

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER 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 60 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Development: Installation of a vehicle crossover

LBH Ref Nos: **77161/APP/2022/960**

Drawing Nos: Parking Dimensions
Location Plan
Block Plan
Floor Plan Parking

Date Plans Received: 21/03/2022

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 05/04/2022

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the western side of High Street and comprises a terraced property. The site is located within the Harefield Village Conservation Area and is located adjacent to the Locally Listed Building at 45-49 Prince Hotel and the Locally Listed Building at 41-43 High Street. The existing building forms part of a historic terrace of dwellings, potentially dating from the late 18th/early 19th century. Historically, it appears that the building was one dwelling and in the mid-19th century it also operated as the village post office. It is not clear when the building was subdivided, however it is evident that the central door was the original entrance.

Externally the building is characterised by curved timber sash windows, each with a central glazing bar. The external elevation is rendered and the original roof finish has been altered to an inappropriate profile tile. Two external chimney stacks are evident along the front roof slope. The building as a whole is pleasant in character, with a cottage aesthetic to the individual property. The frontage to each site comprises of a verdant garden area, each accessed via a pedestrian gate. The property and site, individually and more importantly as part of a group, positively contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The site is located on High Street Harefield which is a busy classified road.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the installation of a vehicle crossover. The front boundary treatment would also be altered and hardstanding installed for on-site parking.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

No recent relevant planning history.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 12th May 2022

Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

2.2

3. Comments on Public Consultations

Three neighbouring dwellings were consulted on 6th April 2022. No comments were received by the end of the consultation period.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE COMMENTS:

HIGHWAYS - Objection

- The proposal has been discussed with Highways colleagues who have raised concerns with the proposed gated entrance. This would require vehicles using the crossover to wait on and obstruct this classified road. This would obstruct the free flow of traffic and increase the risk of harm to highway users.

It is therefore contrary to Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) Policy DMT 1: Managing Transport Impacts - road safety, Policy DMT 2: Highway Impacts - traffic congestion, Policy DMT 6: Vehicle Parking - parking stress and London Plan Policy T4 (2021).

CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN - Objection

- The installation of the vehicle crossover would result in the total loss of the front garden and boundary treatment, erasing all the verdant qualities of the site along the street scene;
- The alteration would detrimentally harm the appearance of the site both individually and as part of a group of dwellings, having a negative impact on the conservation area;
- There would be significant concerns that the proposal would set an unwelcome precedent in terms of this group of properties. The incremental impact of the proposal would exacerbate the harm to the conservation area. Paragraph 28 within the Historic England's Managing Significance in Decision - Taking in the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 2 (GPA, 2 2015) document would be relevant.
- The plans submitted are poor and do not provide a clear landscaping plan for the frontage of the site, nor is it clear whether the surface will be adequately permeable.
- The design and appearance of the front boundary has not been submitted, therefore the impact and harm to the street scene and conservation area is not clear.
- The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the conservation area. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF would be relevant in this instance.
- Duties under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 would need to be considered by the decision maker.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. **MAIN PLANNING ISSUES**

The main issues for consideration with this application are whether the proposed alterations are appropriate to the special historic character and appearance of the building and surrounding Conservation Area, and highway impacts.

Section 72 of the of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Act) 1990 ('The Act') require the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2021) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 202 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designate heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Policy DMHB 1 of the Local Plan: Part Two (2020) notes the Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment. Development that has an effect on heritage assets will only be supported where it sustains and enhances the significance of the heritage asset and puts them into viable uses consistent with their conservation and will not lead to a loss of significance or harm to an asset amongst other criteria.

Policy DMHB 4 of the Local Plan: Part Two (2020) states that new development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, within a Conservation Area or on its fringes, will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. In order to achieve this, the Council will:

A) Require proposals for new development, including any signage or advertisement, to be of a high quality contextual design. Proposals should exploit opportunities to restore any lost features and/or introduce new ones that would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

B) Resist the loss of buildings, historic street patterns, important views, landscape and open spaces or other features that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; any such loss will need to be supported with a

robust justification.

C) Proposals will be required to support the implementation of improvement actions set out in relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans.

Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings should also be actively managed. Development proposals should avoid harm and identify enhancement opportunities by integrating heritage considerations early on in the design process.

The application site comprises a terraced dwelling and is part of a terraced group of dwellings including 56 and 58 High Street which originally was one dwelling and at one time served as the village post office. The properties are set back from the highway by approximately 9m. Each property is accessed by a single pedestrian entrance gate and a contiguous low level hedge runs along the front boundaries. The remaining is laid to lawn. The front gardens and boundary hedge of this particular group of dwellings contribute to the character and significance of the Conservation Area, and to the heritage assets along this stretch of High Street, creating a positive and pleasant street scene. The application site and terraced dwellings within this notable group are characterised by the verdant and long front gardens which face the High Street and contiguous low level hedging which preserve the historic setting. The gardens and pedestrian gates draw attention to the historical characteristics of front gardens free from vehicles.

