

DELEGATED DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
- Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select Option

1. No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received ☐
2. Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds ☐
3. There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action ☐
4. There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings ☐
5. The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below) ☐

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6. Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards ☐
7. No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received ☐
8. Application has not been supported independently by a person/s ☐
9. The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below) ☐

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10. Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha ☐
11. Householder application in the Green Belt ☐

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

12. Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses ☐
13. Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use ☐
14. Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use. ☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15. Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development) ☐
16. Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development) ☐
17. Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development ☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18. ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings) ☐
19. PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION ☐
20. OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS ☐
21. CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION ☐
22. CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION ☐
23. APPROVAL OF DETAILS ☐
24. ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval ☐
25. WORKS TO TREES ☐
26. OTHER (please specify) ☐

The delegation powers schedule has been checked. Director of Residents Services can determine this application.

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informatives are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DATES SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS TO THE ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration**

Address LAND TO REAR OF 56 BRIARWOOD DRIVE NORTHWOOD

Development: Construction of a two storey detached house with associated parking and landscaping

LBH Ref Nos: **19486/APP/2021/3500**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan
21/3515/1
21/3515/3
21/3515/2

Date Plans received : 14/09/2021

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 14/09/2021

1. SUMMARY

Due to its design, layout and location the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Due to its size and close proximity to 56 and 56a Briarwood the proposed dwelling would lead to an unacceptable loss of outlook and visual intrusion, subsequently harming the amenities of those neighbours. The access arrangements and internal layout of the building fails to comply with Policy D7 of the London Plan and would therefore not result in a dwelling which is accessible for all. The application is therefore contrary to planning guidance contained within Local Plan, London Plan and NPPF.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its siting (in rear gardens), uncharacteristically small plot, unusually narrow front elevation, and layout would result in a development of the site, which would fail to harmonise with the appearance of other properties in the area and the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site as proposed, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden areas would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and character and appearance of the area as a whole. 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 DMH 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by virtue of the site layout, access arrangements, internal design of the building, and absence of details to show that the internal layout would comply with Building Regulation requirement M4(2), fails to demonstrate that adequate provision would be provided to meet the needs of people with disabilities. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by virtue of its height, bulk and close proximity to neighbouring properties, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 56 and 56a Briarwood Drive by reason of visual intrusion and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

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) and national guidance.

DMH 6	Garden and Backland Development
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 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

DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
NPPF14	NPPF 2021 - Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding

3 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 proposed site is situated on the eastern side of Oakdale Avenue and comprises part of the rear garden areas serving nos. 56 and 56A Briarwood Drive, as approved under application 19486/APP/2016/1129. The building comprising 56 and 56A is situated to the south of the development site and is a detached property characterised by a two storey gable ended front projection with a square bay single storey feature with a pitched roof. To the side of the building is a single storey porch/hall and there are additional bay features on the side elevation all with hipped roofs. To the north of the site is a detached double garage serving 103 Pinner Road.

The existing properties within the streetscene are primarily two storey semi-detached dwellings finished in brick and render, and set beneath hipped roofs with two storey bay features to the front. To the west is the commercial area of Joel Street and the Northwood Hills shopping area. Northwood Hill tube station is situated further along Joel Street to the south. This site lies within a critical drainage area and has a PTAL score of 2.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a two storey detached house with associated parking and landscaping.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

19486/APP/2000/1115 56 Briarwood Drive Northwood
ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION

Decision: 08-03-2001 Approved

19486/APP/2014/1665 56 Briarwood Drive Northwood

Use of ground floor of residential detached house for child day care centre (first floor to remain residential)

Decision: 22-07-2014 Refused

19486/APP/2016/1129 56 Briarwood Drive Northwood

Conversion of dwelling house into 2 x 3-bed self contained flats involving alterations to side with associated parking and amenity space

