

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 an Option
1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL		
6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT		
10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS		
15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	<input type="checkbox"/>
CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS		
18.	ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	<input type="checkbox"/>
25.	WORKS TO TREES	<input type="checkbox"/>
26.	OTHER (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. 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 informative's 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 DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Character and Appearance

The proposed development by reason of its prominent position, size, scale, bulk, width, proximity to the side boundary and projection beyond the return building line along Ash Grove would result in the virtual loss of an important gap characteristic to the area and the loss of the sense of spaciousness between the application dwelling and the side boundary. This would give rise to a cramped form of development on the site. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2024).

2. NON2 Parking/Highway Impact

The proposal has not demonstrated that sufficient off street parking/manoeuvring/access arrangements would be provided, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, leading to on-street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety, contrary to Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021) and DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

INFORMATIVES

1. I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

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

2. I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2021). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

3. I71 LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Refusing)

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

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
DMEI 12	Development of Land Affected by Contamination
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 GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
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 D8	(2021) Public realm
LPP D14	(2021) Noise
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
NPPF11 -24	NPPF11 2024 - Making effective use of land

NPPF12 -24 NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places

NPPF2 -24 NPPF2 2024 - Achieving sustainable development

NPPF5 -24 NPPF5 2024 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey end of terrace dwelling located on the junction of Beechwood Avenue and Ash Grove. The property has vehicle access located off Ash Grove. To the front of the site is an area of hardstanding and to the rear is a large garden which acts as private amenity space.

The site has a PTAL ranking of 1b and is located on potentially contaminated land.

The surrounding are comprises mainly two storey terraced and semi-detached properties.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the Erection of a 2-bedroom, 3-person dwelling with private amenity space , refuse area and car parking. Erection of a single storey rear extension to the original house.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

46227/APP/2016/4601 54 BEECHWOOD AVENUE HAYES

Single storey side extension

Decision: 14-02-2017 Refusal

Appeal: 29-06-17 Dismissed

46227

Comment on Planning History

The planning history for the site is listed above.

It is important to note application 46227/APP/2016/4601 dated 14-02-17 for the erection of a Single storey side extension which was refused and dismissed at appeal under reference APP/R5510/D/17/3174551 dated 29-06-17. The application was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed single storey side extension, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, size, scale, proximity to the side boundary and projection beyond the return building line along Ash Grove, would result in the virtual loss of an important gap characteristic to the area and the loss of the sense of spaciousness between the application dwelling and the side boundary. This would give rise to a cramped form of development on the site. The proposal would therefore

represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions. following reason:

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

EXTERNAL CONSULTEES:

19 neighbouring properties were consulted on the application by letter dated 19-03-25. The consultation period expired 19-04-25. Two representations have been received and are summarised as:

- Concerns over loss of light and overshadowing
- Concerns regarding neighbouring outlook and loss of openness
- Concerns regarding loss of privacy
- Objections to future planning of dwelling on garage plot at end of garden and concerns with asbestos within garage roof.
- Concerns regarding energy efficiency by increasing reliance on artificial lighting

OFFICER COMMENT:

- An assessment of the impact to neighbouring properties amenities has been discussed within section XXX of this report
- Concerns regarding cost of lighting bills is not a material planning consideration and therefore has not been discussed further.
- This application relates to the erection of an attached dwelling to the side of No.54 Beechwood Avenue and not a new dwelling to the rear of the plot.
- Concerns regarding asbestos are dealt with under separate legislation which would be separate to the planning process.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES:

Access Officer:

This proposal for the erection of a two bedroom dwelling has been reviewed with reference to London Plan Policy D7. No accessibility concerns are raised subject to the following Conditions attached to any approval of the new dwelling: 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. The measures implemented as approved shall be retained thereafter. 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 new 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.

Contaminated Land Officer:

Having consider the applicant submitted application in relation to our land contamination record, please be advise that, we have no objection to the proposed development. However, our land contamination record shows the proposed development site to be on a former potential contaminated land use identified as Nursery/Orchard as well as within 250m buffer zone of a landfill site. Therefore, the following land contamination condition is recommend should the planning application be approved.

