

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 89 WARWICK CRESCENT HAYES MIDDLESEX

Development: Erection of two storey side and rear extension to create 1 x 1-bed dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and boundary treatment following demolition of existing single storey extension.

LBH Ref Nos: **76347/APP/2022/4**

Drawing Nos: Location Plan
 2021/89/WCH/301
 2021/89/WCH/303
 2021/89/WCH/302
 2021/89/WCH/304

Date Plans received : 04/01/2022

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 04/01/2022

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension to create 1x independent dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and boundary treatments following demolition of existing single storey extension.

It is considered that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of host dwelling, neighbouring terraces and street scene. The new dwelling is of poor design and the proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

A detailed assessment of the applications acceptability has been carried out below.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by virtue of its overcomplicated design, siting, size, scale and bulk would fail to appear as a subordinate or architecturally sympathetic addition to the host dwelling and small terrace of houses to which it would be connected. It would unbalance the visual symmetry of the terrace and would form an unsightly addition to the street scene. The proposal is therefore considered to be detrimental to the character, appearance of the host dwelling, the other terraces within the terrace block and the wider street scene, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 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 extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and projection forward of the recognised established return line along this side of Warwick Crescent on this corner plot, is considered to represent an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development within the street scene. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenities of the street scene and open spacious character of this plot and surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November

2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 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) 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
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
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 D5	(2021) Inclusive 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

3 174 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 development site comprises a two storey end of terrace property on the west side of Warwick Crescent. The surrounding area is residential and comprises blocks of two storey terraces. Properties are set back from the street allowing for front gardens and off street parking. They are finished in mixtures of brick, render, and pebble dash.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension to create 1x independent dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and boundary treatments following demolition of existing single storey extension.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

76347/APP/2021/1446 89 Warwick Crescent Hayes Middlesex

Single storey rear extension

Decision: 17-05-2021 Approved

76347/APP/2021/2921 89 Warwick Crescent Hayes Middlesex

Two storey side and rear extension to create 1 x 1 bed, dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and boundary treatments following demolition of existing single storey extension

Decision: 21-09-2021 Refused

76347/APP/2021/4059 89 Warwick Crescent Hayes Middlesex

Two storey side and rear extension to create 1 x 1-bed, dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and boundary treatment following demolition of existing single storey extension.

Decision: 21-01-2022 Refused

76347/APP/2022/280 89 Warwick Crescent Hayes Middlesex

Erection of a two storey side and rear extension to create 1 x 1-bed dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and boundary treatment following demolition of existing single storey extension.

Decision: 06-05-2022 Refused

Comment on Planning History

The sites planning history is set out in section 3.3 of this report.

Planning permission was recently refused for a similar development (76347/APP/2022/280). The application was refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development, by virtue of its siting, size, scale, bulk and width, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the small terrace of houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).

The proposed extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and projection forward of the recognised established return line along this side of Warwick Crescent on this corner plot, is considered to represent an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development within the street scene. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenities of the street scene and open spacious character of this plot and surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).

No step free access has been shown for the proposed dwelling and the internal arrangement of the dwelling would fail to meet the requirements for a M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwelling as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2015 edition). The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021).

This application differs from that proposal in that the proposed dwelling (created through extension) has been reduced in bulk and size. it has a new stepped design. Level access has been shown at the sites principle entrance and the new dwellings garden has been increased in size.

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

7 neighbouring properties were notified of the proposal on 07/06/2022. The consultation period expired on 28/06/22 and 1 comment was received in objection to the proposal. The response has been summarised below:

- 1) The proposal could harm the structural integrity of the neighbouring property
- 2) The proposal would cause harm to the appearance of the terrace block and street scene
- 3) The proposal represents overdevelopment of the site
- 4) The proposal would adversely impact on neighbouring amenities in terms daylight and sunlight and openness .

Officer response: Issues relating to the developments impact on neighbouring amenities,

the site and the character and appearance of the area have been addressed below. Issues relating to the impact of the proposal on the structural integrity of neighbouring dwellings is not a material planning consideration. In the event of an approval, a party wall informative could be added to the decision notice.

