

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 251 LONG LANE HILLINGDON

Development: Sub-division of plot and erection of 1 x 2-bed dwelling (Use Class C3), landscaping, and associated works

LBH Ref Nos: **76753/APP/2021/3469**

Drawing Nos: LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0300 Existing Site Section
 LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0400 Existing Elevations
 LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0450 Street Elevation
 LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0101 Site Plan Existing
 LLH OBA 00 01 DR A 0252 First Floor Plan - Proposed
 LLH OBA 00 00 DR A 0251 Ground Floor Plan - Proposed
 LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0102 Site Plan Proposed
 LLH OBA 00 02 DR A 0253 Roof Plan - Proposed
 251-LongLane-DAS
 LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0452 Proposed North and South Elevation
 LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0350 Proposed Site Section
 LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0451 Proposed East and West Elevation
 LLH OBA 00 ZZ DR A 0100 Location and Block Plan
 LLH OBA 00 00 DR A 0201 Ground Floor - Existing
 LLH OBA 00 01 DR A 0202 Roof Plan - Existing

Date Plans received : 13/09/2021

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 13/09/2021

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks planning permission for the sub-division of plot and erection of 1 x 2-bed dwelling (Use Class C3), landscaping, and associated works.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by reason of its overall size, siting, design and proximity to the front and side boundary lines would appear at odds with the spacing and character of development in the immediate vicinity, giving rise to a cramped form of development which would intensify the residential use of the site and be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area, all harming the established character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal is 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 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), London Plan (2021) policies H4 and H8 and the NPPF (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its scale and proximity, would result in a material loss of residential amenity to the occupants of both the host dwelling at Number 251 Long Lane and the proposed dwelling due to the number and size of the first floor rear facing windows proposed, resulting in an actual or perceived sense of overlooking, failing to

provide satisfactory amenities for those properties. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with Policy DMHB11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020) and the NPPF (2021).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The applicant has failed to demonstrate a satisfactory policy-led approach to the car parking design, layout and access which could be prejudicial to all road users safety, contrary to policy DMT2 and DMT6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2020) and Policy T6 the London Plan (2021).

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said unit and would provide a substandard form of accommodation for future residents contrary to Policy DMHB18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (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 1 Managing Transport Impacts

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP D8 (2021) Public realm

LPP T6 (2021) Car parking

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.

4 174 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 forms the rear part of the garden to No.251 Long Lane. The site fronts onto 'Parkway', a residential cul-de- sac that leads onto St. Helen's College and Hillingdon Court Park.

The site measures 130sqm and is rectangular in shape with a slight chamfer to the western corner, reflecting the angle at which 'Parkway' cuts across the rectilinear pattern of development in the area.

No. 251 Long Lane is a post-war 2 storey semi-detached property with a long rear garden that backs on to 'Parkway'. Due to the angle at which Parkway cuts across from Long Lane, the gardens to the properties along Long Lane progressively get deeper and deeper. From 229 Long Lane to 247 Long Lane, these gardens have been built upon with the new houses fronting Parkway.

The application site is currently occupied by a single storey flat roof garage which is accessed from Parkway over a dropkerb.

The neighbouring properties either side are also occupied by single storey garages to the rear of their gardens.

The site lies within the Critical Drainage Area and the Hillingdon Court ASLC Boundary runs along the opposite side of the road (Parkway).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the sub-division of plot and erection of 1 x 2-bed dwelling (Use Class C3), landscaping, and associated works.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

59206/APP/2005/2951 Land Forming Part Of 249 Long Lane Hillingdon

ERECTION OF A TWO-STOREY DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING

Decision: 14-12-2005 Refused

Appeal: 27-06-2006 Dismissed

59206/APP/2006/2723 Land Rear Of And Forming Part Of 249 Long Lane Hillingdon
ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY DETACHED DWELLINGHOUSE.

Decision: 30-11-2006 Refused

Appeal: 22-06-2007 Dismissed

Comment on Planning History

There is no planning history relating to this plot. It should however be noted that planning permission was refused under application reference 59206/APP/2006/2723 for erection of a two storey detached dwellinghouse on the adjacent site (land to the rear of 249 Long Lane) for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal fails to provide any on-site parking and as such would be likely to cause additional on-street parking which would have a detrimental impact on pedestrian safety and vehicular flow and would be detrimental to the residential amenities of surrounding area. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies BE19, AM7 and AM14 of the Borough's adopted Unitary Development Plan and the Council's Interim Car Parking Standards (December 2001).

2. The proposed development, due to its shallow roof pitch, together with its narrow width, represents an incongruous addition to the street scene, out of keeping with the scale, proportion and architectural composition of other properties in the street which would not complement or improve the amenity and character of the area. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies BE13 and BE19 of the Borough's adopted Unitary Development Plan.

An appeal was subsequently dismissed under reference APP/R5510/A/07/2035964. The Inspector raised highway safety concerns.

Prior to that application reference 59206/APP/2005/2951 - ERECTION OF A TWO-STOREY DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING was refused for the following reasons:-

1. The site is not considered to be of an adequate size to accommodate a house that would be in keeping with the established character of the street. The proposal, which is situated on a prominent site, would not complement or improve the amenity and character of the area and, as such, is contrary to policies BE13 and BE19 of the Borough's adopted Unitary Development Plan.

2. The proposal, due to the first floor obscure glazed window within the rear elevation fails to provide an adequate outlook from this room. The proposal is therefore contrary to design principle 4.1 of the Council's Design Guide: "Residential Layouts and House Design".

An appeal was subsequently dismissed under appeal reference APP/R5510/A/06/2008249. The inspector raised concerns about the overdominant garage door, and awkwardly arranged front door and house being out of proportion and character with the development nearby.

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

Landscape Officer -

This site is occupied by the rear garden of 251 Long Lane, which backs on to the residential street of Parkway. There is a large tree thought to be located in the rear garden of the neighbouring property, 249 Long Lane, which oversails the side / southern boundary. The site lies within the area covered by TPO 168, although the tree in the adjacent garden is not covered by it. COMMENT The response to the planning questionnaire, Q.18, states that no trees influence the site or will be affected by it. Although the approximate location of the tree is shown on plan, according to the aerial photographs, the canopy spread of the tree appears to be under-represented on plan. The third party tree on the neighbouring land to the south may overshadow much of the proposed small back garden. Otherwise, the proposal is to replace the garage fronting onto Parkway with a detached house with an integral garage, modest area of hard landscape in the front and private amenity space to the rear. RECOMMENDATION If you are minded to approve this application, please add conditions RES 9 (parts 1,2 and 5).

Highways

Highways Comments:

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing garage accessed off Parkway and erection of a 2bed dwelling with an integrated single garage inclusive of cycle parking.

The site achieves an average/fair PTAL rating of 2.

The Mayor of London adopted a new and revised London Plan in March 2021, consequently the car parking standards set out in the London Plan 2021 which are restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity, take precedence over those of the Local Development Plans of Local Authorities except where local Development Plans specify lower local maximum standards.

The maximum residential car parking standards set out in the London Plan Policy T6: Table 10.3 are predominately lower than the maximum parking standards set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) and so the London Plan parking standards take precedent.

The maximum parking standards outlined in the London Plan Table 10.3: Outer London PTAL 2-3, 1-2 beds it is up to 0.75 space per dwelling and 1 cycle/bed.

Whilst achieving the London Plan 0.75 car parking space is not practically possible and under DMT6 there would have been a requirement for 2 spaces, the provision of 1 on-site car parking space is considered judicious under the site-specific conditions.

The garage dimensions have not been shown but scaling off the submitted plan the internal dimensions are approx. 6mx3m which complies with the minimum internal dimensions in policy DMT6.

The garage alignment is at an angle with the public highway and therefore substandard. All vehicles must be able to egress perpendicular to the highway.

See the following Council guidance:

https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/media/2123/domestic-vehicle-footway-crossover-policy/pdf/VCO_Appendix_A_New_Policy_050419_4.pdf?m=1590492295747

The relevant para states:

A crossover will only be approved where a standard car parking space (2.4m wide x 4.8m

deep) at 90 degrees to the highway can be accommodated on the front garden/forecourt of the application site. In addition, a vehicle must be able to leave the parking space at right angles to the kerb (see Fig 1).

For pedestrian safety reasons in all new vehicle accesses, it is necessary to maintain within the site areas measuring 1.5m by 1.5m, with no obstruction more than 0.6m high, either side of where the vehicle accesses meet the back edge of the footway, known as pedestrian visibility splays, within which unobstructed visibility is available for drivers to see and be seen by pedestrians on a footway to avoid a potential hazard in time. The splays must be wholly within the site's curtilage and physically protected (dwarf wall/ped gate) from being driven over thereby undermining their necessity.

Given it's a new build higher standard of design, build and safety are applied to new developments, car parking access, layout and arrangement should be designed to improve safety for all road users.

Cycle parking for 2 cycles have been shown inside the garage which is acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION:

Refuse

Reasons for Refusal:

The applicant has failed to demonstrate a satisfactory policy-led approach to the car parking design and layout which could be prejudicial to all road users safety, contrary to policy DMT6 and the London Plan.

Access Officer -

Any grant of planning permission should include the following conditions: Prior to works commencing, details of step free access via the principal private entrance shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall remain in place for the life of the building. REASON To ensure that an appropriate standard of housing stock, in accordance with the 2021 London Plan policy D7 is achieved and maintained. The dwelling(s) hereby approved shall accord with the requirements of Policy D7 of the London Plan, and shall not be occupied until certification of compliance with the technical specifications for an M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015, has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. All such provisions must remain in place for the life of the building. REASON: To not only allow the Building Control body to require the development to comply with the optional Building Regulations standards, but to also ensure the appropriate quantity and standard of accessible and adaptable housing is constructed and maintained in accordance with policy D7 of the London Plan.

3 letters of objection have been received raising concerns about:

1. The similarities between the current proposal and those which have been previously refused and dismissed at appeal on the adjacent site.
2. Overdevelopment
3. Cramped and out of keeping with the locality / harmful addition to local character contrary to Local Plan Part 1 Policy BE1 and Local Plan Part 2 policy DMHB 11 (A) (i)
4. Inadequate car parking provision and subsequent increased demand for on street parking to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety
5. Inadequate garden space / stated garden size misleading, contrary to Local Plan Part 2 Policy DMHB 18
6. Loss of privacy given substandard back to back separation distances
7. Contrary to Local Plan Policy DMH6 in relation to neighbour amenity, vehicular

arrangement, impact on trees

8. Loss of garden not justified

9. Application documents misleading e.g. regarding extent of neighbouring 2 storey development

10. Width of plot inhibits the ability of the contemporary appearance to successfully work / architectural approach at odds with neighbouring properties

11. Integral garage inappropriate / harms proportions of the building - similarity to appeal and relevant Inspector conclusions

12. Impact on amenity contrary to Local Plan Part 2 Policy DMHB 11 and DMH 6

13. Loss of light / overshadowing

14. Contrary to space standards / Local Plan Part 2 Policy DMHB 16 - additional room that could serve as bedroom

15. Concerns about inadequate vision splays

16. Contrary to Local Plan Part 2 Policies DMT 1 and 2

17. Absence of arboricultural assessment / impact on TPO trees cannot be determined / contrary to DMHB 14

18. Impact on Area of Special Local Character

19. Impact accessibility of neighbouring property

Planning Officer Comment:

This is a summary of the objections received and not an exhaustive list given the comprehensive and helpful notes provided. Nevertheless, all matters raised have been taken into account in this decision and have informed this decision. Many are discussed in detail in the main officer report, below.

In relation to point 9 regarding misleading / inaccurate information, the comments received have been taken into consideration in the assessment of the application. It is considered that sufficient information is available to take a decision on the application.

In relation to point 19, it is considered that if the recommendation was to approve, a construction management condition would adequately address access issues during the construction phase.

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

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 1 Managing Transport Impacts

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking

In addition: Development Plan
Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)
The West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan (2021)

Material Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (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 Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

The submitted plans confirm that the back to back separation distance between the two first floor windows of the host and proposed dwelling would be just 19m. This distance falls short of the recognised 21m back to back separation distance. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its scale and proximity, would result in a material loss of residential amenity to the occupants of both properties due to the number and size of the proposed first floor windows proposed, resulting in an actual or perceived sense of overlooking, failing to provide satisfactory amenities for those properties. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with Policy DMHB11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020). The impact of overlooking onto the private rear garden of this neighbour is also considerable.

Given the degree of separation to the properties to the rear, it is considered that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook to the occupants of these properties. There would be an impact on the extreme rear garden of either neighbour with the replacement building however, given the other built form nearby and the overall quality of these rear garden spaces, this does not form a reason for refusal in its own right. Weight has also been given to the previous appeal decisions in this regard.

No side windows are proposed to the property which resolves any overlooking issues to the neighbours either side.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

The NPPF (2021) notes the importance of achieving design which is appropriate to its context stating that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that

fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'

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

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

Policy 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.

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 DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (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.