Land Contamination Condition

(i) The development shall not commence until a scheme to deal with contamination has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). All works which form part of any required remediation scheme shall be completed before any part of the development is occupied or brought into use unless the Local Planning Authority dispenses with any such requirement specifically and in writing. The scheme shall include the following measures unless the LPA dispenses with any such requirement specifically and in writing:

a) A desk-top study carried out by a competent person to characterise the site and provide information on the history of the site/surrounding area and to identify and evaluate all potential sources of contamination and impacts on land and water and all other identified receptors relevant to the site:

(b) A site investigation, including where relevant soil, soil gas, surface water and groundwater sampling, together with the results of analysis and risk assessment shall be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor. The report should also clearly identify all risks, limitations and recommendations for remedial measures to make the site suitable for the proposed use; and

(c) A written method statement providing details of the remediation scheme and how the completion of the remedial works will be verified shall be agreed in writing with the LPA prior to commencement, along with the details of a watching brief to address undiscovered contamination. No deviation shall be made from this scheme without the express agreement of the LPA prior to its implementation.

(ii) If during remedial or development works contamination not addressed in the submitted remediation scheme is identified an addendum to the remediation scheme shall be agreed with the LPA prior to implementation; and

(iii) Upon completion of the approved remedial works, this condition will not be discharged until a comprehensive verification report has been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The report shall include the details of the final remediation works and their verification to show that the works have been carried out in full and in accordance with the approved methodology.

(iv) No contaminated soils or other materials shall be imported to the site. All imported soils for landscaping and/or engineering purposes shall be clean and free of contamination. Before any part of the development is occupied, all imported soils shall be independently tested for chemical contamination, and the factual results and interpretive reports of this testing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority..

REASON: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological

systems and the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (January 2020) Policies - DMEI 11: Protection of Ground Water Resources and DMEI 12: Development of Land Affected by Contamination.

Highway Officer Comment:

The proposal involves the building of a new 2 bed dwelling (with two bicycle parking spaces and a car parking space accessed off an existing dropped kerb off Ash Grove) on the northern side land of the donor property.

The proposed development will result in the donor dwelling losing the formal car parking and access off Ash Grove. The new dwelling is proposing 1 car parking space/bay aligned at an angle with a bike store shown for 2 cycles accessed off Ash Grove.

The application site has a PTAL ranking of 1b indicating access to public transport is very poor and that occupiers and visitors of the proposed dwelling would be largely reliant on private car travel contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 9: Promoting Sustainable Transport and The Mayor's Transport Strategy which aims to encourage people to walk, cycle and travel by public transport.

The maximum parking standards outlined in the London Plan Table 10.3: Outer London PTAL 0-1, 1-2 beds it is up to 1.5 space per dwelling and in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020), policy DMT6 it is 2 spaces for dwellings with curtilage. Given that 1.5 spaces is not possible and taking into account the very poor PTAL rating of 1b and it's a new build, Policy DMT6 takes preference. Therefore, to comply with the adopted parking standard up to 2 car parking spaces are required for both the new and the donor dwelling.

The applicant is proposing 1 car parking spaces each for both the new and existing donor dwelling, consequently the proposals are contrary to policy DMT6 and therefore unacceptable given the site-specific conditions of site achieving a PTAL rating of 1b and on-street parking stress.

The applicant has stated that the existing donor dwelling has front forecourt parking off Beechwood Ave, however no formal dropped kerbs exist, furthermore a dropped kerb would not be acceptable within 5m of an existing road junction. It should be noted that (source: Google Streetview) a vehicle is parked directly in front of the donor dwellings entrance, guidance requires that pedestrian entrances/paths should be kept clear at all times of any (including potential) obstruction by at least 1m to ensure unhindered path for pedestrians especially in an emergency, anything less is not acceptable.

