difference in ground levels between dwellings, a greater separation

distance may be necessary. Policy DMHD 1 requires that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed units, both those on the front elevation and to the rear of the site, would be dual aspect and habitable room windows in the rear elevations of both elements would face towards each other at first and second floor levels at a distance of 19.78 m, according to the submitted plans. This is a slight shortfall of the required 21 m which could be deemed acceptable. In addition, the rear windows of the second floor units have been angled to prevent any direct overlooking of the of the proposed private amenity areas of the first floor.

The central windows in the rear elevation of Flats 3 and 4 that serve 'Bedroom 1' are proposed to be obscure glazed in order to prevent the overlooking of the rear gardens of Nos 1 and 3 Midcroft, Side windows are proposed to give access to light and some sense of outlook to these bedrooms. That said, the rear elevation window serving the bedrooms labelled 'Bedroom 2' cannot be conditioned to be obscure glazed and would give rise to an element of overlooking and loss of privacy to the rear gardens of Nos 1 and 3 Midcroft

The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)

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 D3 of the London Plan (2021) requires that development proposals should: Form and enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) states 'Development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings. It should improve an area's visual or physical connection with natural features. In areas of poor or ill-defined character, development should build on the positive elements that can contribute to establish an enhanced character for the future function of the area.'

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that A) The Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment. Development that has an effect on heritage assets will only be supported where: i) it sustains and enhances the significance of the heritage asset and puts them into viable uses consistent with their conservation; ii) it will not lead to a loss of significance or harm to an asset, unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide public benefit that would outweigh the harm or loss, in accordance with the NPPF; iii) it makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area; iv) any extensions or alterations are designed in sympathy, without detracting from or competing with the heritage asset; the proposal would relate appropriately in terms of siting, style, scale, massing, height, design and materials; vi) buildings and structures within the curtilage of a heritage asset, or in close proximity to it, do not compromise its setting; and vii) opportunities are taken to conserve or enhance the setting, so that the significance of

the asset can be appreciated more readily.

Policy DMHB 4: Conservation Areas Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that new development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, within a Conservation Area or on its fringes, will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. In order to achieve this, the Council will: A) Require proposals for new development, including any signage or advertisement, to be of a high quality contextual design. Proposals should exploit opportunities to restore any lost features and/or introduce new ones that would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. B) Resist the loss of buildings, historic street patterns, important views, landscape and open spaces or other features that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; any such loss will need to be supported with a robust justification. C) Proposals will be required to support the implementation of improvement actions set out in relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon 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. It should also not have an adverse impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

Street Front Extension

The conservation officer has acknowledged that the design of the additional storey on the front elevation would relate to the architectural language of the original building. The use of matching brickwork and replication of the parapet detail would ensure the articulation of the additional storey remains in keeping, whilst ensuring a definitive roof line. The proportionately smaller window openings and simple detailing would ensure the building maintains a sense of hierarchy and not draw undue attention to it within the street scene and the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The red brick flat arches above the windows would need to be carefully tuck pointed in order to match the existing. It is strongly advised that existing materials are salvaged and re-used as part of the development, notably brick work and the parapet detail. A sample panel of the brick work would be required prior to construction therefore should this application be determined favourably this shall be covered by way of a condition.

As existing, the first floor windows have been altered to modern pivot windows; it is highly likely the alteration was carried out without planning permission. Therefore, proposed windows should not match the existing and vertically sliding sash windows would need to be reinstated. Ideally they would need to be constructed of timber and replicate traditional sash window joinery details, providing an enhancement to the appearance of the building. As before, should this application be determined favourably this shall be covered by way of a condition.

However, the conservation officer also states that the same quality of the front elevation

has been entirely lost to the rear. Whilst it is appreciated that the elevation would not be visible from a highly trafficked public facing environment the unremarkable appearance of the rear elevation, and the projecting window feature would be considered an out of keeping feature.

The entire site is located within a conservation area, the quality of the rear elevation should have the same value as a principal elevation with the aim to enhance and raise the quality of design within the service yard environment. The parapet detail with a stone cornice should be consistent across the entire building along all exposed edges. The application of render to the side and rear elevations would deviate from the predominant brick finish to buildings within the service yard. The proposed render finish would be considered unacceptable.

Thus, the proposed front extension, by reason of the design and use of materials of the rear elevation, would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original property and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

Rear Extension

However the same quality of the front elevation has been entirely lost to the rear. The rear elevation would lack any interest or design quality. Whilst it is appreciated that the elevation would not be visible from a highly trafficked public facing environment the plain, flat nature of the rear elevation would be considered inappropriate. Taking into account the site is located within a conservation area the quality of the rear elevation should have the same value as a principal elevation with the aim to enhance and raise the quality of design within the service yard environment. Therefore it would need to be amended to better relate to the character and style of the original building. The parapet detail with a stone cornice should be consistent across the entire building along all exposed edges. The application of render to the side and rear elevations would deviate from the predominant brick finish to buildings within the service yard. The proposed render finish would be considered unacceptable.

The proposed two storey element to be constructed above the existing service yard area to the rear would result in the site being fully developed up to the rear boundary which abuts the service road. There are no other residential elements on this rear boundary of the other commercial premises within the street scene. this would create an isolated built form which would fail to appear as a subordinate addition to the host building. Although it would have a corresponding height to that of the proposed front elevation addition, its design is not of any exceptional quality and it would be visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. As the Conservation officer states, these rear views do form part of the environment in which any heritage asset is experienced and just because they are not easily viewed from the public realm this does not lessen the requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the conservation area.