No. 251 Long Lane is a post-war 2 storey semi-detached property with a long rear garden that backs on to 'Parkway'. Due to the angle at which Parkway cuts across from Long Lane, the gardens to the properties along Long Lane progressively get deeper and deeper. From 229 Long Lane to 247 Long Lane, these gardens have been built upon with the new houses fronting Parkway. The Proposed dwelling would be sited forward of the dwellings constructed to the rear of numbers 245 and 247 such that it would abut the front boundary of the site with Parkway, resulting in a visually awkward siting along this

frontage.

Whilst the overall gabled roof design and bulk of the proposed dwelling is considered acceptable, with a contemporary appearance, its siting alongside the boundary with number 249 and siting forward of the building line is considered to represent a visually incongruous and cramped form of development on this garden site, out of keeping with the established pattern and form of development in the locality.

It is noted that the appeal Inspector in relation to the first appeal raised significant concerns about the dominance of the integral garage door in the front elevation. The current proposal also includes this feature and giving this decision appropriate weight, would be unacceptable in terms of its visual appearance in the streetscene.

Overall the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the site, streetscene and residential area as a whole all 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 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), London Plan (2021) policies H4 and H8 and the NPPF (2021).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

See below.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Policy DMT 2: Highways Impacts 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: Vehicle Parking states:

A) 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; and/or
- ii) a transport appraisal and travel plan has been approved and parking provision is in accordance with its recommendations.

B) All car parks provided for new development will be required to contain conveniently located reserved spaces for wheelchair users and those with restricted mobility in accordance with the Council's Accessible Hillingdon SPD.

The site achieves an average/fair PTAL rating of 2.

The Mayor of London adopted a new and revised London Plan in March 2021, consequently the car parking standards set out in the London Plan 2021 which are restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity, take precedence over those of the Local Development Plans of Local Authorities except where local Development Plans specify lower local maximum standards.

The maximum residential car parking standards set out in the London Plan Policy T6: Table 10.3 are predominately lower than the maximum parking standards set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) and so the London Plan parking standards take precedent.

The maximum parking standards outlined in the London Plan Table 10.3: Outer London PTAL 2-3, 1-2 beds it is up to 0.75 space per dwelling and 1 cycle/bed.

Achieving the London Plan 0.75 car parking space is not practically possible and DMT6 would have sought 2no. spaces, so the provision of 1 on-site car parking space is considered an appropriate provision under the site-specific conditions. The garage dimensions have not been shown but scaling off the submitted plan the internal dimensions are approx. 6mx3m which complies with the minimum internal dimensions in policy DMT6.

However, the garage alignment is at an angle with the public highway and therefore substandard. All vehicles must be able to egress perpendicular to the highway for reasons of both highway and pedestrian safety, as identified in the Highway officers' comments.

The proposal therefore fails to provide a safe and convenient access to the property and would be prejudicial to both highway and pedestrian safety, in conflict with the above mentioned policies in the development plan.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

Quality of Accommodation:

Policy DMHB 16: Housing Standards states:

All housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment. To achieve this all residential development or conversions should:

meet or exceed the most up to date internal space standards, as set out in Table 5.1.

A two bedroom (4 person) two storey house is required to provide 79 square metres which the proposed dwelling would achieve.

It is noted that neighbours have raised concerns that the small first floor room labelled as a study could be used as a bedroom. This room has a floor area of 7 square metres and does not meet the minimum space standards for a single bedroom and therefore the application is considered as a two bedroom property with first floor non-habitable study.

Policy DMHB 18: Private Outdoor Amenity Space states: All new residential development and conversions will be required to provide good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space. Amenity space should be provided in accordance with the standards set out in Table 5.2.

From this table it is confirmed that a two bedroom dwelling is required to provide 60 square metres. The proposal would only result in a private rear garden area measuring 37 square metres. The proposal therefore fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said unit, in conflict with this policy and having implications for the quality of accommodation on site.

Trees:

The site lies within the area covered by TPO 168, although the tree in the adjacent garden is not covered by it. Although the approximate location of the tree is shown on plan, according to the aerial photographs, the canopy spread of the tree appears to be under-represented on plan. The third party tree on the neighbouring land to the south may overshadow much of the proposed small back garden which would further exacerbate the quality of the outdoor amenity space. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation for future residents contrary to Policy DMHB18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020).

Access:

In the event of an approvable scheme, the proposed dwelling would be required to provide details of a step free access which could be secured by way of condition.

7.6 Other Issues

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 application site lies within a Critical Drainage Area. In the event of an approvable scheme, a condition requiring sustainable urban drainage measures would be imposed.

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 West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan (2021)

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

Telephone No: 01895 250230