The proposed new dwelling parking bay is at an angle to the public highway including the proposed car parking layout for the donor dwelling both car parking arrangements are not acceptable. Such parking arrangements due to the angles and manoeuvres involved would require drivers to awkwardly and uncomfortably turn their head/neck to the extreme end in order to see in both directions for pedestrians and vehicles, drivers are likely to manoeuvre quickly, potentially without due care to avoid physical discomfort, thereby creating potentially hazardous conditions for all road users. This would be exacerbated further by the none provision of pedestrian visibility splays and its proximity to the adjacent junction adding to potential conflict points. Guidance requires that a vehicle hardstanding should be at least 4.8 metres deep and set out at perpendicular to the public highway (see link below).

The Council's domestic vehicle footway crossover policy sets out the framework in relation to requests made for front garden, open plan parking:

https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/media/10036/Domestic-Vehicle-Footway-Crossover-Policy/pdf/p3New_Vehicle_Crossover_Policy_Aug_2022.pdf?m=1666970906077 and <https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/article/9908/Guidance-notes-on-applying-for-a-dropped-kerb>.

Guidance also requires the provision of pedestrian visibility splays (see link above), measuring 2.4m by 2.4m, these should be provided. The fences, walls and shrubs within these areas to be kept to a maximum height of 0.6m. In addition to this, vehicular splays should be provided in accordance with national recommendations, specifically Manual for Streets.

No detailed information about the dimensions of the cycle storage to accommodate 2 cycles for the new dwelling have been provided to substantiate that

The applicant did not provide annotated dimensions of the cycle parking storage and layout on the submitted plans to demonstrate that the dimensions and access widths are compliant with Local Plan Part 2 DMT5, the London Plan or London Cycling Design Standards. From the drawings submitted it would be impractical/difficult to access the bike stores with ease and therefore would discourage cycle use and travel.

The London Plan (2021) Policy T6.1 Residential Parking requires that all residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles. The new dwelling would therefore be required to provide 1no. active 7Kw active EVCP.

Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons for Refusal:

For the reasons stated above the application has failed to demonstrate a satisfactory policy and design-led approach, and until the above issue has been satisfactorily addressed, the Highway Authority therefore would raise an objection as the proposals are contrary to policies and will result in overspill of vehicles being displaced onto the local highway network creating stress and nuisance to local users parking demand, and likely to lead to inconsiderate and illegal parking on the roads within the vicinity of the sites access which could be prejudicial to highway safety. Therefore the proposals are contrary with:

- The Published London Plan Policy T4 Assessing and Mitigating Transport Impacts and Policy T5: Cycling
- London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies Policy DMT 1: Managing Transport Impacts, Policy DMT 2: Highways Impacts, Policy DMT 5: Pedestrians and Cyclists and Policy DMT 6: Vehicle Parking.
- London Borough Of Hillingdon Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy (DVFC) 4.7.1 Pedestrian Visibility
- The application also fails to concur with the Mayor's Transport Strategy which aims to encourage cycling, walking and the use of public transport

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
DMEI 12	Development of Land Affected by Contamination
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 GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
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 D8	(2021) Public realm
LPP D14	(2021) Noise
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
NPPF11 -24	NPPF11 2024 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF2 -24	NPPF2 2024 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5 -24	NPPF5 2024 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

In addition: Development Plan:

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

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

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

Material Considerations:

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two states that buildings should be laid out so that adequate daylight and sunlight can penetrate into and between them, and the amenities of existing houses are safeguarded. Furthermore the policy stresses the importance of new buildings and extensions providing adequate amount of external amenity space, that not only protects the amenity of the occupants of the proposed development, but also of those of the surrounding buildings, as well as protecting both parties privacy.

Number 52 Beechwood Avenue is located south of the application site and forms part of the row of semi-detached properties. The proposed development would involve the erection of a new dwelling to the side of No.54 and would also include the demolition of an existing rear conservatory structure and the erection of a single storey rear extension to No.54 sited along the shared boundary with this neighbour. This neighbour does not have any rear additions, therefore the proposed extension would extend 3.5m beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property and have a height of approx.. 2.8m characterised with a flat roof. Given the modest depth and height it is not considered that the extension would cause a significant level of overshadowing or loss of light to warrant refusal. Given the location of the proposed dwelling away from this neighbour, there would be no harm to their amenities.

