

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
(AS AMENDED)**

PLANNING STATEMENT

Installation of vehicular Crossover to front (amended
application).

On behalf of Mr. Sigis Aleknavicius.

137 Belmont Road, Uxbridge, UB8 1QZ

CONTENTS

- 1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS
- 2 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY
- 3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
- 4 PLANNING POLICY
- 5 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS
- 6 CONCLUSION

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Decision notice and delegated report for planning application (Ref: 14404/APP/2019/2055).

1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1.1 The application site is a two-storey detached property.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and consistent in style and character.
- 1.3 The property is not located within a conservation area nor is the property listed.

2 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.1 Planning applications (Ref:14404/APP/2019/3681) Single storey/rear extension. Granted, 08/01/20.

- 2.2 Planning applications (Ref: 14404/APP/2019/2055) Installation of vehicular crossover to front. Refused on 13/08/19 for the following reasons:

"The proposed vehicle crossover, by reason of vehicles reversing in or out of the site into oncoming traffic, close to a roundabout junction, on to Belmont Road, and the increase in the number of potential conflict points along the road would result in the disruption of the free flow of traffic and would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

The proposal by reason of the partial loss of the boundary treatment to the frontage and the majority of the soft landscaped front area and its replacement with an excessive area of hardstanding, would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area in which

it would be set by creating an open parking area and emphasising the appearance of a hard surfaced area. The proposals is thus, contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.”

- 2.3 Planning applications (Ref: 14404/APP/2019/1895) Single storey rear extension involving demolition of existing. Refused, 31/07/19.

3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1 Installation of vehicular crossover to front.
- 3.2 The applicant site has an existing dropped kerb situated on the other side of the development and will simply be emulating this dropped kerb on the other side to create and a separate entrance and exit point to better facilitate off-street parking.
- 3.3 The proposal includes alterations to the front boundary treatment.

4 PLANNING POLICY

- 4.1 MHCLG's National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
- 4.2 MHCLG's National Planning Practice Guidance (Online)
- 4.3 GLA The London Plan (2016)
- 4.4 Hillingdon Local Plan (Part one)
- 4.5 Hillingdon Local Plan (Part two)
- 4.6 Hillingdon residential Extensions Guidelines (2008)

5 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Preliminary Matters

- 5.1 The previous application (ref:14404/APP/2019/2055) failed on two accounts; The concern to highway safety and the use of excessive hardstanding. This application seeks to demonstrate how this amended application solves these issues.

Character and Appearance

- 5.2 The delegated report for the planning application (ref: 14404/APP/2019/2055) states the following:

"One of the positive aesthetic attributes of this area is that a considerable number of the front gardens remain in a form which allows for planting and enclosure, this is assisted by the access and ability to provide parking at the frontage. A number of properties along Belmont Road benefit from a crossover to the front garden, however a second access is not common."

"the majority of the soft landscaped front area and its replacement with an excessive area of hard standing, would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area in which it would be set by creating an open parking area and emphasizing the appearance of a hard-surfaced area."

- 5.3 The proposal seeks to create a front garden with 56.6% soft landscaping; approx. 6% less than the existing soft landscaping, which is the equivalent to a loss of 5sqm. This 5 sqm would be inconsequential to the visual amenity provided by the cumulative soft landscaping and is allowed under permitted development rights. The application seeks to use grass crate to reinforce grass in order to support a vehicle whilst also maintaining a large portion of soft landscaping of the garden. Therefore, the proposal would largely be covered by soft landscaping, ensuring that visual amenity is preserved.

- 5.4 The hard-surfaced area is further broken apart through the use of two large flower beds, located along the front boundary and along the bay window of the existing dwelling. This will provide great visual relief to the hard landscaping and ensure a visual amenity for the surrounding area. Due to the slats of the boundary wall, the planting, especially along the front boundary, would be visible from the street, further visually softening the development.
- 5.5 This proposal does not affect existing trees located on the street as there are no trees directly located outside of the property which would be disrupted by the dropped kerb, thereby maintaining the existing streetscape.
- 5.6 The dropped kreb will measure in 2850mm across the pedestrian path and at the entrance point onto the property.
- 5.7 The application site currently has an existing dropped kerb on the other side of the front elevation. This will then become the vehicular exit point whilst the proposed dropped kerb will be an entrance point. The new dropped kerb will have negligible impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
- 5.8 The proposal includes a new front boundary treatment with pillars measuring 1.9m in height. The dwarf walls between the pillars will measure in 0.2m in height and will have horizontal wooden slats situated on top. The use of wooden slats creates a visually permeable wall that works cohesively with the surrounding area and is the same material used on the neighbouring property 139 Belmont Road. The gates on either side will also be made of the same material and will be electronically controlled to slide open. The front boundary wall will work cohesively with the established streetscape and will introduce a level of symmetry and refinement which respects the streetscape. As stated above within the delegated report; *"One of the positive aesthetic attributes of this area is that a considerable number of the front gardens remain in a form which allows for planting and enclosure"*. The proposal would therefore ensure the established character and appearance of the area is preserved in proposing the enclosure of the front garden.

