

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 34 ACACIA AVENUE EASTCOTE

Development: Erection of 1 no. detached 4-bed dwelling house and 2 no. semi-detached 4-bed dwelling houses (following demolition of existing dwelling)

LBH Ref Nos: **1788/APP/2021/3141**

Drawing Nos: 4505/03
4505/02
4505/01
Pottle_34Acacia
Design and Access Statement

Date Plans received : 13/08/2021

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 13/08/2021

1. **SUMMARY**

Permission is sought to replace an existing bungalow with 3x two storey dwellings.

Due to their narrow front elevations, narrow plot widths, excessive height next to the neighbouring bungalows and close proximity to one another, the resulting properties would form an oversized and visually cramped addition to the street scene, harming its character and appearance. Additionally, each of the properties would provide substandard bedrooms and bathrooms and are therefore not of high quality design as required by the London Plan (2021). The rear garden of unit 3 is insufficient to meet the amenity space needs of its new occupants. As insufficient private amenity space is proposed, alongside inadequate internal layouts and visually cramped properties, the proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.

Taking into consideration these points (explained in detail below) the proposed development is recommended for refusal.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

By reason of their narrow front elevations, narrow plot widths, excessive height next to neighbouring bungalows and close proximity to one another, the proposed dwellings would form an oversized and visually cramped addition to the street scene, harming its character and appearance. Due to the mentioned features, as well as the fact that the proposal would provide inadequate amenity space for plot 3 and substandard internal layouts for future occupants of all dwellings, the proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area and is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies, Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 130 (a) and 130 (c) of the NPPF (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Each of the 4 bedroom semi detached dwellings (Plot 2 and 3) fails to provide a twin/double bedroom with a minimum internal floor space of 11.5sqm. Furthermore the smallest bedroom within each of the properties is below the single bedroom minimum internal space requirement (7.5sqm). Additionally, Plot 1 of the proposed development includes a study/bedroom which fails to provide 7.5sqm of internal floor space for its occupants. The proposed dwellings are therefore considered to be of poor design and are contrary to policy D6 (F) of the London Plan (2021).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The entrance level W/C's within each of the dwellings fails to meet the requisite space standards set out in Diagram 27 of Approved Document M to the Building Regulations. They also fail to provide the required clear access zones set out in Diagram 27 of Approved Document M to the Building Regulations. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy D7 A(2) of the London Plan, which requires all houses (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) to meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Plot 3 would provide 91sqm of private amenity space for future occupants of the 4 bedroom dwelling, it would therefore fail to comply with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and is considered to provide a substandard level of private amenity space for future occupants of the property.

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 (2021).

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
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
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP H2	(2021) Small sites
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP D1	(2021) London's form, character and capacity for growth

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 T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

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

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

4 I74 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Refusing Consent)

This is a reminder that under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), should an application for appeal be allowed, the proposed development would be deemed as 'chargeable development' and therefore liable to pay the London Borough of Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This would be calculated in accordance with the London Borough of Hillingdon CIL Charging Schedule 2014 and the Mayor of London's CIL Charging Schedule 2012. For more information on CIL matters please visit the planning portal page at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a detached bungalow situated on the north side of Acacia Avenue. The property has been finished in render and mock tudor beaming and has an integral garage. It is set back from the main road allowing for a front garden and off street parking. The bungalow has been extended in the past and spans most of the sites width.

Properties in the area are single to two storeys in height and many of them have accommodation in their lofts. In terms of form they are detached and semi detached. Their designs vary and externally they are finished in pebble dash, brick, render, mock tudor beaming, cladding, hung tiles or mixtures of the mentioned materials. Each property is set back from the road allowing for off road parking and/or a front garden.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of 1 no. detached 4-bed

dwelling house and 2 no. semi-detached 4-bed dwelling houses (following demolition of existing dwelling).

3.3 Relevant Planning History

1788/APP/1999/2127 34 Acacia Avenue Eastcote

ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (TO FORM ENCLOSURE FOR EXISTING SWIMMING)

Decision: 03-12-1999 Approved

1788/E/76/1626 34 Acacia Avenue Eastcote

Householder development - residential extension(P)

Decision: 31-12-1976 Approved

Comment on Planning History

The planning history for the site is set out in section 3.3 of this report. There is no comment to make on that history.

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

46 neighbouring properties were directly notified of the proposal on 23/09/21. 17 letters of objection were received in response to consultation. The objections are summarised below:

- 1) The proposed development would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene
- 2) The proposed development would harm neighbouring amenities (by way of loss of light, privacy and overshadowing)
- 3) The proposed development would provide insufficient parking and would harm the highways network causing traffic and congestion
- 4) The proposal would cause disturbance during construction and pollution (air and noise)
- 5) Loss of greenery at the front of the site would harm the areas appearance
- 6) The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site
- 7) 3 new 4 bed homes will put a strain on schools and local services

Eastcote Residents Association were also consulted on the application and objected to the scheme for the following summarised reasons:

- 1) increase in people will lead to an adverse impact on utility usage, drainage and sewage capacity, parking/traffic issues and increased pressure on local services.
- 2) Cycle stores are placed within the neighbouring garden
- 3) Landscaping should be retained as per policy requirement and further details regarding boundary treatments are needed
- 4) plot 2s bin store is in plot 1
- 5) the vehicle cross over should be policy compliant
- 6) the proposed development would be out of character with neighbouring bungalows and the wider area, harming the appearance of the street scene
- 7) New development should seek to provide the highest standards of design and quality green homes as mentioned in the design and access statement

8) PD rights should be removed if the proposal is approved and all other mentioned issues should be explored

Officer response: Issues regarding the developments impact on neighbouring amenities, the appearance of the area, parking, highway safety, private amenity space provision and design have been addressed below. Construction periods are temporary as such so are their impacts, furthermore laws are in place restricting construction times to business hours - limiting impacts. Had the application been recommended for approval, a condition would have been placed on the application requiring a construction management plan to ensure impacts on the road and neighbours were further minimised. Other relevant conditions would also have been added to make the development policy compliant (regarding parking, drainage, landscaping and more). Impacts on services are not a material consideration for a development of this size.

Other comments

Highways Officer: No objection subject to conditions.

Access Officer: The plans should be amended to demonstrate compliance with the technical specifications within Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition).

Trees and Landscaping Officer: No objection subject to conditions

Officer Response : The highways, trees and access officer's full comments are set out below and have been taken into consideration in the determination of this application.

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.H1 (2012) Housing Growth

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

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

LPP H1 (2021) Increasing housing supply

LPP H2 (2021) Small sites

LPP H10 (2021) Housing size mix

LPP D1 (2021) London's form, character and capacity for growth

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 T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - 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 London Plan (2021)

Material Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) 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 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) advises that proposals should not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook.

Paragraph 5.38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

"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."

Paragraph 5.40 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

"For the purposes of this policy, outlook is defined as the visual amenity enjoyed by occupants when looking out of their windows or from their garden. The Council will 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."

Paragraph 5.41 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

"The Council will aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight and sunlight and unacceptable overshadowing caused by new development on habitable rooms, amenity space and public open space. The Council will also seek to ensure that the design of new development optimises the levels of daylight and sunlight. The Council will expect the impact of the development to be assessed following the methodology set out in the most recent version of the Building Research Establishments (BRE) "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice".

Each of the proposed properties and their rear windows would be approximately 30m away from the rear elevations of dwellings on Myrtle Avenue (to the rear of the site). The amenities of those properties are therefore unlikely to be harmed by the proposed development.

Plot 1 is sited next to No.38 Acacia Avenue. On the issues of light and outlook, No.38 has side elevation dormer windows (serving bedrooms) which would face into the flank wall of the detached dwelling on plot 1, due to the 10m plus separation distance (between the dormers and new flank wall), the dormers are unlikely to be subjects of any significant loss of outlook or light. Furthermore the dormer windows are secondary to front and rear elevation gable windows which provide outlook and light, as such any losses would be mitigated by other openings. At ground floor the new detached property would be closest to No.38's garage. However It would also be 5m away from a side elevation door and window. The side window is a secondary window to the properties study/living space which receives its primary source of light from a large front window, as such there would be no significant loss of light to the space. Furthermore the detached dwelling would not extend beyond a line drawn at 45 degrees from the rear or front elevation windows of No.38, taking into consideration the above it is unlikely to lead to any significant loss of light or outlook to the property.

Plot 3 is sited nearest to No.30 Acacia Avenue. On the issues of light and outlook, No.30 has a side elevation dormer window (serving bedroom) which would face into the flank wall of the detached dwelling on plot 3 at a separation distance of just over 3m. The development is therefore likely to cause some loss of light and outlook from the window. However at present the room receives its primary source of light and outlook from its south facing large front elevation gable end window. As such the loss of light to the secondary opening would not be significantly harmful to occupiers of the space. Additionally the dormer window, provide views onto the roofs of neighbouring properties, which is not ideal, and outlook would still be achieved from the main front gable windows. Furthermore the detached dwelling would not extend beyond a line drawn at 45 degrees from the rear or front elevation windows of the No.30, taking into consideration the above it is unlikely to lead to any significantly harmful loss of light or outlook to the property.

Properties on this side of Acacia Avenue are north facing, as such the sun would move from east to west via the south casting shadows away from No.30 (almost completely) and from No.38 (for most of the day). The development is therefore unlikely to lead to any significant overshadowing. The position of the dwellings within their plots (behind neighbouring front elevations and not significantly extending beyond their rear elevations) would ensure that neighbouring patios and gardens are not subject to overbearing or any significantly harmful loss of light.

Furthermore It is common for properties in the area to have first floor windows which look

into neighbouring gardens at a close distance, the proposed development is therefore unlikely to lead to any undue and significant loss of privacy to No 38 or No.30 Acacia Avenue. Conditions could also be added restricting side elevation windows.

The front elevations of the new properties would look toward the street like other dwellings in the area. As their building line is consistent with other two storey dwellings in the area, the views provided from their front windows would cause no undue overlooking or loss of privacy.

For the reasons mentioned above the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbours, subject to conditions.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) states 'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).'

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF (2021) states 'Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.'

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) requires that all new development achieves a 'high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations and extensions.' Policy H1 supports the delivery of new housing in the Borough.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that all development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including:

- i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding:
 - scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures;
 - building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns;
 - building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure;
 - architectural composition and quality of detailing;
 - local topography, views both from and to the site; and
 - impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment.
- ii) ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes;
- iii) ensuring that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities;
- iv) protecting features of positive value within and adjacent to the site, including the safeguarding of heritage assets, designated and un-designated, and their settings; and
- v) landscaping and tree planting to protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.

Policy 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 D6 of the London Plan states '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'. The policy also advises that the layout, orientation, form and provision of outdoor space in new housing developments should be appropriate to their surrounding context.

Policy GG4 of the London Plan (March 2021) seeks to ensure that London's housing needs are met. This objective is reiterated in the Mayor of London's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Housing, although it is noted that in achieving housing targets, full account must be given to other policy objectives. Policy H1 of The London Plan (2021) promotes the optimisation of housing output within different types of location. Policy H10 of The London Plan encourages the Council to provide a range of housing choices in order to take account of the various different groups who require different types of housing. Consideration will also be given to the accessibility of the site to services and amenities.

It should be noted that the boroughs tree and landscaping officer provided the following comments on the proposal:

'This site is occupied by a single-storey bungalow, with a detached garage, located on the north side of Acacia Avenue. The plot is exceptionally wide compared with the neighbouring properties in this residential street. According to the aerial photographs and Google Streetview, There are a number of mature trees along the rear boundary. There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site. COMMENT No trees will be affected by the proposed development although, if approved, tree protection should be provided throughout the demolition and construction operations, to prevent accidental damage to the trees and their root protection areas. The proposed layout provides parking in the front gardens with space for soft / living landscape. Bile storage is indicated in the back gardens, which will be discrete and secure. Bin storage is proposed in the front garden which would be best avoided. If bin storage cannot be located to the rear of the buildings, the stores should be well designed, screened with planting and kept away from the front (public) boundary. RECOMMENDATION No objection subject to pre-commencement condition RES8, and RES9 (parts 1,2 and 5) and RES10.'

Had the application been recommended for approval, the mentioned conditions would have been added to the decision notice, however the application has been recommended for refusal with regards to its visual impact for the reasons set out below.

The area surrounding the site is characterised by single and two storey detached dwellings located on good sized plots. Dwellings vary in their design, appearance and material finish. Furthermore they are all set back from the road allowing for off street parking and landscaping. Good visual spacing exists between all properties at first floor, however some have built up to their respective shared boundaries at ground floor.

The new detached dwelling would be 7.4m high approximately and the semi's would be 8.2m high. The detached dwelling would be on an unusually narrow plot when compared with other detached dwellings in the area and the new semi detached dwellings would be on a much narrower plot when compared with other semi detached dwellings in the area. The front elevations of the dwellings are also predominantly narrower than other detached and semi detached dwellings in the area (respectively). Due to their comparatively narrow plots, narrow elevations, excessive height next to neighbouring bungalows.No.38 and

No.30 Acacia Avenue and minimal separation distance from each other, the new properties would form a visually cramped and oversized addition to the street scene, harming its character and appearance.

Furthermore taking into consideration the excessive heights of the buildings, their comparatively narrow elevations and plots, the fact that inadequate internal bedroom and bathroom space is provided within each of the dwellings and that substandard amenity space is provided for one of the dwellings, the proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.