The proposed new dwelling would not break the rear building line of No.54 at either ground or first floor level as such there would be no harm to the amenities of this neighbouring property in terms of loss of light, loss of outlook, overshadowing, nor would it be overbearing.

The properties located to the front of the site are located approx. 22m away from the front building line of the new dwelling, it is not considered that the proposed development would cause a loss of light or overshadowing to these neighbouring properties, nor would there be any significant overlooking or loss of privacy given the separation distance.

Number 2 Ash Grove is located east of the application site. This property is located a significant distance away from the proposed new dwelling and there would be no harmful loss of light or overshadowing. Given the separation distance there would be no harmful loss of privacy or overlooking created.

As such, the proposed development would not be detrimental to the occupiers of the surrounding context in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy, sense of enclosure, visual impact, overbearing

impact, outlook and loss of daylight/sunlight. Therefore, the proposal complies with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) states. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: 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.

Policy D1 of the London Plan states that design of new buildings and the spaces they create should help reinforce or enhance the character, legibility, permeability and accessibility of the neighbourhood.

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

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also required that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

With regard to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 requires:

- i) single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth or 3.6 metres where the plot width is 5 metres or more;
- ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- iii) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level;
- iv) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet;
- v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;

The proposed development involves the erection of a single storey rear extension to No.54 Beechwood Avenue and the erection of a two storey attached property to the side of No.54.

The application site comprises a prominent two storey end of terrace dwelling on the corner junction of Beechwood Avenue and Ash Grove. The dwelling has a single storey rear conservatory structure with the side of the property laid with soft landscaping. Currently the row of four terrace dwelling fits comfortably within the street scene and offers a sense of symmetry with the two end properties featuring a prominent gable feature to distinguish the end of terrace dwellings. The dwelling has vehicle access provided off Ash Grove, although there is an area of hardstanding to the front of the property, there is no official dropped kerb to provide off street parking.

The proposed single storey rear extension to the rear of No.54 would measure 3.5m in depth, span the full width of the rear elevation and measure approx. 2.8m in height characterised with a flat roof. This would comply with Policy DMHD 1 and would not appear of out character within the surrounding area.

However, in assessing the impact of the proposed attached dwelling, It is important to note the dismissed appeal at the site for a single storey side extension under reference 46227/APP/2016/4601 (appeal reference APP/R5510/D/17/3174551). The application was refused due to its siting in an open prominent position, size, scale, proximity to the side boundary and projection beyond the return building line along Ash Grove. The inspector upheld the officers decision and stated:

5. Owing to the building line, the undeveloped nature of the area to the side of the house is important to the character and spaciousness of the Ash Grove street scene. However, as the appellant acknowledges, Beechwood Avenue is a tightly developed area with little space between the properties. Only Nos 54 and 58 have any side garden areas in this part of the street. As a consequence, the area to the side of the house is also important to the character and spaciousness of the host property and the Beechwood Avenue street scene.

7. Nevertheless, the front of the extension would reduce the gap between the side of the house and the boundary to around 1.6m. It would significantly breach the Ash Grove building line and it would harmfully erode the existing sense of spaciousness found to the side of the house. In turn, it would harmfully erode the contribution that this area makes to the spaciousness of the Ash Grove and the Beechwood Avenue street scenes.