- 5.9 The proposal is therefore in accordance with The London Plan (2016), policies 7.4 and 7.6; the LB of Hillingdon Local Plan (2018), policies BE1; The NPPF.

Highway Safety

- 5.10 The delegated report states that the following in regard to highway safety:

"Concerns are raised with associated vehicular access of Belomont Road which is already heavily trafficked thus creating instances which would obstruct the free-flow of traffic along a classified Road. This arrangement is further exacerbated with access being directly located off a bus stop which would give rise to highway safety implications."

- 5.11 The application seeks to use the proposed vehicular crossover in conjuncture with the existing crossover. This would mean the proposed dropped kerb will become the sole entrance into the property and the existing dropped kerb would be used as an exit, creating a one-way traveling direction. Therefore, the vehicles would be able to enter and leave in a forward gear. In this respect, the efficiency of the proposal would ensure there would be little disturbance to the free flow of traffic. The proposal would arguably improve the free flow of traffic in creating designated entrances/exits which would work more cohesively with the traffic rather than worsening.
- 5.12 The boundary treatment ensures visibility of pedestrians and vehicles from the wooden horizontal slats which are spaced out. Furthermore, the columns would measure 1.3m in height, the same as the existing and would have a smaller width of 0.3m from the existing 0.45m. This ensures that the pillars would not contribute to the visual obstruction above and beyond what is already existing and actually seeks to improve visibility with smaller widths of the columns.
- 5.13 Policy 6.3 of the London Plan (2016) states that development proposals should ensure that impacts on transport capacity and the transport network, at both a corridor and local level, are fully

assessed. The policy emphasises that development should not adversely affect safety on the transport network. In addition, Policy AM7 of the saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan (2008) states *"The local planning authority will not grant permission for developments whose traffic generation is likely to (ii) Prejudice the free flow of traffic or conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety."* And Policy AM14 state that any *"new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the council's adopted car parking standards as set out in annex 1."*

- 5.14 Paragraph 11.3 of the Residential Extension Guidance (2008) recommends "the front garden should be large enough to allow a car to park at a right angle to the road without overhanging the pavement".
- 5.15 The 10.2m width and 5m depth of the front garden is considered a sizeable area which could accommodate a vehicle and the design ensures overhanging the public highway or blocking access to the property is prevented. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the Hillingdon's Car parking standards recommends that the minimum dimension for parking bay is 2400mm x 4800mm. Therefore, the front garden can comfortably facilitate a vehicle without negatively impacting pedestrian safety.
- 5.16 The proposal is in accordance with the LB of Hillingdon Local plan (2018), policy DMHB 15; The London Plan (2016), policy 6.3 and would not be harmful to neighboring amenity.
- 5.17 The application site is located on a road which operates at the speed of 30mph. This ensures that the risk of collision from a vehicular crossover is kept low.
- 5.18 The use of the wooden slats ensures visibility from both sides of the front boundary wall and therefore ensures that pedestrians are visible at all times.
- 5.19 The design of the front garden is so that there is a separate entrance and exist will ensure that the car can enter and exit in forward gear.

This ensures that pedestrian safety is protected and essentially preserves the free flow of traffic.

- 5.20 The proposed development will therefore be in accordance with the LB of Hillingdon local plan (2018), policy DMHB 15; and the London Plan (2016).

6 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 This proposal would not be prejudicial to pedestrian and highway safety and seeks to create the second dropped kerb to further aid the free flow of traffic.
- 6.2 The proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and proposes an acceptable amount of 56.6% soft landscaping, which is proportionate to the site, creating a visually attractive front garden.
- 6.3 Overall the proposed development is in accordance with the provisional London Plan, policies 6.3, 7.4 and 7.6; the LB of Hillingdon local plan (2018), policies DMHB 14, 15 and BE1; paragraph 24 of the NPPF.
- 6.4 We respectfully ask that planning permission is granted for the proposed development.