Consequently, the proposed rear element would be considered an incongruous feature and an over development of the site which would be harmful to the appearance of the conservation area.

As a result, the proposal would result in an incongruous addition to the rear elevation which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building, the visual amenities of the street scene and would harm the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Highways & Transportation commented as follows: -

Site Characteristics

The application site is located on the north east side of the High Street in Ruislip. The site location exhibits extensive parking controls and a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 4 which is considered as good thereby discouraging dependency on the ownership and usage of the private motor car.

This is a 'car-free' proposal which would supply 3 new residential flats (3x2 bedrooms) with 1 flat within a second floor extension to the existing build which consists of a retail component (Vodafone) at ground level with an existing flatted provision on the first floor and a new 3 storey build to the rear of the site located adjacent to the rear service road which would contain 2 flats.

A recent application for a comparable scheme (1983/APP/2020/2657) was refused for a number of reasons in late 2020 but not on highway related grounds. Henceforth, the previously supplied comments are reprised below.

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.

It is proposed to provide 3 new residential units with zero on-plot parking provision. The standard requires a maximum of 3-5 on-plot spaces. However, it is noted that in recent years a number of comparable residential planning permissions in the vicinity, which were subject to appeal processes, have incorporated 'car-free' status. This has been mainly due to the sustainable nature of the location together with extensive parking controls in the immediate and wider area which inherently deter private car ownership and usage. It is therefore acknowledged that the Planning Inspectorate has trended toward this line of approach on a number of other appealed sites with similar 'car-free' and demographic scenarios.

As part of an earlier pre-application enquiry on a flatted proposal at this address (1983/PRC/2019/267) the applicant was advised in January this year that if a 'car-free' development is pursued it would be recommended that on-street parking stress surveys are undertaken within the locality in order to catalogue the levels of parking demand in all roads within a walking distance of 200m of the site. However as subsequent events related to the pandemic have affected working and parking patterns, such an exercise is unlikely to produce true or representative data and hence is no longer a requirement at this time. Notwithstanding this point, it is noted that the applicant has made effort to execute this exercise and has observed an element of spare on-street capacity which can be legitimately used on the surrounding roadways.

Hence for all of the reasons outlined above, it is not anticipated that any measurable

undue parking displacement would result due to the absence of parking provision. The 'car-free' proposal is therefore considered acceptable as presented.

Cycling Parking Provision

In terms of cycle parking there is a requirement to provide 1 secure and accessible space for each residential unit in order to accord with the Council's standard. 4 spaces are provided to the rear of the site within the loading under-croft area which is considered acceptable in principle.

Operational Servicing/Refuse Requirements

Refuse collection would continue in conjunction with collections undertaken from the existing first floor flat. However, a new bin store is to be provided within the ground floor rear under-croft servicing area which would cater for the proposal. It should be ensured that waste collection distances to a maximum of 10m from the collection point to the service road are achieved and applied by the new occupiers. The arrangement as proposed satisfies the above parameters hence there are no further observations.

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 a suitable planning condition.

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

7.4 Carparking & Layout

As discussed above

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Access officer has commented as follows:

This proposal has been reviewed against the requirements of the London Plan policy D7 which should not be applied to the extension and conversion of this existing development.

Conclusion: no objections raised from an accessibility perspective.

7.6 Other Issues

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 bedspaces, a double (or twin bedroom) has a floor area of at least 11.5m². The bedrooms in the proposal are all in excess of these requirements. 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. A two bedroom (3 person) flat is required to provide an internal floor area of 61m² and all the proposed units are in excess of this minimum requirement.

Policy DMHB 11 requires that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities.

Policy D6 of the London Plan requires, inter alia:

Housing development should be of high quality design and provide adequately-sized rooms (see Table 3.1) with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differentiating between tenures.

Qualitative aspects of a development are key to ensuring successful sustainable housing. Table 3.2 sets out key qualitative aspects which should be addressed in the design of housing developments.

Housing development should maximise the provision of dual aspect dwellings and normally avoid the provision of single aspect dwellings. A single aspect dwelling should only be provided where it is considered a more appropriate design solution to meet the requirements of Part B in Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach than a dual aspect dwelling, and it can be demonstrated that it will have adequate passive ventilation, daylight and privacy, and avoid overheating.

The design of development should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, whilst avoiding overheating, minimising overshadowing and maximising the usability of outside amenity space.

The proposal, involves the provision of kitchen/dining/living rooms with their windows facing the rear of the site. In order to avoid the issue of overlooking between these habitable room windows, it is proposed to provide enclosed amenity spaces with a depth of 5m with a high (1.8m) boundary treatment. At this distance, it is considered that these rooms would have very poor outlook and limited levels of natural lighting that would result in a substandard form of living accommodation and reliance upon artificial means of lighting which would fail to satisfy sustainability and energy efficiency objectives and would be to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D6 and SI2 of the London Plan (2021).

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Development Management Policies (January 2020) recognises that new residential buildings should 'provide external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of the occupants of the proposed and surrounding buildings'. Table 5.3 states that for a one bedroom flat a minimum of 20m² should be provided and for a two bedroom flat a minimum of 25m² should be provided. The submitted plans indicates the provision of private amenity spaces in excess of this minimum requirement together with communal amenity areas and therefore to comply with Policy DMHB 18

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 (2021)

Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016)
Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard
National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Diane Verona

Telephone No: 01895 250230