For the reasons mentioned above the development is considered to form an oversized, poorly designed, uncharacteristic and unduly prominent addition to the street scene which would cause significant harm to the areas character and appearance.

The applicant has referred to the other schemes which they believe to be comparable to this proposal in their design and access statement. However none of those applications are on Acacia Avenue, as such their visual impact on their respective street scenes vary. None of the applications are for 2x semi detached and 1x detached dwelling as such the proposals vary and each of the referenced applications were decided before the introduction of the London Plan (2021), NPPF (2021) and Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), which require developments to be of high quality design and to visually integrate with their environments, as well as other considerations. The mentioned schemes are therefore not considered to be comparable or to warrant approval of this application.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Policy DMT 2 states 'Development proposals must ensure that: i) safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided to the Council's standards; ii) they do not contribute to the deterioration of air quality, noise or local amenity or safety of all road users and residents; iii) safe, secure and convenient access and facilities for cyclists and pedestrian are satisfactorily accommodated in the design of highway and traffic management schemes; iv) impacts on local amenity and congestion are minimised by routing through traffic by the most direct means to the strategic road network, avoiding local distributor and access roads; and v) there are suitable mitigation measures to address any traffic impacts in terms of capacity and functions of existing and committed roads, including along roads or through junctions which are at capacity.'

Policy DMT 6 states 'Development proposals must comply with the parking standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1 in order to facilitate sustainable development and address issues relating to congestion and amenity. The Council may agree to vary these requirements when: i) the variance would not lead to a deleterious impact on street parking provision, congestion or local amenity.'

Similarly the London Plan (2021) seeks to provide adequate parking for new residential development and to avoid harm to highways networks.

The Highways Officer was consulted on the proposed development and provided the following comments:

'The address is located within a residential catchment in Eastcote and consists of a substantive detached bungalow with a single carriageway crossing (cc) located at the far eastern end of the site envelope. The proposal is for No.34 to be demolished and replaced by a pair of semi-detached units and a separate detached dwelling - all with four bedrooms. Two on-plot parking spaces are proposed for each dwelling and the existing cc would serve one of the semi's whilst a new cc would be required for the remaining semi. Two further c.c's are also proposed for the detached unit.

Acacia Avenue is devoid of parking controls and due to the relatively isolated nature of this location from public transport facilities, the site exhibits a poor public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating of 2 and therefore raises dependency on the ownership and use of private motor transport.

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.

In order to comply with the maximum parking standard there is a requirement for up to 2 on-plot spaces per unit to be provided. This quantum is proposed and is welcomed as the location exhibits a relatively poor PTAL level which encourages a provision at the maximum end of the standard.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP's)

In line with the London Plan (2021), within any final parking quantum there is a requirement for a minimum 20% 'active' EVCP provision with all remaining spaces being designated as 'passive' provisions which, in this case, would equate to 1 'active' and 1 'passive' space per unit. This aspect is absent from the submission but can be secured by planning condition.

Cycle Parking Provision

In terms of cycle parking there would be a requirement to provide 2 secure and accessible spaces for each dwelling to accord with the Council's adopted cycle parking standard. 1 cycle space per unit is indicated to the rear of each new build which is considered acceptable in terms of positioning but should be increased to 2 spaces per unit by way of planning condition.

Vehicular Access Provision

1) Semi-detached unit (located at the far eastern end of the site envelope)

Currently there is a single carriageway crossing (cc) located at the far eastern end of the site envelope. This unit would utilise this existing but revised crossing that should be dimensioned in line with the Council's 'Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy 2019 (DVFC)'. The revised crossing requires centralising to cater for the two 'side by side' parking spaces with a width of crossing at the 'back of footway' not exceeding 3.6 metres and 4.8 metres at the 'edge of kerb'. The dimensions shown on plan marginally exceed those permitted hence this detail should be adjusted post-permission. It should be noted that the new crossing would need to be constructed to the Council's standard executed under S184 of the Highways Act 1980 (or suitable alternative arrangement) at the applicant's/developer's expense.

2) Semi-detached unit (located central to the site envelope)

A new cc is required to serve the two 'side by side' parking spaces and as above, the dimensions shown on plan marginally exceed those permitted i.e. a maximum width not exceeding 3.6 metres at the 'back of footway' and 4.8 metres at the 'edge of kerb'. Hence this detail should be adjusted post-permission executed under S184 of the Highways Act 1980 (or suitable alternative arrangement) at the applicant's/developer's expense.