Decision: 31-05-2016 Approved

19486/APP/2020/3490 56 Briarwood Drive Northwood

Two x 2-storey, 2-bed semi detached dwellings with amenity space

Decision: 15-02-2021 Refused

Comment on Planning History

Planning permission was recently refused at the site for a similar scheme comprising two dwellings (19486/APP/2020/3490). That application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its siting and layout would result in a development of the site, which would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site as proposed, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden areas would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and character and appearance of the area as a whole. The proposal is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMH 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the NPPF.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, size, scale and design, including an alien and disproportionate roof form, would fail to harmonise with the character and architectural composition of surrounding properties, appearing as an awkward, incongruous and cramped form of development which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016).
3. The proposed development by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, height and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 56 and 56a Briarwood Drive by reason of overdominance, visual intrusion and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.
4. The proposed development, by virtue of its failure to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the proposed units and retain sufficient usable amenity space for the existing property at 56a Briarwood Drive, would result in an over-development of the site detrimental to the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.
5. The proposal has not demonstrated that sufficient off street parking would be provided, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, leading to on-street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety and

contrary to policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), to Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards as set out in Appendix C of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policies 6.3 and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016).

It should also be noted that in 2016 permission was granted for the subdivision of no. 56 Briarwood Drive into 2 separate residential units (19486/APP/2016/1129). The proposed works included splitting of the rear garden area to provide separate amenity spaces. The works were carried out.

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

47 neighbouring properties were directly notified of the proposed development on 05/10/21. The consultation period ran for 21 days, ending on 26/10/21. Additional notification was sent to 56A Briarwood Drive on 10/11/21, with the consultation period expiring on 01/12/21. In response to consultation on the application 6 objections received. Those objections have been summarised below:

- 1) The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site
- 2) The proposed dwelling is out of character and harmful to the appearance of the area
- 3) The proposal would have an adverse ecological impact
- 4) The proposal would lead to the loss of parking spaces, where parking is needed, subsequently leading to more kerb side parking and harm to the local highways network/safety issues
- 5) The proposal would have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenities (loss of light, privacy, overlooking, overbearing)
- 6) The proposal would increase flood risk and drainage issues in the area
- 7) Noise and dust during construction would cause disturbance to nearby residents
- 8) The proposal could lead to the loss of a nearby tree
- 9) The proposal could harm mains supplies to Oakdale Dental Surgery
- 10) The nearby garage maybe harmed due to its close proximity to the proposed works.

Officer response: Issues regarding the developments impact on neighbouring amenities, the character and appearance of the area, parking, highway safety, drainage, flooding have been addressed in sections 7.1-7.6 of this report. The physical impact of the proposed development on the nearby garage and mains supplies to the dental surgery would be controlled during construction through building regulations, they are not planning matters or material considerations. Construction works are temporary as such so are their impacts. Furthermore construction works are legally restricted to working hours to ensure that the amenities of neighbours are not significantly harmed. The loss of unprotected trees, which are also located to the rear of the site where they provide no contribution to the appearance of the area is unavoidable, as they could be removed without permission. As the trees to the rear of the site could be removed without permission any associated ecological impact is also unavoidable and would therefore not form a sound reason for refusing this application.

Consultee Comments

The Borough's Tree Officer, Highways Officer and Access Officer have been consulted on the application. The Borough's highways and tree officer have raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions, however the access officer has raised concerns regarding the access to and internal arrangement of the property.

Each of the consultees full comments are set out below, in relevant sections of this report.

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.H1 (2012) Housing Growth

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 6 Garden and Backland Development

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 16 Housing Standards

DMHB 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

DMEI 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality

LPP SI13 (2021) Sustainable drainage

NPPF14 NPPF 2021 - Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding

In addition: 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)
West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan (2021)

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

Local Plan Policy DMHB 11 sets out design guidance for all new development in the borough. Part B of the policy states 'development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space'.

Guidance for Policy DMHB 11 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'.

Guidance for Policy DMHB 11 also 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. Single aspect dwellings should be avoided'.