The proposed new dwelling would measure 4.9m in width, 10.1m in depth at ground floor level, 6.6m in depth at first floor level, be set back from the front elevation of No.54 by 1m, set in from the side boundary by 0.9m and would be set down from the main ridge height of the row of terraces characterised with a pitched roof. The proposed dwelling would infill the spacious gap to the side of the property which is an important feature within the street scene. Both No.54 and 58 Beechwood Avenue (corner plot properties) are characterised with spacious plots and it is considered that the infilling of this space would create a cramped appearance out of character with the surrounding area. In addition to this, the new dwelling would significantly breach the front building line of Ash Grove to a harmful degree and at two storeys in height would be readily visible from multiple public vantage points. Whilst the site does benefit from a large side plot, it is not considered that the erection of a new dwelling in this location is appropriate for its setting and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

It is also important to mention a similar development for the erection of an attached dwelling to the side of No.24 Beechwood Avenue that was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal under reference 51562/APP/2019/2523 (appeal reference APP/R5510/W/20/3248390 dated 07-10-20). This development is similar to No.24 as they are both located on prominent corner plot locations and are located along the same street. Within the appeal, the inspector stated:

6. Although a 1m gap would be retained to the side boundary, at 2-storeys in height this would still be intrusive and overbearing on Lime Grove. The proposed extension would infill an important and characteristic gap on a corner plot and would project forward of the established existing building line along Lime Grove, harming the street scene.

In addition to this, the erection of an additional dwelling to the side of No.54 is considered to unbalance the row of terraced properties. As detailed above, the existing end of terraced properties are characterised with prominent gable features and adding an additional dwelling of this width and height to this row of terraced would harmfully unbalance the symmetry. It is not considered that the new dwelling would appear as a side extension as stated within the submitted design and access statement, rather due to its width and design would appear as a new dwelling attached to the side.

As such, the proposed development by reason of its, prominent position, size, scale, bulk, width, proximity to the side boundary and projection beyond the return building line along Ash Grove would result in the virtual loss of an important gap characteristic to the area and the loss of the sense of spaciousness between the application dwelling and the side boundary. This would give rise to a cramped form of development on the site. The proposal would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2024).

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 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 table sets out that 2 parking spaces should be provided for a development of this nature, as well as the retention of 2 spaces for the existing dwelling.

Similarly the London Plan (2021) seeks to provide adequate parking for new residential development and to avoid harm to the local highway network.

The proposal involves the building of a new 2 bed dwelling (with two bicycle parking spaces and a car parking space accessed off an existing dropped kerb off Ash Grove) on the northern side land of the donor property.

The proposed development will result in the donor dwelling losing the formal car parking and access off Ash Grove. The new dwelling is proposing 1 car parking space/bay aligned at an angle with a bike store shown for 2 cycles accessed off Ash Grove.

The application site has a PTAL ranking of 1b indicating access to public transport is very poor and that occupiers and visitors of the proposed dwelling would be largely reliant on private car travel contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 9: Promoting Sustainable Transport and The Mayor's Transport Strategy which aims to encourage people to walk, cycle and travel by public transport.

The maximum parking standards outlined in the London Plan Table 10.3: Outer London PTAL 0-1, 1-2 beds it is up to 1.5 space per dwelling and in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020), policy DMT6 it is 2 spaces for dwellings with curtilage. Given that 1.5 spaces is not possible and taking into account the very poor PTAL rating of 1b and it's a new build, Policy DMT6 takes preference. Therefore, to comply with the adopted parking standard up to 2 car parking spaces are required for both the new and the donor dwelling.

The applicant is proposing 1 car parking spaces each for both the new and existing donor dwelling, consequently the proposals are contrary to policy DMT6 and therefore unacceptable given the site-specific conditions of site achieving a PTAL rating of 1b and on-street parking stress.

The applicant has stated that the existing donor dwelling has front forecourt parking off Beechwood Ave, however no formal dropped kerbs exist, furthermore a dropped kerb would not be acceptable within 5m of an existing road junction. It should be noted that (source: Google Streetview) a vehicle is parked directly in front of the donor dwellings entrance, guidance requires that pedestrian entrances/paths should be kept clear at all times of any (including potential) obstruction by at least 1m to ensure unhindered path for pedestrians especially in an emergency, anything less is not acceptable.