Appendix 1

Decision notice and delegated report for planning application (Ref:
14404/APP/2019/2055).



Mr D Black
85
Bernadette Avenue
Anlaby Common
HU4 7QB

Application Ref:
14404/APP/2019/2055

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)
REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

The Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon as the Local Planning Authority within the meaning of the above Act and associated Orders **REFUSES** permission for the following:-

Description of development:

Installation of vehicular crossover to front

Location of development: 137 Belmont Road Uxbridge

Date of application: 18 June 2019

Plan Numbers: See attached Schedule of plans

Permission is refused for the reason(s) listed on the attached schedule:-

Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration

Date: 13 August 2019

- NOTES:
- (i) Please also see the informatives included in the Schedule of Reasons.
 - (ii) Should you wish to appeal against this decision please read the attached sheet which explains the procedure.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

Application Ref: 14404/APP/2019/2055

SCHEDULE OF REASONS

- 1 · The proposed vehicle crossover, by reason of vehicles reversing in or out of the site into oncoming traffic, close to a roundabout junction, on to Belmont Road, and the increase in the number of potential conflict points along the road would result in the disruption of the free flow of traffic and would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.
- 2 · The proposal by reason of the partial loss of the boundary treatment to the frontage and the majority of the soft landscaped front area and its replacement with an excessive area of hardstanding, would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area in which it would be set by creating an open parking area and emphasising the appearance of a hard surfaced area. The proposals is thus, contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 · 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 'Saved' UDP 2007, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

END OF SCHEDULE

Address:

Residents Services
London Borough of Hillingdon
3 North Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW
Tel: 01895 250230
www.hillingdon.gov.uk

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

Application Ref.No.: 14404/APP/2019/2055

SCHEDULE OF PLANS

001 - received 18 Jun 2019

Location Plan (1:1250) - received 18 Jun 2019

RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS AGGRIEVED BY DECISION OF LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)

If you are aggrieved by the decision of your local planning authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or to grant it subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the office of the First Secretary of State under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

If you want to appeal, then you must do so within six months of the date of this notice, using a form which you can get from the Planning Inspectorate at Customer Support Unit, Room 3/15 Eagle Wing, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN (Tel 0117 372 8424). Appeal forms can be downloaded from the Planning Inspectorate's website at [**www.Planning-inspectorate.gov.uk**](http://www.Planning-inspectorate.gov.uk)

If you intend to submit an appeal that you would like examined by inquiry then you must notify the Local Planning Authority and Planning Inspectorate (inquiryappeals@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) at least 10 days before submitting the appeal.

Further details are available at [**www.gov.uk/government/collections/casework-dealt-with-by-inquiries**](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/casework-dealt-with-by-inquiries)

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal, but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances, which excuse the delay in giving notice of an appeal.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to him that the local planning authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of any development order and to any directions given under a development order.

In practice, the Secretary of State does not refuse to consider appeals solely because the local planning authority based their decision on a direction given by him.

Purchase Notices.

If either the local planning authority or the officer of the First Secretary of State refuses permission to develop land or grants it subject to conditions, the owner may claim that he can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use by carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted.

In these circumstances, the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council (District Council, London Borough Council or Common Council of the City of London) in whose area the land is situated. This notice will require the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER DECISION

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

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select Option

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

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

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

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

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

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

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

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

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

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

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

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

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

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

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

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

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

Address 137 BELMONT ROAD UXBRIDGE

Development: Installation of vehicular crossover to front

LBH Ref Nos: **14404/APP/2019/2055**

Drawing Nos: 001
Location Plan (1:1250)

Date Plans Received: 18/06/2019

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 18/06/2019

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises of a large detached property situated on the North East side of Belmont Road Uxbridge. The principle elevation faces to the South East. The property benefits from a large L shaped rear garden which backs onto the residential gardens of properties on Belmont Close. The front garden provides off street parking space, as well as a garage to the side.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising predominantly of two storey semi-detached and detached properties.