3) Detached unit

Two smaller and separate cc's are proposed to serve 2 individual on-plot spaces. In terms of scale, these also conform to the DVFC policy requirements however there is inadequate physical separation between the cc closest to the one proposed for 2) above. This should be rectified with a separation of 900mm between the two at the kerb face.

Access Visibility Requirements (applicable to each unit)

In safety terms, effort should be made to maintain a low frontage wall treatment onto Acacia Avenue in order to help ensure 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 Acacia Avenue itself. In order to assist with improving sight-lines at the site entrances for vehicles and pedestrians, it is therefore recommended that the front boundary wall height should not exceed 0.6m throughout the width of the frontage in order to achieve the aim of improved visibility. This aspect can be secured via planning condition.

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. Clearly the proposal would raise the level of vehicular activity to and from the site as compared to the existing single residential unit. However peak period traffic movement into and out of the site would not be expected to exceed 2-3 additional vehicle movements during the most crucial and sensitive peak morning and evening hours hence this uplift is considered marginal in generation terms and therefore can be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Refuse collection would be facilitated from Acacia Avenue. In terms of bin storage positioning, waste collection distances should not exceed 10m from the point of collection on the public highway. Refuse storage is proposed on the frontage of each new build which indicates conformity to the above. There are no further observations.

Construction Logistics Plan (CLP)

A full and detailed CLP would be a requirement given the constraints and sensitivities of the local residential 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

Subject to the alterations to the carriageway crossing widths for each of the semi-detached dwellings and the marginal relocation of one of the crossings provided for the detached unit (as described within the above 'Vehicle Access Provision' chapter), the following applies:

"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)."

Taking into consideration the above the proposed development is considered to be acceptable on highways grounds. Had the application been recommended for approval, the suggested conditions would have been added, alongside conditions requiring further details of visibility splays, parking layouts, crossovers and construction management plans.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Addressed above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

The Council's access officer has provided the following comments on the proposed development:

This proposal for a 1no. 4-bed dwelling house and 2no. semi-detached 4-bed dwelling houses raises accessibility concerns. Policy D7 of the 2021 London Plan requires all new housing to be designed and constructed as accessible and adaptable in accordance with M4(2) as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition). Revised plans should be requested prior to any grant of planning permission to address the following issues. 1. Step free access into the dwellings is required. Details should be submitted to satisfy the above policy requirement. 2. The entrance level WCs for each of the respective dwelling types does not meet the requisite space standards or provide the required clear access zones for such a cubicle in a four bedroomed house. 3. Particular attention should also be paid to the entrance lobby arrangement and to spatial requirements within the bedrooms, bathrooms and kitchen area. The plans should be amended accordingly to demonstrate compliance with the technical specifications within Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition). Conclusion: unacceptable. Details should be submitted prior to any planning approval.

The access officers comments are noted and have been taken into consideration below.

Plot 3 would have 91sqm of private amenity space and would therefore provide a substandard level of private garden space for future occupiers of the 4 bedroom dwelling, contrary to Policy DMHB 18 of the Local Plan.

Each of the 4 bedroom semi detached dwellings (Plot 2 and 3) do not provide a twin/double bedroom with a floor space of 11.5m² as required by the London Plan. Furthermore the smallest bedroom within each of the bedrooms is below the single bedroom minimum space requirement of 7.5sqm as set out in the London Plan. Plot 1 of the proposed development includes a study which could be used as a bedroom in the future, paragraph 5.60 of the Local Plan, Part 2 is clear that such spaces should be considered as bedrooms. The study/future bedroom is therefore also below the 7.5sqm minimum requirement for a single room in the London Plan.

To ensure new dwellings are well designed and are accessible for all future needs of residents, Policy D7 of the London Plan requires new development to comply with the standards set out in M4(2) of Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition). The downstairs toilets for the each of the new dwellings do not meet the space standards or clear access zones specifications. The proposed dwellings are therefore not considered to be accessible to all and contrary to the London Plan.

Taking into consideration all of the above the new properties are not considered to be accessible to all or of high quality design, warranting refusal of the application.

Notwithstanding the above, it should be noted that each of the dwellings would exceed the general minimum internal floor space standards for 4 bed, two storey dwellings.

7.6 Other Issues

Bin and cycle stores have been shown on the submitted plans. If the application were recommended for approval a condition could be added to the application to ensure that the bin and cycle storage areas are provided and are in appropriate locations.

8. Reference 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 London Plan (2021)

Contact Officer: Haydon Richardson

Telephone No: 01895 250230