Consultee Comments

Tree Officer: No comment received. However, it should be noted that for an almost identical scheme which was recently refused at the site (76347/APP/2022/280) the tree officer made the following comments,, which are considered to be relevant to this scheme.

'This site is occupied by a two-storey end of terrace house, with an attached single-storey utility room, located on the west side of Warwick Crescent, at the junction with Woodrow Avenue. Due to the angle of the terrace fronting onto the junction, this property sits within a wider than average triangular-shaped plot. There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site, however there are two highway trees located either side of the existing driveway, which contribute to the visual amenity and wider environmental quality of the street. COMMENT According to the response to the planning questionnaire, Q.18, there are no trees nearby which could influence the site. However, Google Streetview shows that this is not the case - these trees do influence the site albeit, they are outside the control of the applicant. The location and spread of these trees is not indicated on the existing, or proposed, site layout. They should be. The proposed site layout shows a dropped kerb and driveway providing access to two parking spaces for the existing house. The plan should be annotated to confirm that the existing dropped kerb will be retained without the need to extend it closer to the street tree. No reference is made to the existing boundary wall, part of which will need to be removed to facilitate this parking arrangement. A new parking space has been provided for the new dwelling which is located parallel to the boundary wall and back edge of the pavement. An annotation on the proposed site plan refers to the space being accessed through a gap in the timber fence on the southern boundary. - The plan lacks clarity as to how this detail works. (Google Streetview shows a grass track behind this boundary fence which is accessed via a dropped kerb. Does the owner have the right to use this access?) To summarise, the details submitted are vague. There is no objection in principle, provided that the parking / access arrangements are work - and that there is no impact on the street trees. RECOMMENDATION Ideally the above details should be clarified, prior to determination of the application. If these details are resolved there will be no objection subject to conditions RES9 (parts 1,2, and 5).'

Access Officer: No objection, subject to conditions. See section 7.5 of this report for full comments.

Highways Officer: No objection, subject to conditions. See section 7.3 of this report for full comments.

Officer response: Had the application been recommended for approval the suggested conditions would have been added to the decision.

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
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
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 D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

In addition: 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 its separation distance from No.91, 87, and 156 Warwick Crescent the proposed dwelling is unlikely to lead to any loss of light or privacy to those properties. Nor is it likely to be overbearing or to lead to a significant loss of outlook from their habitable room windows.

The two storey side extension (to be used as a new dwelling) would not dissect a line drawn at 45 degrees from the nearest habitable room windows of No.89 or any other property nearby, it is therefore in line with policy guidance for two storey extensions.

At present the first floor rear windows of all properties within the block of terraces provide views into each others gardens at a short distance. This level of overlooking is common of this dense residential environment. The proposed first floor rear windows of the new dwelling would provide similar views and are therefore unlikely to result in any harmful loss of privacy or overlooking. Front elevation windows would provide views toward the street. The remaining windows and doors are ground floor and would look into the properties boundary treatments or the shared access road.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would cause no significant harm to neighbouring amenities, especially when considering that a high level of overlooking already exists in this residential area.

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'.

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 dwelling has been designed to appear as an extension to the dwelling. The new dwelling would have a staggered frontage and staggered side elevation alongside pitched roofs and a flat roof. it would have an access to the side and a monopitched roof at the front (to assimilate with other properties in the terrace). The design of the dwelling is considered to be poor, cramped, overcomplicated and convoluted. It would detract from

the simple appearance of the host dwelling and neighbouring terraces. It would lead to the loss of openness which currently characterises the corner plot. Due to the prominent siting of the property (on the corner plot) its poor design would be visible from multiple vantage points harming the area's appearance.

Additionally, the proposed dwelling would breach the Warwick Crescent building line, creating a property which is unusually close to the main road and significantly further forward than other dwellings on the road. The new dwelling would therefore form a unduly prominent addition to the road, which fails to respect the set backs and pattern of built development in the area.