The proposed dwelling is sited in the rear garden area of nos. 56 and 56a Briarwood Drive and would be situated approximately 15m to the rear of 56a and 12m from the conservatory of no.56. At 7.6m high, the proposed two storey building situated between 12m and 15m from the rear windows of 56 and 56A Briarwood would significantly harm the residential amenities of these properties. The proposed building is even closer to their gardens and would impact adversely on views out of their amenity spaces and windows. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of those properties, by reason of visual intrusion and a loss of outlook.

The property would front Oakdale Avenue, as such its rear windows would be orientated towards the rear of the properties along Pinner Road. Due to its backland location and separation distance from properties on Pinner Road, the dwelling is unlikely to lead to any significant loss of light to their habitable rooms, nor any harmful overshadowing. The proposal is also unlikely to lead to any significant loss of privacy to the the gardens of properties on Pinner Road (namely No's 97 to 103), due to its distance from their rear windows, patios, and the proposed dwelling's absence of side elevation windows.

The rear elevation of the proposed dwelling would also face the rear gardens of properties

on Briarwood Drive (with no. 57 adjoining the site), allowing views over the rear portions of the gardens. Having regard to the orientation of the proposed dwelling and the distance to the existing buildings. It is considered that this would be a common arrangement in an urban area and whilst there would be some impact, the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable overlooking/loss of privacy or significant loss of light, loss of outlook or sense of enclosure to these properties.

To the front of the building the proposed dwellings would face the rear of the commercial premises fronting Joel Street and the flats above (at a distance of 24m). It would face the Kingdom halls Jehovah's witness building at a distance of 14m but would provide oblique views toward the site, which would be further limited by landscaping, it is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on that users of that building.

For the reasons mentioned above the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic policies states that a high quality design should be achieved in all new buildings, alterations and extensions, and states that schemes should not result in the inappropriate development of gardens and green spaces that erode the character and biodiversity of suburban areas.

Local Plan Policy DMHB 11 states:

'A) 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'.

Policy DMH6 states:

'There is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable, subject to the following criteria: i) neighbouring residential amenity and privacy of existing homes and gardens must be maintained and unacceptable light spillage avoided; ii) vehicular access or car parking should not have an adverse impact on neighbours in terms of noise or light. Access roads between dwellings and unnecessarily long access roads will not normally be acceptable; iii) development on backland sites must be more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties; and iv) features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat must be retained or re-provided'.

Table 3.2 of the London plan sets out design guidance for new housing development in the City. It states 'The layout of the scheme (including spaces between and around buildings) should form a coherent, legible and navigable pattern of streets and blocks'.

Paragraph 71 of the NPPF (2021) states inter alia:

"Plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area."

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF (2021) states:

"Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

- a) the identified need for different types of housing and other forms of development, and the availability of land suitable for accommodating it;
- b) local market conditions and viability;
- c) the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services - both existing and proposed - as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use;
- d) the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; and
- e) the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places."

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);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience'

The proposed building is approximately 7.6m high, 6.2m wide and 10m deep. it would be finished in brick, with two storey front bay and hipped roof.

The surrounding area is primarily characterised by semi detached dwellings with hipped roofs and gabled bay features. The proposed dwelling includes a bay and has a similar roof design to the nearby detached Oakdale Dental Practice, its design is therefore not considered to be wholly incompatible with the area. Notwithstanding these points, the property would be uncharacteristically narrow and small when compared with neighbouring dwellings and in these respects it would not integrate well with the appearance of neighbouring buildings.

As mentioned previously, surrounding properties and the local area are predominantly characterised by semi detached properties set in large, rectangular plots, with a width in excess of 13m. Many of the dwellings have been extended. Visually the dwellings are

finished in a variety of materials and are set beneath hipped roofs of between 7.75m - 8.8m and eaves of approximately 5.3m - 5.3m. Each property is set back from the main road and its front elevation faces the main road where it contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal fails to follow the historic grain of the surrounding area due to its isolated backland location. The existing properties are characterised by their spacious plots and are set back from the road with ample gaps between the built forms, maintaining a sense of rhythm along the road as well as providing a sense of openness to the street scene. In comparison to neighbouring sites, the proposed dwelling and plot would be significantly smaller, with limited rear garden space, minimal frontage and no contribution to the appearance of the main road. The proposal would therefore be out of character. Furthermore due to its narrow front elevation the dwelling would be at odds with the much wider frontages of other properties which characterise the area. The infilling of the gap (between Briarwood Drive and Pinner Road), which at present provides an important break in the built form would appear out of character with the pattern, scale and form of development within the surrounding area. Therefore in principle this form of development is considered unacceptable.