The proposed new dwelling parking bay is at an angle to the public highway including the proposed car parking layout for the donor dwelling both car parking arrangements are not acceptable. Such parking arrangements due to the angles and manoeuvres involved would require drivers to awkwardly and uncomfortably turn their head/neck to the extreme end in order to see in both directions for pedestrians and vehicles, drivers are likely to manoeuvre quickly, potentially without due care to avoid physical discomfort, thereby creating potentially hazardous conditions for all road users. This would be exacerbated further by the none provision of pedestrian visibility splays and its proximity to the adjacent junction adding to potential conflict points. Guidance requires that a vehicle hardstanding should be at least 4.8 metres deep and set out at perpendicular to the public highway. Guidance also requires the provision of pedestrian visibility splays, measuring 2.4m by 2.4m, these should be provided. The fences, walls and shrubs within these areas to be kept to a maximum height of 0.6m. In addition to this, vehicular splays should be provided in accordance with national recommendations, specifically Manual for Streets.

The proposed drawings show the provision of cycle storage for 2 bikes to the side of the new property and cycle storage within the rear garden for the existing property accessed via Ash Grove. Should the application have been recommended for approval, a condition would have been secured to provide further details of this storage.

The London Plan (2021) Policy T6.1 Residential Parking requires that all residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles. The new dwelling would therefore be required to provide 1no. active 7Kw active EVCP. Should the application have been recommended for approval, a condition would have been secured for these details.

The Highway Authority have been consulted on the application and have concluded that the application has failed to demonstrate a satisfactory policy and design-led approach, and until the above issue has been satisfactorily addressed, the Highway Authority therefore would raise an objection as the proposals are contrary to policies and will result in overspill of vehicles being displaced onto the local highway network creating stress and nuisance to local users parking demand, and likely to lead to inconsiderate and illegal parking on the roads within the vicinity of the sites access which could be prejudicial to highway safety.

As such, the development is contrary to Policy T4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.4 Carparking & Layout

See above section.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

INCLUSIVE DESIGN AND ACCESS:

Policy D5 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design.

Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) states that at least 10 per cent of dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) must meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'. All other dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) must meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.

The Councils access officer has been consulted on the application and raises no accessibility concerns subject to the imposition of conditions which would have been added to the decision should the application have been recommended for approval.

INTERNAL LIVING STANDARDS:

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) sets out the minimum internal floor space standards required for residential developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for future occupants.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment. The space standards set out in Table 5.1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) are the same as those found in Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021).

The proposed dwelling would be classed as a 2 bed, 3 person dwelling. Policy D6 of The London plan (2021) requires a minimum of 70sqm of GIA with 2 sqm of built in storage. The proposed dwelling would have approx. 76sqm which would comply with this standard. Both bedrooms are adequately sized and all habitable rooms would have a sufficient level of light and outlook. As such, the development would comply with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

EXTERNAL AMENITY SPACE PROVISION:

Policy DMHB 18 (Private Outdoor Amenity Space) states all new residential development and

conversions will be required to provide good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space. Amenity space should be provided in accordance with the standards set out in Table 5.3: Private Outdoor Amenity Space Standards.

Table 5.3 of Policy DMHB 18 requires 2 and 3 bedroom properties that have a minimum of 60sqm of private external amenity space that is well located and useable.

The existing dwelling would have approx. 84sqm of rear garden and the new dwelling would have approx. 91sqm which would comply with this standard. As such the development would comply with Policy DMHB 18.

7.6 Other Issues

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT:

The site is located within an established residential area.

The National Planning Policy Framework has a requirement to encourage the effective use of land.

London Plan (2021) Policy H2 states that well designed housing schemes on small sites should be actively supported. The Hillingdon Local Plan details how small scale sites will make a contribution to housing supply.

The development site is located within a garden which would be visible from the street.

Policy DMH 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) 'Garden and Backland Development' 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.

The proposed dwelling would be located within the garden of an existing property and as such Policy DMH 6 would be applicable. As discussed within the impact on street scene section of this report, the proposed development would infill a significant, spacious gap which forms a key part of the character and appearance of the street scene and would break the return building line of Ash Grove. As such, the development would not comply with Policy DMH 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development management Policies (2020).