The resulting gardens would also be unusually small when compared with others in the area, subsequently harming the area's character. As would the introduction of a flat roof into this area dominated by pitched roofs.

As with the aforementioned refused scheme (76347/APP/2022/280), Policy DMHD1 relating to residential extensions is not considered to be a key policy engaged by the development, as the proposal is to create a new house rather than an extension. Furthermore if it were to be applied the proposal would fail due to its excessive width, and overcomplicated design which relates poorly to the main dwelling and area's appearance.

For the reasons mentioned above the proposal is still considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The previous reasons for refusal have not been overcome on this key issue.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

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

Policy DMT 5 states 'A) Development proposals will be required to ensure that safe, direct and inclusive access for pedestrians and cyclists is provided on the site connecting it to the wider network, including: i) the retention and, where appropriate, enhancement of any existing pedestrian and cycle routes; ii) the provision of a high quality and safe public realm or interface with the public realm, which facilitates convenient and direct access to the site for pedestrian and cyclists; iii) the provision of well signposted, attractive pedestrian and cycle routes separated from vehicular traffic where possible; and iv) the provision of cycle parking and changing facilities in accordance with Appendix C, Table 1 or, in agreement with Council. B) Development proposals located next to or along the Blue Ribbon Network will be required to enhance and facilitate inclusive, safe and secure pedestrian and cycle access to the network. Development proposals, by virtue of their design, will be required to complement and enhance local amenity and include passive surveillance to the network.'

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

parking provision, congestion or local amenity.'

The layout of the proposed development site is almost identical to that considered in application No.76347/APP/2022/280 and 76347/APP/2021/405, none of which were refused on highways grounds.

The Borough's Highways Officer has been consulted on this new proposal and has provided the following comments:

'The application is a resubmission of an earlier application ref.no. 76347/APP/2021/2921, and 76347/APP/2021/4059, all the highway aspects of the current submission appear unchanged from the previous submissions, therefore the highways comments remain the same as the previous submission and are relisted below:

The proposal involves erection of a side and rear extensions to the existing donor property to create a 1x1 bed dwelling with 1 on-site car parking space, and the donor property with 2 on-site car parking spaces, both utilising the existing vehicle access off Warwick Crescent.

The site achieves a poor below average 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.

For the new unit proposal to satisfy policy DMT6 secure and covered cycle parking spaces based on 1 per 1 or 2 bed unit should 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.

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.

RECOMMENDATION:

No objection subject to the following condition

Conditions:

Before the occupation of the proposed development, cycle parking/storage in accordance with Policy DMT5 and EV charging point shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The EV charging points and cycle parking 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.'

Taking into consideration the above and the fact that the proposed scheme is almost identical to previous schemes at the site, which have not been refused on highways grounds, it is considered that subject to the above condition, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highways impacts and parking provision. Had the application been recommended for approval the suggested condition would have been added.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

See above

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

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

'This proposal for a new dwelling house has been assessed against the requirements of London Plan policy D7. No accessibility concerns are raised, however, any grant of planning permission should include the following conditions: Prior to any works on site above damp proof course level, details of step free access via all points of entry and exit 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 housing of an inclusive design is achieved and maintained in accordance with Policies D5 and D7 of the London Plan (2021). The dwelling 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'.

Taking into consideration the above, it is considered that the proposal would provide a dwelling which is accessible and adaptable, subject to the mentioned condition. Had the application been recommended for approval the suggested condition would have been added.

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 living accommodation for existing and future occupants. The standards advise that for 1b, 2 person properties which are two storey, 58m² of space should be provided, along with a 1m² of internal storage space. The new dwelling would meet these standards.

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 existing 3 bedroom property would have 60sqm of

external amenity space and proposed 1 bedroom dwelling would have 35sqm of amenity space. It is therefore considered that adequate external amenity space would be provided for occupiers of both dwellings.

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 proposed development would be CIL liable.

8. Reference Documents

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

Contact Officer: Haydon Richardson

Telephone No: 01895 250230