The proposed development would entail removal of the hedge, vehicular access across the pavement to a new hardstanding parking bay in the front of No. 60. The proposal includes the addition of a pedestrian gate and a gate for the vehicle to be situated adjacent to the public footpath. The proposal will inevitably result in the loss of the landscaped garden and front boundary hedge, harming the visual amenity of the street scene and failing to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

Due to the narrowness of the site it is not considered that there is sufficient space remaining along the front boundary to include a suitable level of soft landscaped boundary treatment and soft landscaping in the front garden to help mitigate the identified harm. This is also taking into account the need to provide pedestrian visibility splays, which is constrained by the projecting front building line of No. 62 High Street. Therefore it is not considered appropriate to condition these details in the event that the application was considered otherwise acceptable.

The removal of the front hedge and loss of the front garden to create off street parking space would have an adverse visual and environmental impact on the area. The installation of the vehicle crossover would result in the total loss of the front garden and boundary treatment, erasing all the verdant qualities of the site along the street scene.

It is considered that the hard surfacing, together with the loss of the boundary hedge, would significantly erode the historic character of these properties within the conservation area. In addition the provision of on-site parking would add modern clutter and distract from this historic terrace of dwellings. It is acknowledged that the adjoining properties have retained their front gardens and contiguous boundary hedge. The cumulative effect of establishing such an unwelcome precedent would have a detrimental impact on the group of dwellings, this would further deteriorate their collective historic interest as a group, and fail to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area including the setting of the adjacent Locally Listed Building at 45-49 Prince Hotel and the Locally

Listed Building at 41-43 High Street.

The notion that similar properties along High Street benefit from hardstanding to the front is noted, however it is considered that the other properties vary significantly in terms of their contribution to the Conservation Area. The semi-detached properties at 57-59 High Street benefit from hardstanding to the front for parking and No. 86 High Street benefits from the hardstanding to the front for parking. In terms of the properties at 57-59 High Street, these properties appear more modern than the application site and it is considered that they contribute quietly to Conservation Area. The amount of hardstanding and lack of any greenery is not a positive attribute along High Street and it is not considered that this development is a positive precedent. No. 86 High Street is a detached property with a larger area to the front of the site. By virtue of the larger front garden, a low brick wall and boundary hedge are retained, which eases the presence of the parking and hardstanding. It is not considered that the properties, located closest to the application site, are directly applicable to the application site in setting a comparable precedent. It is noted that where there is off-street parking within the vicinity of the site this is characteristically to the rear or down side rows of buildings, maintaining original front gardens/building lines and preserving the character of the conservation area.

It is considered that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the conservation area. Whilst the proposal would provide an off street parking space at the application site, the continued viable use of the site as a residential dwelling is not dependent on this proposal. In light of this, the benefit of the proposal would be limited to the private convenience of the occupiers. Taking this into account, there are insufficient public benefits identified to outweigh the harm that would be caused by this proposal.

Taking the above into consideration, it is considered that the proposal would cause harm to the visual amenity of the street scene, the appearance of this group of terraced dwellings, the wider setting of the adjacent locally listed building at 45-49 Prince Hotel and the locally listed building at 41-43 High Street, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 2 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), and the NPPF (2021).

Highway Safety:

There are concerns with how vehicles would enter and exit the proposed parking space. The front garden does not appear large enough for a car to enter and exit the site in a forward gear. It is considered that the likelihood would be for cars to exit the parking in reverse gear. This stretch of High Street is relatively busy and forms an important connectivity route between Harefield, Rickmansworth and Uxbridge to the south. There are concerns that the increased volume of reversed manoeuvring would increase the risk of vehicle collision with pedestrians, cyclists and drivers in the vicinity. This concern is further exasperated given that the terraced property at No. 62 High Street would somewhat obstruct visibility in reverse gear.

There are also highway concerns in relation to the proposed gated entrance, as this would require vehicles to wait on and obstruct the road. This would obstruct the free flow of traffic and increase the risk of harm to highway users.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal, by reason of vehicles reversing into the High Street and the gated entrance necessitating that vehicles would need to wait on and obstruct the road, would result in the disruption of the free flow of traffic and

increased risk of harm to highway users contrary to Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two Development Management Policies (2020).

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development would cause harm to the visual amenity of the street scene, the appearance of this group of terraced dwellings, the wider setting of the adjacent locally listed buildings, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 3, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), and the NPPF (2021), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by reason of vehicles reversing into the High Street and the gated entrance necessitating that vehicles would need to wait on and obstruct the road, would result in disruption to the free flow of traffic and increased risk of harm to highway users contrary to Policies DMT 2, DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021).

INFORMATIVES

Standard Informatives

- 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 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) 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.

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings

DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Niamh McMenamin

Telephone No: 01895 250230