



Richard Phillips <rphillips@hillington.gov.uk>

Re: 159 Charville Lane, Hayes - App. No. 4734/APP/2017/4236 - Drainage Comments

1 message

joseph@jones.tf <joseph@jones.tf>

4 June 2018 at 22:32

To: Richard Phillips <rphillips@hillington.gov.uk>

Hi Richard

Our Flood Risk guy has given us his advice and I respond as follows.

If there are questions regarding the existing soakaway's, it would be no problem to indicate their location on a map, together with all elements of drainage which presumably include the foul and surface water pipe work.

If need be we can carry out a percolation test on the soakaway's or else where on site.

We can make a specific data request to the EA for surface water and flood risk maps, however they will almost certainly provide the same maps which are on their website, and which are already included in the FRA.

We can carry out the works proposed to the ordinary watercourse to the front of the property "remove the new culvert and replace it by a new culvert which mimics the size of the ditch".

Of course those proposed works to an Ordinary Watercourse may also need a separate approval

A CCTV survey of the drainage as constructed can be carried out.

A site level survey can be carried out if required.

We have already provided a plan that shows that much of the garden will be returned to grass or landscaped, and we can ensure that the front drive will be surfaced with permeable material (it already is).

We can prepare a Flood Action Plan if it is deemed necessary (in line with consents in the area I presume).

I would say the above could be dealt with by condition.

Regards

Joseph

Joseph G Jones
BFSGC
Tel: 07756 917937

On 30-05-2018 15:34, Richard Phillips wrote:

Joseph,

Thank you for your email and I do apologise for the delay in getting back to you.

I will attempt to answer your queries in the order that they were raised.

In terms of neighbour complaints, the Council's Enforcement Team do mention that there have been complaints made about this site as regards caravans in the garden being lived in, but in terms of the planning application, to date, there has only been one response received from the public and this is in support of the application.

This application is not being dealt with any differently from any other application for a replacement dwelling in the Green Belt. The guidance and criteria under which these applications are assessed apply to all.

You queried why anyone would go back to the floor area in 1945. As I stated in my email of 27/4/18, the relevant year is in fact 1948 and this is the date everyone has to go back to for buildings constructed before 1948 as it is the year defined within legislation:-

"original" means—

- (a) in relation to a building, other than a building which is Crown land, existing on 1st July 1948, as existing on that date;
- (b) in relation to a building, other than a building which is Crown land, built on or after 1st July 1948, as so built;

As regards Nos. 119 - 137 Charville Lane, you query why the amount of existing and proposed building on site had to be like for like but this was not the case anyway on this particular scheme. The case officer appears to have just made a simple comparison between the new development and all types of buildings and structures on site. In the end, this did not form part of the case officer's justification for recommending approval of the scheme, with the Inspector's consideration on the earlier very similar scheme being the important consideration, and it was this that was relied upon by the case officer to justify the very similar housing re-development scheme on the site.

As regards the original size of the bungalow (ie going back to 1948), I have not seen anything to suggest that this was not the bungalow contained within the eaves of its original hipped roof (of which there appears to be 7 similar small buildings as you say in the 1945 Google Earth photograph) and now only Nos. 153 and 157 still retain the original hipped roof form. Measuring submitted plans, the LPA has estimated this to be 74sqm and you have come to a very similar figure (78sqm) from measuring the neighbour's property (No. 157).

In terms of the maximum size of dwelling, as previously mentioned, taking the 50% guidance rule and with an original floor area of 78sqm, this would give an overall maximum allowable internal total floor area of $78 + 39\text{sqm} = 117\text{sqm}$, which would be measured by including all the habitable floor space on both floors. The existing building on site has a total floor area of 184sqm if the front bays and porch are omitted or 136% of the original property.

What would assist is if the first floor could be made non-habitable, ie just loft space. It is already shown as only providing storage space so if access was restricted, by replacing the stairs with a loft ladder access, then the first floor would not count towards the overall internal floor area, reducing the increase in floor area to 83%. Any further reductions would be welcomed and make the arguments at committee easier but with the omission of the first floor (and front bays and porch), I suspect that I would be in a position to recommend the application favourably, particularly as I would be able to argue the particular merits of this case and that a former detached garage had been removed.

I do have to be able to take this application to committee one way or another to the Central and South Planning Committee meeting on 27/6/18 so it would be appreciated if we can agree an extension of time till 29/6/18. If you do wish to amend the plans by removing the front bays and porch and ensuring the first floor does not provide internal living space by removing the stairs, then I would need these by Tues. 12/6/18 at the very latest (and scaleable). The plans would also need to show the front and rear garden area landscaped with exception of parking space for 2 cars etc (the detail could be conditioned) and caravans omitted as per previous emails. You would also need to deal with the Flood Officer comments originally provided on 19/1/18, preferably with a revised, more comprehensive and robust FRA and this needs looking at ASAP if you have not commenced this already.

You also queried the comments of the Access Officer and why would Category 2 M4 (2) apply here but this category applies to 90% of new housing and seeks to ensure that new housing is accessible and adaptable (the other 10% is for wheelchair standard housing). Detailed design guidance is provided in the latest design guide which can be found on the Council's website on the following link:-

file:///C:/Users/richardp/Downloads/Accessible_Hillingdon_SPD_2017_(Published).pdf,

This could however, also be conditioned.

Please let me know if you require further information.

Regards,

Richard