The site is situated within the Developed Area as identified in the policies of the Adopted Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) where the prevailing character of the area is residential.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application proposes for the installation of vehicular crossover to front. There is an existing vehicular crossover to the front of this property, and as such this will be a second.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

14404/A/78/0891 137 Belmont Road Uxbridge

Householder dev. (small extension,garage etc) (P)

Decision Date: 08-08-1978 Approved

14404/APP/2019/1895 137 Belmont Road Uxbridge

Single storey rear extension involving demolition of existing

Decision Date: 31-07-2019 Refused

Comment on Planning History

14404/APP/2019/1895 - REFUSAL - An application for a single storey rear extension was refused on grounds that: by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, depth and proximity would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 135 Belmont Road by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

5 neighbouring properties were consulted via letter, and a further site notice was displayed which expired on 24.07.2019.

By the end of the 21 day consultation period no objections were received.

Highways officer:

Proposals include the creation of a vehicular access off Belmont Road which makes up part of the London Borough of Hillingdon Classified Road Network. It is noted that the site currently makes use of a vehicular crossover and upon implementation of the proposals will see a secondary access point along the western section of the site frontage.

Concerns are raised with associated vehicles having to reverse out onto Belmont Road which is already heavily trafficked thus creating instances which would obstruct the free-flow of traffic along a Classified Road. This arrangement is further exacerbated with access being directly located off a bus stop which would give rise to highway safety implications.

For the reasoning set out above, I must recommend that this application is refused.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property, the impact upon the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers and car parking provision.

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), states that " the local planning authority will consider whether the traffic Generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the capacity and functions of existing and committed principal roads only, and will wholly discount any potential which local distributor and access roads may have for carrying through traffic".

The Council produces standing advice with regard to acceptable dimensions for crossovers. The proposed crossovers as shown on the scaled proposed layout plan will be 3.5 m wide at the back of the public footway and 4.4m at the kerb.

The creation of a vehicular access off Belmont Road, which is part of the London Borough of Hillingdon Classified Road Network would raise highways concerns. It is noted that the site currently makes use of a vehicular crossover and upon implementation of the proposals will see a secondary access point along the western section of the site frontage.

Concerns are raised with associated vehicles having to reverse out onto Belmont Road which is already heavily trafficked thus creating instances which would obstruct the free-flow of traffic along a Classified Road. This arrangement is further exacerbated with access being directly located off a bus stop which would give rise to highway safety implications.

This would interrupt flow along the highway and further manoeuvring on this part of the main road system close to a junction would increase accident risk through direct conflict or distraction from the main task in hand for drivers on the principal route. Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) aims, amongst other matters, to ensure that development would not prejudice the free flow of traffic or impact upon conditions related to highway safety. The proposed scheme would run contrary to these objectives which are also embodied within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions (HDAS).

One of the positive aesthetic attributes of this area is that a considerable number of the front gardens remain in a form which allows for planting and enclosure, this is assisted by the access and ability to provide parking at the frontage. A number of properties along Belmont Road benefit from a crossover to the front garden, however a second access is not common. HDAS objectives seeks to protect or enhance the character and appearance of neighbourhoods. It is not considered that the second driveway into 137 Belmont Road will enhance the character of the area. Overall, therefore, the proposal, by reason of the proposed driveway being a secondary dropped kerb addition to 137 Belmont Road would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area in which it would be set by creating an open parking area and emphasising the appearance of a hard surfaced area. The proposals is thus, contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

Therefore, this application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed vehicle crossover, by reason of vehicles reversing in or out of the site into oncoming traffic, close to a roundabout junction, on to Belmont Road, and the increase in the number of potential conflict points along the road would result in the disruption of the free flow of traffic and would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of the partial loss of the boundary treatment to the frontage and the majority of the soft landscaped front area and its replacement with an excessive area of hardstanding, would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area in which it would be set by creating an open parking area and emphasising the appearance of a hard surfaced area. The proposals is thus, contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 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 'Saved' UDP 2007, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

Standard Informatives

- 1 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
- 2 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon 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 - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance..

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: Nurgul Kinli

Telephone No: 01895 250230

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER DECISION

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

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select Option

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

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

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

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

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

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

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

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

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

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

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

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

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

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

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

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

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

Address 137 BELMONT ROAD UXBRIDGE

Development: Installation of vehicular crossover to front

LBH Ref Nos: **14404/APP/2019/2055**

Drawing Nos: 001
Location Plan (1:1250)

Date Plans Received: 18/06/2019 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 18/06/2019

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises of a large detached property situated on the North East side of Belmont Road Uxbridge. The principle elevation faces to the South East. The property benefits from a large L shaped rear garden which backs onto the residential gardens of properties on Belmont Close. The front garden provides off street parking space, as well as a garage to the side.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising predominantly of two storey semi-detached and detached properties.

The site is situated within the Developed Area as identified in the policies of the Adopted Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) where the prevailing character of the area is residential.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application proposes for the installation of vehicular crossover to front. There is an existing vehicular crossover to the front of this property, and as such this will be a second.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

14404/A/78/0891 137 Belmont Road Uxbridge
Householder dev. (small extension, garage etc) (P)

Decision Date: 08-08-1978 Approved

14404/APP/2019/1895 137 Belmont Road Uxbridge
Single storey rear extension involving demolition of existing

Decision Date: 31-07-2019 Refused

Comment on Planning History

14404/APP/2019/1895 - REFUSAL - An application for a single storey rear extension was refused on grounds that: by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, depth and proximity would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 135 Belmont Road by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

5 neighbouring properties were consulted via letter, and a further site notice was displayed which expired on 24.07.2019.

By the end of the 21 day consultation period no objections were received.

Highways officer:

Proposals include the creation of a vehicular access off Belmont Road which makes up part of the London Borough of Hillingdon Classified Road Network. It is noted that the site currently makes use of a vehicular crossover and upon implementation of the proposals will see a secondary access point along the western section of the site frontage.

Concerns are raised with associated vehicles having to reverse out onto Belmont Road which is already heavily trafficked thus creating instances which would obstruct the free-flow of traffic along a Classified Road. This arrangement is further exacerbated with access being directly located off a bus stop which would give rise to highway safety implications.

For the reasoning set out above, I must recommend that this application is refused.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property, the impact upon the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers and car parking provision.

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), states that " the local planning authority will consider whether the traffic Generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the capacity and functions of existing and committed principal roads only, and will wholly discount any potential which local distributor and access roads may have for carrying through traffic".

The Council produces standing advice with regard to acceptable dimensions for crossovers. The proposed crossovers as shown on the scaled proposed layout plan will be 3.5 m wide at the back of the public footway and 4.4m at the kerb.

The creation of a vehicular access off Belmont Road, which is part of the London Borough of Hillingdon Classified Road Network would raise highways concerns. It is noted that the site currently makes use of a vehicular crossover and upon implementation of the proposals will see a secondary access point along the western section of the site frontage.

Concerns are raised with associated vehicles having to reverse out onto Belmont Road which is already heavily trafficked thus creating instances which would obstruct the free-flow of traffic along a Classified Road. This arrangement is further exacerbated with access being directly located off a bus stop which would give rise to highway safety implications.

This would interrupt flow along the highway and further manoeuvring on this part of the main road system close to a junction would increase accident risk through direct conflict or distraction from the main task in hand for drivers on the principal route. Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) aims, amongst other matters, to ensure that development would not prejudice the free flow of traffic or impact upon conditions related to highway safety. The proposed scheme would run contrary to these objectives which are also embodied within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions (HDAS).

One of the positive aesthetic attributes of this area is that a considerable number of the front gardens remain in a form which allows for planting and enclosure, this is assisted by the access and ability to provide parking at the frontage. A number of properties along Belmont Road benefit from a crossover to the front garden, however a second access is not common. HDAS objectives seeks to protect or enhance the character and appearance of neighbourhoods. It is not considered that the second driveway into 137 Belmont Road will enhance the character of the area. Overall, therefore, the proposal, by reason of the proposed driveway being a secondary dropped kerb addition to 137 Belmont Road would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area in which it would be set by creating an open parking area and emphasising the appearance of a hard surfaced area. The proposals is thus, contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

Therefore, this application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed vehicle crossover, by reason of vehicles reversing in or out of the site into oncoming traffic, close to a roundabout junction, on to Belmont Road, and the increase in the number of potential conflict points along the road would result in the disruption of the free flow of traffic and would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of the partial loss of the boundary treatment to the frontage and the majority of the soft landscaped front area and its replacement with an excessive area of hardstanding, would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area in which it would be set by creating an open parking area and emphasising the appearance of a hard surfaced area. The proposals is thus, contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 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 'Saved' UDP 2007, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

Standard Informatives

- 1 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
- 2 The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon 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 - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance..

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

Contact Officer: Nurgul Kinli

Telephone No: 01895 250230