

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 THE BROADWAY 47 JOEL STREET EASTCOTE

Development: Erection of a three storey building to create a business unit and 1 x 2-bed residential unit involving demolition of existing store/garage to rear and remodelling of existing basement to increase business use

LBH Ref Nos: **17155/APP/2021/1453**

Drawing Nos: PL01.00 Rev. A
 Photographs
 PL01.01 Rev. B
 PL01.02 Rev. B
 PL01.03 Rev. B
 PL01.04 Rev. B
 PL02.07 Rev. C
 PL02.01 Rev. C
 PL02.02 Rev. C
 PL02.03 Rev. C
 PL02.04 Rev. C
 PL02.05 Rev. C
 PL02.06 Rev. C
 Design and Access Statement
 Flood Risk Assessment

Date Plans received : 13/04/2021

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 13/04/2021

1. SUMMARY

This proposal is for the demolition of the existing store/garage and erection of a new 3 storey building to create a business unit and 1 x 2-bed residential unit involving demolition of existing store/garage to rear and remodelling of existing basement to increase business use. This application is a re-submission of application ref: 17155/APP/2020/3664 which was refused for several reasons.

This proposal fails to respect the visual amenity of the site and the surrounding area. It is also considered that it would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and would fail to provide adequate access for future occupants. It is therefore recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed building, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, depth and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers, by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light, loss of outlook and loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed building by reason of its siting in this visually prominent position, size, scale, bulk, overall height and design would be an incongruous addition, which would be unduly prominent, overly dominant and out of scale with the character, appearance and visual amenities of the surrounding area and street scene. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by reason of its design and layout fails to provide a development which meets the requirements of people with disabilities and would therefore give rise to a substandard form of working and living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies D5 and D7 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.

DME 3	Office Development
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
DMTC 1	Town Centre Development
DMTC 2	Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP E1	(2021) Offices
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
LPP GG5	(2021) Growing a good economy
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP SD5	(2021) Offices, other strategic functions and residential development in the CAZ
LPP SD6	(2021) Town centres and high streets
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP T6.2	(2021) Office parking
NPPF- 2	NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF- 5	NPPF-5 2018 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF- 6	NPPF-6 2018 - Building a strong, competitive economy
NPPF- 7	NPPF-7 2018 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres
NPPF- 11	NPPF-11 2018 - Making effective use of land
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places

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.

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

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a brick built inner terraced property situated on the Eastern side of Joel Street. From Joel Street it presents a 3 storey building with Domino Pizza at ground floor. The building then extends through to the street behind, with the lower ground floor being accessed from Ferndown to the rear. Above the shop there are 2 x 1 bed flats which are accessed via an external stair case to the rear of the property. The proposed works to the property all relate to development which will be visible and accessed from Ferndown.

The street scene is a mixture with flats above the shops facing Joel Street, additional business units on the lower ground floor level and with the gardens and garages of the residential properties of Briarwood Drive and Ferndale as it turns eastwards. The road is a no parking area.

The site lies within Northwood Hills Town Centre, primary shopping area and is also within a Critical Drainage Area.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal is for the erection of a three storey building to create a business unit and 1 x 2-bed residential unit involving demolition of existing store/garage to rear and remodelling of existing basement to increase business use

3.3 Relevant Planning History

17155/APP/2020/3664 The Broadway 47 Joel Street Eastcote

Erection of a four storey building to create two business units and 1 x 2-bed residential unit involving demolition of existing store/garage to rear and remodelling of existing basement to increase business use

Decision: 02-03-2021 Refused

Comment on Planning History

Prior approval 17155/APP/2017/1028 for conversion of part of the basement from retail to residential was refused in 2017, as the area exceeded the maximum permissible; insufficient information was provided to demonstrate existing A1 use and it was considered to have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of residential occupiers.

A previous planning application 17155/APP/2016/3514 for a first floor rear extension to create 1 x 1 bed self contained flat was refused on the basis that it failed to provide sufficient parking; it resulted in the provision of habitable rooms in close proximity to the neighbouring property resulting in an oppressive environment for future occupiers and failed to provide sufficient amenity space. This was dismissed at appeal.

Application 17155/APP/2014/3458 for a 3 storey attached building for 2 x 1 bed flats and conversion of basement to 1 x 1 bed flat was refused on highway safety grounds; insufficient parking or amenity space; visually intrusive and detrimental to the amenities of nearby residents.

As discussed above this a re-submission of application ref:17155/APP/2020/3664 which was for the 'Erection of a four storey building to create two business units and 1 x 2-bed residential unit involving demolition of existing store/garage to rear and remodelling of existing basement to increase business use' and was refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed four storey building, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, depth and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers, by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light, loss of outlook and loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.

2. The proposed four storey building by reason of its siting in this visually prominent position, size, scale, bulk, overall height and design would be an incongruous addition, which would be unduly prominent, overly dominant and out of scale with the character, appearance and visual amenities of the surrounding area and street scene. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One -

Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

3. The proposal, by reason of its design and layout fails to provide a development which meets the requirements of people with disabilities and would therefore give rise to a substandard form of working and living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies D5 and D7 of the London Plan (2021).

This application differs from the previously refused scheme has been reduced in size in terms of its scale, bulk and height reducing the height down to 3 storeys. Amendments have also been made to the internal layout of the proposal.

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

48 neighbours including the Northwood Hills Residents Association were consulted on the 16th April 2021 for a period of 21 days. 4 responses were received raising the following issues:

- Siting, design, size and proximity to the boundary would result in an intrusive form of development harmful to the streetscene.
- No parking.
- No private amenity space.
- The proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site.
- Overlooking.
- Flooding issues.
- Impact upon trees.
- Impact upon foundations
- Access issues to 18,19,20 and 21 Ferndown.
- Poor outlook, loss of view.
- Poor design/appearance.

Officer Comment: Concerns relating to the foundations are not a material planning consideration. All other matters are dealt with in the report below.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES

Access Officer

An assessment of this proposal has been conducted with reference to London Plan policy D5 and D7. 1. All new residential accommodation should be accessible and adaptable in accordance with policy D7. It is noted however, that it may not be feasible to provide wheelchair access to the residential units above ground. This would be supported by paragraph 3.7.6 of the London Plan, which recognises that the application of M4(2), requiring lift access (a step free approach to the principle private entrance), may have particular implications for developments of four storeys or less where historically the London Plan may not have required a lift. Local Planning Authorities are therefore

required to ensure that dwellings accessed above or below the entrance storey in buildings of four storeys or less have step-free access. However, unless the applicant submits a clear, well evidenced and compelling case to the LPA as to why lift access cannot be provided, the application should not be supported on the grounds of non-compliance with London Plan policy D7.

Conclusion: unacceptable. Justification for the lack of lift access to the residential units above lower ground floor should be submitted and evaluated prior to any approval.

Any grant of planning permission should include the following conditions:

Prior to works commencing, details of step free access via the principal private entrance shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall remain in place for the life of the building.

REASON To ensure that an appropriate standard of housing stock, in accordance with the 2021 London Plan policy D7 is achieved and maintained.

The dwellings hereby approved shall 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, and all such provisions shall remain in place for the life of the building.

REASON: To ensure that an appropriate standard of housing stock, in accordance with the 2021 London Plan policy D7 is achieved and maintained'.

Tree Officer

This site is occupied by the lower ground floor and land to the rear of 47 Joel Street, accessed via Ferndown. The front of the property forms part of the retail parade on Joel street, with the rear / lower elevations used for service access from a residential street. There is no existing living landscape and no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site. COMMENT The current submission follows the refusal of application ref. 17155/APP/2020/3664. The proposal will create a three-storey structure to include residential space on levels two and three. Aside from a small balcony, there is no soft landscape, or other amenity space provision. According to the D&AS (12.11) the development will rely on the current provision of local outdoor public open space. - This being the case, the development should make a financial contribution towards the development and maintenance of POS. RECOMMENDATION No objection subject to securing a financial contribution payable to Green Spaces for the provision of local POS on which development depends. This is required to mitigate the lack of provision within the development site.

Officer Comment: Whilst a financial contribution would be desirable it is noted that no such contribution was sought as part of the previously refused application. The lack of a financial contribution did not form a reason for refusal.

Highways

Site Characteristics & Background

The address consisting of a ground floor sui-generis use (formally A5 (Hot food takeaway) with residential above is located on Joel Street and is placed within the local district shopping centre in Northwood. The proposed development of 2 business units (Class E(g) -173m2 GIFA) and 1 two-bedroom residential unit is to be positioned to the rear of the site which is currently a single storey storage building with vehicular access taken at the rear from 'Ferndown' - a local residential road. One on-plot parking garage space is proposed for the residential component.

The site is in proximity to Northwood Hills LU Station and exhibits a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 3 which is considered as moderate. However, in practice, the 'real world' PTAL is somewhat higher than numerically depicted and hence sustainable travel to and from the address is anticipated. A comparable application (17155/APP/2020/3664) at this address was recently refused but not on highway related grounds.

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.

Residential

The maximum parking standard requires 1-1.5 spaces to be provided on-site in order to comply with the adopted parking standard. 1 garage space is proposed hence this standard is met.

Business Units

The maximum parking standard for an E(g) use class requires 1 space per 50-100m² (GIFA) hence the proposal would demand 1-2 on-plot spaces. The business component is presented as car-free. However, it is noted that the existing sui-generis 'A5' storage usage of a similar scale demands a comparable number of spaces hence it can be considered that the status quo in net parking terms would remain with the 'car-free' proposal as presented.

The 'car-free' aspect is therefore considered broadly acceptable further reinforced by the aforementioned good 'real world' transport links and extensive parking controls in the area which act as a parking constraint.

Cycling Provision

In terms of cycle parking there would be a requirement to provide 1 secure and accessible space for the residential unit with 1 space for the business component. 2/4 spaces are proposed respectively which satisfies the standard.

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 'net' change from the sui-generis storage use to the proposed E(g) class and residential use would be expected to generate a nominal increase in activity spread mainly throughout the working day with peak period traffic movement into and out of the site not anticipated to rise beyond 1-2 vehicle movements during the peak morning and late afternoon/evening hours. Henceforth any such variation in trip generation can be readily absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

Operational Refuse & Servicing Requirements

Refuse collection would be conducted from Ferndown.

In order to conform to the Council's 'waste collection' maximum distance collection parameter of 10m i.e. distance from a refuse vehicle to the point of collection, arrangements should ensure that waste is positioned at a collection point within this set distance. The proposed positioning of the bin storage area in proximity of Ferndown therefore indicates conformity. 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 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

Part 2 Policies:

DME 3 Office Development

DMEI 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality

DMH 2 Housing Mix

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 16 Housing Standards

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

DMTC 1 Town Centre Development

DMTC 2 Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas

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

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D5 (2021) Inclusive design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP D7 (2021) Accessible housing

LPP E1 (2021) Offices

LPP GG2 (2021) Making the best use of land

LPP GG4 (2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs

LPP GG5 (2021) Growing a good economy

LPP H1 (2021) Increasing housing supply

LPP SD5 (2021) Offices, other strategic functions and residential development in the CAZ

LPP SD6 (2021) Town centres and high streets

LPP SI13 (2021) Sustainable drainage

LPP T5 (2021) Cycling

LPP T6 (2021) Car parking

LPP T6.1 (2021) Residential parking

LPP T6.2 (2021) Office parking

NPPF- 2 NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development

NPPF- 5	NPPF-5 2018 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF- 6	NPPF-6 2018 - Building a strong, competitive economy
NPPF- 7	NPPF-7 2018 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres
NPPF- 11	NPPF-11 2018 - Making effective use of land
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places

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 bulk, massing and height of the development has been reduced. The previous application proposed a distance of approx 4.1 metres between habitable room windows at No. 47 and the development and this has been increased to approx 16.9m. It is considered that this distance would still be unacceptable and contrary to the Council's minimum requirement of 21m. Furthermore the development would still be only 8.9m from the terrace which forms part of the occupiers residential unit. As such it is considered that this development would cause harm to the amenity of residents at No. 47.

The development would also be only 10m away from the rear of No. 49 where there are two large habitable room windows and a terrace. As such it is considered that the development would cause harm to the amenity of residents of that property. This property abuts the existing 4 storey building at no 53-55 Joel Street, and as such already has a

restricted outlook. Given the scale and proximity of the development it is considered this would result in an overbearing impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The proposal includes a high level window serving a kitchen on its rear elevation facing the Joel Street properties. This would be obscure glazed to prevent any overlooking. It is noted that this kitchen would be served by a second window.

Overall it is considered the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy DMHB 11.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

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.

The street scene is comprised of an open aspect of the rear gardens of the properties fronting Briarwood Drive and Ferndown to the east, broken only in part by a pair of garages. To the west is the three storey terrace fronting Joel street set back approximately 25.5m with service yards to the rear. Also to the rear of the terrace are a number of one and two storey additions, which have extended the commercial premises at ground floor and provide terraces for the flats above. There is a long single storey garage structure to the rear of no. 4 Ferndown and a flat roofed two storey office building to the rear of no. 8 Ferndown and 39a The Broadway. At the end of the terrace is a four storey block including a mansard roof, which occupiers the corner plot, where Ferndown turns away to the south east.

The proposed building would comprise a 3 storey mixed use block at a height of approximately 8.6m and a maximum width of 6.8m. Whilst the height of the building has been reduced since the submission of the refused application, its width is the same. The development would be set immediately adjacent to the road. This is a substantial building in a very prominent position, which would be an incongruous addition which would be unduly overly dominant and out of scale with the character and appearance of the area.

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

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Local Plan: Part 2 Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 require the Council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

The 'net ' change from the sui-generis storage use to the proposed E(g) class and residential use would be expected to generate a nominal increase in activity spread mainly

throughout the working day with peak period traffic movement into and out of the site not anticipated to rise beyond 1-2 vehicle movements during the peak morning and late afternoon/evening hours. Henceforth any such variation in trip generation can be readily absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Local Plan: Part 2 Policy DMT 6 requires that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the Council's adopted parking standards unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

The Council's Highways Officer has commented on the application as follows:-

'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.

Residential

The maximum parking standard requires 1-1.5 spaces to be provided on-site in order to comply with the adopted parking standard. 1 garage space is proposed hence this standard is met.

Business Units

The maximum parking standard for an E(g) use class requires 1 space per 50-100m² (GIFA) hence the proposal would demand 1-2 on-plot spaces. The business component is presented as car-free. However, it is noted that the existing sui-generis 'A5' storage usage of a similar scale demands a comparable number of spaces hence it can be considered that the status quo in net parking terms would remain with the 'car-free' proposal as presented.

The 'car-free' aspect is therefore considered broadly acceptable further reinforced by the aforementioned good 'real world' transport links and extensive parking controls in the area which act as a parking constraint.

Cycling Provision

In terms of cycle parking there would be a requirement to provide 1 secure and accessible space for the residential unit with 1 space for the business component. 2/4 spaces are proposed respectively which satisfies the standard.

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 'net ' change from the sui-generis storage use to the proposed E(g) class and residential use would be expected to generate a nominal increase in activity spread mainly throughout the working day with peak period traffic movement into and out of the site not anticipated to rise beyond 1-2 vehicle movements during the peak morning and late afternoon/evening hours. Henceforth any such variation in trip generation can be readily absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety

Operational Refuse & Servicing Requirements

Refuse collection would be conducted from Ferndown.

In order to conform to the Council's 'waste collection' maximum distance collection parameter of 10m i.e. distance from a refuse vehicle to the point of collection, arrangements should ensure that waste is positioned at a collection point within this set distance. The proposed positioning of the bin storage area in proximity of Ferndown therefore indicates conformity. 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 T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021)'.

As such the development would not lead to circumstances prejudicial to pedestrian and highway safety.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Residential Amenity of future occupiers

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 sets out the minimum internal floor spaces required for developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants. The standards require a two person 2 bed 3 person flat over two floors should have a minimum internal floor area of 70sqm. The internal floor areas for the proposed flat would be approximately 79sqm, in compliance with these requirements.

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light.

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 5.3 identifies a requirement of 25sqm for each 2 bed property. The level of amenity space proposed would be well below this standard. However it is noted that Northwood recreation ground located approximately 300m to the west and Hogs Back open space is approximately 500m to the north. It maybe therefore be unreasonable to refuse the proposal on this basis.

7.6 Other Issues

Operational Refuse & Servicing Requirements

Refuse collection would be conducted from Ferndown.

In order to conform to the Council's 'waste collection' maximum distance collection parameter of 10m i.e. distance from a refuse vehicle to the point of collection, arrangements should ensure that waste is positioned at a collection point within this set distance. The proposed positioning of the bin storage area in proximity of Ferndown therefore indicates conformity. There are no further observations.

Access

The Access Officer has advised that the development is unacceptable. All new residential accommodation should be accessible and adaptable in accordance with policy D7 . It is

noted however, that it may not be feasible to provide wheelchair access to the residential units above ground. This would be supported by paragraph 3.7.6 of the London Plan, which recognises that the application of M4(2), requiring lift access (a step free approach to the principle private entrance), may have particular implications for developments of four storeys or less where historically the London Plan may not have required a lift. Local Planning Authorities are therefore required to ensure that dwellings accessed above or below the entrance storey in buildings of four storeys or less have step-free access. However in such cases the onus is on the applicant to submit a clear, well evidenced and compelling case to the LPA as to why lift access cannot be provided. In this case no such evidence has been provided as such the development would be contrary to London Plan policy D7.

It is noted that the Design and Access Statement includes plans to demonstrate that a lift can be provided in the future if required. As the list does not form part of the proposal it is considered that refusal on accessibility grounds is warranted in this case.

Critical Drainage Area

The site lies within a critical drainage area and any approval would require an informative for the provision of sustainable drainage measures.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012).
Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (January 2020).
The London Plan (2021).
Supplementary Planning Document 'Accessible Hillingdon'.
National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer: Kelly Sweeney

Telephone No: 01895 250230