Taking into consideration the above (as well as the fact the proposal would cause harm to neighbouring amenities due to its layout, design and siting), the proposed development fails to comply with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies, Policies DMH 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

The Boroughs Highways and Traffic Officer has been consulted on the proposed development and has provided the following comments:

'Site Characteristics & Background

This corner address is located within a residential catchment in Northwood on the junction of Briarwood Drive and Oakdale Avenue. No.56 has been previously sub-divided into 2x3 bedroom flats (19486/APP/2016/1129) with 2 on plot parking spaces per flat arranged on the frontage (2) and to the rear including a garage space (2). Approximately 50% of the original rear garden has been subdivided accordingly. The remaining 50% is now considered to be a 'vacant plot' by the applicant who proposes to populate the land with a single 3-bedroom detached unit with 2 on-plot parking spaces.

The surrounding road network exhibits some parking restrictions operating from 8am to 6.30pm - Monday to Saturday and there is a controlled parking zone (CPZ) encompassing the location which operates from Monday to Friday - 1pm to 2pm. The address displays a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 3 which is considered as moderate and therefore heightens dependency on the ownership and usage of private motor transport.

A planning application for two 2-bedroom semi-detached units on this site with one on-plot parking space per unit (19486/APP/2020/3490) was refused earlier this year for several reasons including insufficient on-plot parking 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.

The proposal would require an on-plot provision of up to 2 parking spaces to fully comply with Hillingdon's adopted parking standard. 2 spaces are indicated hence there is conformity to the standard.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP's)

In line with the London Plan (2021), within the final parking quantum there is a requirement for a minimum 20% 'active' EVCP provision with all remaining spaces being designated as 'passive' provisions. Given the configuration of spaces in this case, it is recommended that 1 'active' and 1 'passive' space are provided for the new unit in order to future proof for anticipated demand. This requirement has not been acknowledged by the applicant but can be secured by way of planning condition.

Cycle Parking Provision

In terms of cycle parking, there would be a requirement to provide 2 secure and accessible spaces in order to meet the Council's adopted cycle parking standard. Detail has been presented with the required level of provision located to the rear of the new build which is considered fit for purpose.

Vehicular Trip Generation

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

The proposal would clearly increase traffic generation from the site as compared to the existing dormant nature of the vacant 'garden' plot. However peak period traffic movements into and out of the site would not be expected to rise beyond 1-2 vehicle movements during the peak morning and evening hours. Hence this uplift is considered marginal in generation terms and therefore can be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

Vehicular Access

In highway impact terms there is no objection in principle to the new carriageway crossing on Oakdale Avenue. The crossing should conform to the Council's 'Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover' Policy 2019 which stipulates that the width of crossing at the 'back of footway' should not exceed 3.6 metres and 4.8 metres measured at the 'edge of kerb'. Finalised detail would be arranged post-permission and it should be noted that the new crossing would need to be constructed to the relevant Council construction standard executed under S184 of the Highways Act 1980 (or suitable alternative arrangement) at the applicant's/developer's expense.

Furthermore, it would also be prudent to maintain a low wall height in the vicinity of the site entrance and frontage boundary with Oakdale Avenue in order to aid pedestrian and vehicle safety on sight-line grounds. A wall height not exceeding 0.6m should therefore be provided for at least a metre length on both sides of the crossing at the back of footway.