At present the Council can demonstrate a 5 year housing supply and as such the erection of one new two bed dwelling does not outweigh the substantial harm that it would create.

LANDSCAPING:

Policy DMHB 14 states :

- A) All developments will be expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural features of merit.
- B) Development proposals will be required to provide a landscape scheme that includes hard and soft landscaping appropriate to the character of the area, which supports and enhances biodiversity and amenity particularly in areas deficient in green infrastructure.
- C) Where space for ground level planting is limited, such as high rise buildings, the inclusion of living walls and roofs will be expected where feasible.
- D) Planning applications for proposals that would affect existing trees will be required to provide an accurate tree survey showing the location, height, spread and species of trees. Where the tree survey identifies trees of merit, tree root protection areas and an arboricultural method statement will be required to show how the trees will be protected. Where trees are to be removed, proposals for replanting of new trees on-site must be provided or include contributions to offsite provision.

The existing boundary treatment for the property comprises a a hedges boundary which integrates well with the surrounding are. Concerns are raised regarding the removal of this hedge and replacement with a 1.8m high fence. Should the application have been recommended for approval, a detailed landscape scheme would have been secured via a condition to ensure the development integrated well within the surrounding area.

CONTAMINATED LAND:

The application site lies on potentially contaminated land. The Councils contaminated land officer has been consulted on the application and has no objection to the proposed development subject to a pre-commencement condition requiring studies to be undertaken. Should the application have been recommended for approval, this condition would have been added.

FLOODING AND DRAINAGE:

The application site is not located within an area at risk of flooding, however should the application have been recommended for approval, a condition would have been secured regarding SUDs measures.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN:

In England, Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). It became mandatory for major developments on 12 February 2024 and small sites on 2 April 2024. Developers must deliver a BNG of at least 10%. This means a development will result in more or better-quality natural habitat than there was before development. The land owner is legally responsible for creating or enhancing the habitat and managing that habitat for at least 30 years to achieve the target condition.

Policy 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.

Paragraph 8.6.6 of Policy G6 of The London Plan (2021) states that biodiversity net gain is an approach to development that leaves biodiversity in a better state than before. Losses should be avoided, and biodiversity offsetting is the option of last resort.

Policy EM7 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part One Strategic Policies (2012) states that

Hillingdon's biodiversity and geological conservation will be preserved and enhanced, with particular attention given to improving biodiversity from all development.

Paragraph 6.28 of Policy DMEI 7 (Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement) of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two Development Management Policies (2020) states it is important that planning decisions are appropriately informed by the right level of survey and information on ecology features. The Council will apply Natural England's standing advice at the validation stage. Applications will only be validated if they have the appropriate information. Where initial assessments recommend further surveys, these will be expected to be provided as part of a planning submission. All ecological reports or information submitted should adhere to nationally accepted best practice survey standards and be consistent with the British Standard BS 42020: 2013 Biodiversity - Code of Practice for Planning and Development or an updated variation. Where appropriate, the Council will require the use of the approved DEFRA biodiversity impact calculator (as updated) to inform decisions on no net loss and net gain.

During the process of the application, the applicant has provided the Biodiversity Net Gain Metric Calculation for the site along with a Biodiversity net Gain Report and Calculations. The report concludes that the current proposal does not meet the minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain and that the applicant is required to purchase off site units from a registered habitat bank provider to ensure that they deliver the minimum requirements of 10% BNG for habitat units. Should the application have been recommended for approval a condition would have been added requiring a BNG net gain plan and justification why 10% cannot be provided on site. If this cannot be achieved on site, off site credits must be purchased with confirmation of this.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY:

Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that to ensure development is sustainable, planning permission will only be granted for development that clearly demonstrates there will be sufficient infrastructure of all types to support it. Infrastructure requirements will be predominantly addressed through the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (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 square metre. CIL rates are index linked. The proposal involves the erection of a new dwelling and would therefore be liable to pay CIL.

CONCLUSION:

The application is recommended for refusal.

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 (March 2021)

Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

Contact Officer:

Rhian Thomas

Telephone No: