

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. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm 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 Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm**

Address LAND AT REAR OF 44 AND 45 ZEALAND AVENUE HARMONDSWORTH

Development: Erection of 2 no. bungalows with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatments

LBH Ref Nos: **76673/APP/2021/3132**

Drawing Nos: BS 1
 J19019-001 Rev A - received 22.09.2021
 J19019-002
 J19019-003

Date Plans received : 12/08/2021 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 22/09/2021

Date Application Valid: 12/08/2021

1. SUMMARY

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of 2 no. bungalows with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatments. It is considered that the proposed development would cause harm to the character of the area, whilst also providing a substandard level of accommodation for future residents of the new properties. Furthermore, there are concerns regarding the proposed parking arrangements. It is therefore recommended that the application be refused. A detailed assessment of the application acceptability has been carried out below.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Due to their irregular size, design, lack of streetscene frontage and backland location the proposed dwellings would form an uncharacteristic and incongruous form of development which would fail to harmonise with the established character of the area. Furthermore the resulting gardens would be unusually small, when compared with other properties in the area to the detriment of the areas character. Overall it is considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the character of the area, 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 and D3 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Both of the new 2 bed, 3 person dwellings would fail to provide 61sqm of internal floor space for their future occupiers. The properties would therefore provide an indoor living area of an unsatisfactory size for their future occupiers, giving rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of their future occupiers. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy D6 A of the London Plan (2021), Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (2015).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development fails to demonstrate that the proposed parking plan functions and is fit for purpose. Failure to provide a functional parking arrangement would result in vehicles being displaced onto the local highways network. Roadside parking would create a more hazardous environment for road users and pedestrians. It would also have an adverse impact on the free flow of traffic on the local highways network. The development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), as well as policy T4 of the London Plan (2021).

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development would lead to harmful increase in people and vehicle movements in and out of the site which would subsequently cause noise, nuisance and disturbance to the occupiers of No.44 to No.45 Zealand Avenue. The development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies DMH 6 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), as well as paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF (2021).

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

2 I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan (2021).

DMH 1	Safeguarding Existing Housing
DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMH 6	Garden and Backland Development
DMHB 7	Archaeological Priority Areas and archaeological Priority Zones
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 D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking

LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The proposed development site comprises the 2 residential dwellings (44 and 45 Zealand Avenue) and their rear gardens. The area is characterised by two storey semi detached properties, finished in brick, render and pebble dash. Good spacing exists between each pair of semis and each pair set back from the main road allowing for front gardens and off road parking.

The site is located within Heathrow Archaeological Priority Area.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of 2 no. bungalows with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatments.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

60113/APP/2004/3058 44 Zealand Avenue Harmondsworth

ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE AND SHED)

Decision: 06-01-2005 Approved

60113/APP/2019/3344 44 Zealand Avenue Harmondsworth

The property has been used as Short Term Let for a period in excess of 10 years (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for an Existing Development)

Decision: 17-03-2020 WD

60113/APP/2020/3581 44 Zealand Avenue Harmondsworth

Conversion of existing extension into a 1-bed self-contained flat with associated external works

Decision: 02-02-2021 Refused

65386/APP/2017/1820 45 Zealand Avenue Harmondsworth Middlesex

Single storey rear extension

Decision: 19-07-2017 Refused

65386/APP/2019/3346 45 Zealand Avenue Harmondsworth Middlesex

Use of the property as Short Term Let (4 beds) (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for an Existing Development)

Decision: 17-03-2020 WD

Comment on Planning History

The sites planning history is set out in section 3.3 of this report. There are no comments to make on the sites history.

During the process of the application amended plans were submitted showing secure cycle storage.

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

45 neighbours were notified on 16/09/2021. 4 letters of objection were received. Those objections have been summarised below:

- 1) The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- 2) The proposal would cause harm to neighbouring amenities (noise, disturbance, light, privacy).
- 3) The proposal would cause harm to the local highways network and includes inadequate parking.
- 4) The proposal provides inadequate living accommodation for future residents.
- 5) Contrary to Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) - Policy DH6.
- 6) Contrary to London Plan (2021) Policy D6 and national space standards.

Harmondsworth and Sipson Residents Association were consulted on the application and did not respond.

Officers comments: Issues regarding the developments impact on parking provision, highway safety, neighbouring amenities, the character and appearance of the area and living accommodation have been addressed in the main body of the report below.

Consultee Comments

GLAAS: 'The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) gives advice on archaeology and planning. Our advice follows the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the GLAAS Charter.

NPPF section 16 and the London Plan (2021 Policy HC1) make the conservation of archaeological interest a material planning consideration.

Having considered the proposals with reference to information held in the Greater London Historic Environment Record and/or made available in connection with this application, I conclude that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest. the proposed development is too small to have a significant archaeological impact at this location. No further assessment or conditions are therefore necessary. This response relates solely to archaeological considerations. If necessary, Historic England's Development Advice Team should be consulted separately regarding statutory matters.'

Tree Officer: This site is occupied by two semi-detached plots with a vehicle access between them, located on the south side of Zealand Avenue. According to the aerial photographs there are no trees or landscape features of merit on the sites and no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting them. COMMENT No trees will be affected by the proposal. The layout is dominated by hard surfacing intended to accommodate parking and unscreened bin stores in the front garden. The bike and bin storage should be accommodated securely and discretely to the rear. With an improved layout soft / living

landscape could be re-introduced in the front gardens. The proposed bungalows have one car park space each. The car manoeuvring space appears to be sub-standard and space around the cars for access tight and inconvenient, at best. - Please refer to highway specialists. If these issues can be overcome by design the scheme may be acceptable subject to high quality landscape details. RECOMMENDATION Unacceptable as presented.

Access Officer: No objection subject to conditions. Full comments are outlined further on in the report.

Highways Officer: No objection subject to conditions. Full comments are outlined further on in the report.

Officer comment: Had the application been recommended for approval, the recommended conditions would have been added. Issues regarding the developments impact on the local highways network, amenity, and the developments impact on the appearance of the area are set out below.

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 1 Safeguarding Existing Housing

DMH 2 Housing Mix

DMH 6 Garden and Backland Development

DMHB 7 Archaeological Priority Areas and archaeological Priority Zones

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

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D5 (2021) Inclusive design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP T6.1 (2021) Residential parking

LPP T4 (2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts

NPPF11 NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land

NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

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'.

Due to their 2.9m single storey height, approximately 20m separation distance from properties on Zealand Avenue, 25m separation distance from the properties on Pinglestone Close, and the fact that the ground floor windows of the new dwellings would look toward boundary treatments, the proposed dwellings are unlikely to cause any undue loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings that would justify a refusal of planning permission. Nor would the proposed development cause an undue loss of outlook or have any harmful overbearing impact on neighbouring dwellings.

Additional vehicle movements between No.44 and No.45 are likely to generate noise, which would have an adverse impact on the amenities of the above mentioned (and other surrounding) properties. Light generated from cars entering and exiting the backland development site (during the night) would cause disturbance to the occupiers of No.44 and No.45 Zealand Avenue. Occupier's of those properties would also be subjected to increased nuisance and disturbance caused by additional cars and people entering and exiting the site, via the single access route which runs between the properties.

Overall it is therefore considered that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenities of No.44 and No.45 Zealand Avenue.

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 development site comprises 2 residential dwellings (44 and 45 Zealand Avenue) and their rear gardens. The area is characterised by two storey semi detached properties, finished in brick, render and pebble dash. Good spacing exists between each pair of semis and each pair set back from the main road allowing for front gardens and off road parking. It should be noted that Zealand Avenue and other nearby streets are defined by dwellings with a strong frontage and presence in the street scene and most back garden development comprises small outbuildings of an ancillary nature.

Due to their height and 35m plus distance from the main road the proposed dwellings are unlikely to impact on the appearance of the street scene.

The proposal includes two, single storey, flat roofed, detached dwellings of contemporary design. The area is characterised by two storey, pitched roof, traditionally designed, semi detached dwellings, as such the proposed dwellings would be out of character in terms of size and design. Furthermore the dwellings would have no frontage which contributes to the areas appearance and would therefore be out of character with other dwellings.

Garden development in the area is smaller and has less site coverage than that proposed. As such the amount of development proposed is considered to be uncharacteristic of garden development in the area.

The area is characterised by properties with large, elongated, rectangular gardens. The proposal would result in unusually small gardens, impacting adversely on the areas character.

Overall it is therefore considered that due to their irregular size, design, backland location and lack of frontage, the proposed dwellings would form an uncharacteristic and incongruous form of development which would fail to harmonise with the established character of the area. Furthermore the resulting gardens would be unusually small, when compared with other properties in the area to the detriment of the areas character. For these reasons the proposal would be detrimental to the character of the area, 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 and D3 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Highways and Traffic Officer:

The proposal involves the erection of 2x2 bed dwellings each with 1 car parking space on land that forms the rear gardens of the donor property's both of whom retain their forecourt car parking.

The site achieves a poor 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. Also, the cycle parking standard in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 DMT6 is 1/bed, cycle parking should be secure and sheltered and the layout and dimensions in accordance with guidance contained in the London Cycling Design Standards

Whilst achieving 0.75 car parking space is not possible and under DMT6 there would have been a requirement for 2 spaces for the new dwelling, the provision of 1 on-site car parking space is considered judicious under the site-specific conditions which the applicant is compliant with by providing 1 on-site car parking space for each new dwelling.

The applicant has not provided detailed and annotated car parking layout dimensions, however scaling off the plan it would appear that the new parking bay dimensions are substandard as shown, however the width of the site at the rear is measured as being approx. 17m, this length should be sufficient to accommodate 2x4.8m length bays and a 6m aisle length between them. The HA believes that there is sufficient scope for the applicant to satisfactorily address the car parking layout requirement and therefore could be conditioned. The applicant is required to show all dimensions annotated on the deposited plans.

However, for the proposal to fully satisfy policy DMT6 secure and covered cycle parking spaces based on 1/bed unit and electric vehicle charging points should also be provided.

No cycle storage has been indicated/shown by the applicant. The HA believes that there is sufficient scope for the applicant to satisfactorily address the cycle requirement and therefore could be conditioned. The applicant is required to show all dimensions annotated on the deposited plans.

Also, in line with The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) Policy DMT 6: there is also a requirement for an Electric Vehicle Charging Point

(EVCP) provision for the new dwelling. The HA believes that there is sufficient scope for the applicant to satisfactorily address the EV requirement and therefore could be conditioned.

On collection day, waste collection distances between a bin store (or suitable collection point) and a refuse vehicle should not exceed 24m to accord with waste collection standard. As presented, this parameter is exceeded given that refuse vehicles cannot gain access in relative proximity to the address. New occupiers would then be required to move their waste to a position within the 10m rule. It is considered that for this relatively small scale of development, it is in the best interest of the occupiers to place their refuse within the 10m distance parameter if they wish for their refuse to be collected.

Colleagues in waste collection/cleansing should be consulted on the suitability of this location and arrangement.

RECOMMENDATION:

No objection subject to the following condition

Conditions:

Before the occupation of the proposed development, car parking and cycle storage layouts in accordance with Policy DMT6 and EV charging point shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The car parking layout, EV charging points and cycle parking store shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with the agreed details and completed prior to occupation of the development hereby approved and shall thereafter be retained, maintained, and kept available for the occupants of the development at all times.'

Officer Comment:

The proposal is located within PTAL 1b.

The London Plan (2021) states that new dwellings in PTAL 0-1, in outer London, providing 2 bedrooms should provide up to 1.5 parking spaces per property. The proposal therefore requires 3 parking spaces. Only 2 would be provided as such there would be a policy shortfall of 1 space. In this case, the shortfall of 1 parking space alone is unlikely to warrant refusal of the application as each new dwelling would be provided with one space). Notwithstanding this point, amended plans have been submitted showing sizeable cycle storage units within close proximity of the two spaces which would be provided. The units along with boundary treatments would undermine and limit use of the parking spaces. Resulting in them not being fit for purpose. No swept path analysis or parking layout plans have been submitted to suggest otherwise. Overall the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the two proposed parking spaces could function. Their failed usability would result in roadside parking which would create a more hazardous environment for road users. The proposal is therefore considered to result in a more dangerous environment for pedestrians and vehicle users, which would also have an adverse impact on the free flow of traffic on the local highways network.

The development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), as well as policy T4 of the London Plan (2021).

7.4 Carparking & Layout

See above

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

The Council's Local Plan, the London Plan and NPPF all support the creation of new residential development in existing residential areas subject to compliance with all other relevant policies.

The Council's Local Plan (2020) Policy DMHB 18 states that new residential developments should provide an adequate level of private amenity space for occupiers that is good quality and usable. The policy advises that for 2-3 bedroom properties at least 60sq.m of private amenity space should be provided. Both the proposed dwellings and existing dwellings would be provided with amenity space in excess of 60m2.

The London Plan (2021) sets out the minimum internal floor spaces required for developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants.

Both of the new 2 bed, 3 person dwellings would fail to provide 61sqm of internal floor space for their future occupiers. The properties would therefore provide an indoor living area of an unsatisfactory size for their future occupiers, giving rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of their future occupiers. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy D6 A of the London Plan (2021), Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (2015).

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.

Archaeology

The proposal has an acceptable Archaeological impact as mentioned by GLAAS in the consultation section above.

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