Removal of On-Street Residents Parking Bay

To facilitate the new crossing, it would also be necessary to remove a section of an on-street parking bay in Oakdale Avenue which would require amendment to the Traffic

Management Order (TMO) which legitimises all of the parking bays and yellow lines in the area. The TMO process would occur post-permission and the costs associated with this process together with the physical removal/alteration of the bay itself would also be borne by the applicant/developer.

Please note that the TMO process includes statutory public consultation and advertising in order to highlight the changes required. This may result in objections to the loss of the on-street parking bay and as the Council has a public duty to consider valid objections, this may lead to the retention of the said parking bay. There are no further observations.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Refuse collection would be conducted via Oakdale Avenue.

A main bin storage location should be located in proximity of the public highway in order to conform to the Council's 'waste collection' maximum distance parameter of 10m i.e. distance from a refuse vehicle to the point of collection. Some detail is shown with storage located to the side of the build which broadly conforms to the standard. On this basis 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).'

Taking into consideration the above, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on parking provision and highway safety (subject to conditions).

7.4 Carparking & Layout

see above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Residential Amenity of future occupiers

Table 3.1 of London Plan (2021) provides the most up to date 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 3 bed, 4 person dwelling, set over 2 floors to provide 84sqm of internal space with storage. The new dwelling would provide 93sqm and would therefore comply with the London Plan and Policy DMHB 16 of the Local Plan (2020).

Policy DMHB 18 advises that all new residential development will be required to provide good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space. For a 3 bed property a minimum of 60sqm should be provided. The proposal provides 82m2 of private amenity space and therefore complies with policy DMHB 18. The amenity space remaining to serve 56 and 56a Briarwood Drive would also be considered of sufficient size.

The Boroughs' Access Officer was consulted on the proposed development and provided the following comments:

'This proposal for a single dwelling house 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

dwelling is required. Details should be submitted to satisfy the above policy requirement.

2. The entrance level WC shown on plan does not meet the requisite space standards or provide the required clear access zones for such a cubicle in a three 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. Revised plans should be submitted prior to any planning approval.'

Taking into consideration the above the proposed development would result in a dwelling which is not accessible to all and is contrary to Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021).

7.6 Other Issues

Critical Drainage

The site lies within a critical drainage area and any approval would require a condition requiring the provision of sustainable drainage measures.

Trees and Landscaping

It should be noted that the borough's tree officer has stated the following regarding the proposed scheme:

'This site is occupied by a two-storey detached house, located on the north side of Briarwood Drive, at the junction with Oakdale Avenue. The house sits within a spacious plot with a rear conservatory, detached garage on the west side and a rear garden which extends along the side of Oakdale Avenue. The response to the planning questionnaire (Q. 15) states that there are no trees on the site. Evidently this is an oversight, there were trees on site recently according to aerial photographs and Google Streetview, however, there are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site. COMMENT This submission follows application ref. 19486/APP/2020/3490, which was refused. The fourth reason for refusal stated: 'The proposed development, by virtue of its failure to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the proposed units and retain sufficient usable amenity space for the existing property at 56a Briarwood Drive, would result in an over-development of the site detrimental to the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies. The current proposal seeks to build a single two-storey detached house with parking for two cars in the front gardens. According to the Macleod layout plan, the scheme will benefit from space for soft landscape in the front which will enhance both the setting of the new dwelling and the wider streetscape. A modest size private garden will wrap around the building with space to securely and discretely accommodate bin and bike stores to the rear. The garden for flat 2 (56A Briarwood Drive) continues to offer a less than ideal private garden space, however it does provide a potential external amenity space. RECOMMENDATION - No objection subject to conditions RES9 (parts 1,2 and 5)'.

Had the application been recommended for approval the suggested conditions would have been added, however the proposal is unacceptable for the reasons outlined above and throughout the report.

Ecology/Wildlife

Representations have raised concern about the impact on wildlife and protected species.

Given the nature of the site, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on wildlife that would warrant a refusal of planning permission. In addition, separate legislation exists to afford specific protection to protected species.

CIL

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

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)
National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Contact Officer: Haydon Richardson

Telephone No: 01895 250230