

DELEGATED DECISION

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

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select Option

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

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

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

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

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

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

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

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

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

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

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

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

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

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

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

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

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning, Building Control, Sport & Green Spaces**

Address 82 MELLOW LANE EAST HAYES

Development: Two storey, 3-bed, detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space and two storey side extension to existing dwelling

LBH Ref Nos: **69325/APP/2015/2438**

Drawing Nos: 08/495/02
 08/495/01
 08/495/09
 08/495/10
 08/495/06
 08/495/03
 08/495/08
 08/495/07
 08/495/05
 08/495/04
 Location Plan (1:1250)

Date Plans received : 13/08/2015

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 13/08/2015

1. SUMMARY

The proposal seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension to the existing dwelling and a new two storey, 3-bedroom dwelling with associated parking and amenity space in the sub-divided site.

The proposal has been assessed against current policies and guidance for new housing development in terms of the potential effects of the design, scale and site layout on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the potential impacts on the residential amenities of adjoining and nearby occupiers, and on highways related matters such as access for all vehicles, traffic/pedestrian safety and parking availability. The amenities of the occupants of the existing and proposed dwellings have also been considered.

In summary, the proposed existing and detached dwellings are not considered to relate satisfactorily with the distinctive spacious character and appearance of the locality, and would result in over-development of the site contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of The London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts (July 2006).

Furthermore, the sub-division of the site is such that the proposed dwelling would have an overbearing and overdominating appearance in relation to the closest adjacent property at No. 84 Hayes End Drive, and it would result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of that property by reason of direct overlooking of its front garden and loss of privacy. The proposal would also fail to provide a satisfactory level of residential amenity and internal living accommodation for occupants of the existing and proposed dwellings by reason of severely restricted outlook from rear facing windows and inadequate private rear garden amenity space, contrary to Policies BE19, BE20,

BE21, BE22, BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted HDAS SPD: Residential Layouts (December 2008).

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed detached dwelling, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, siting in an open prominent corner position and projection forward of the return front building line on Hayes End Drive, would result in the loss of an important and distinctive spacious gap characteristic to the area, resulting in a cramped appearance. The proposal would therefore represent an over-development of the site to the detriment of the character and the visual amenities of the area and to this existing open area of the street scene. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of The London Plan (2015) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed detached dwelling, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, projection forward of the return front building line on Hayes End Drive and inadequate separation distance between it and the closest adjacent property at No. 84 Hayes End Drive, would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking, overbearing and over-dominating impact on that adjacent property, to the detriment of the visual and residential amenities of occupants of that property, contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts (July 2006).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed detached dwelling, by reason of very close proximity to the blank flank wall of the closest adjacent property to the rear at No. 84 Hayes End Road, would result in severely restricted outlook from ground and first floor habitable windows, thereby failing to provide a satisfactory standard of internal living environment for the benefit of future occupiers of the dwelling. The proposal would therefore give rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers, contrary to Policy 3.5 of The London Plan (2015), Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal, by reason of the sub-division of the site and its coverage by both the existing and proposed dwellings, would fail to provide usable amenity space of sufficient area and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the extended host dwelling (82 Mellow Lane East). As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation for current and future occupiers of the existing dwelling, contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Layouts and HDAS: Residential Extensions.

5 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the siting and excessive width of the proposed cross over when combined with the existing and the layout of the proposed parking would

result in conditions which would be prejudicial 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 Layouts.

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 Compulsory Informative (1)

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

2 I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (2015) and national guidance.

AM14	New development and car parking standards.
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
LDF-AH	Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010
LPP 3.3	(2015) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2015) Housing Choice
LPP 7.2	(2015) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4	(2015) Local character

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies (2015). On the 8th November 2012 Hillingdon's Full Council agreed the adoption of the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies. Appendix 5 of this explains which saved policies from the old Unitary Development (which was subject to a direction from Secretary of State in September 2007 agreeing that the policies were 'saved') still apply for development control decisions.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a very spacious corner plot, which is located on the southern side of Mellow Lane East and on the eastern corner of its 'T' junction intersection with Hayes End Drive.

The site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling (No. 82 Mellow Lane East), which has a main hipped roof and projecting front bay features. There is a driveway to the western end of the front garden and a retaining brick wall forms an enclosure of the front garden and the overgrown and expansively sized western side garden.

The surrounding streetscene is predominantly residential in character and appearance and features junction properties with considerable open spaces to their side boundaries. The Green Belt lies adjacent to the northern side of the T-junction and comprises expansive woodlands/Tree Preservation Areas. There are restrictive parking controls in the form of single and double yellow lines close to the junction corners, although properties in the immediate locality generally have off-street parking spaces within their plot boundaries.

The site is located in a 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks permission for the sub-division of the site and erection of a new two storey, 3-bed, detached dwelling with associated parking and side / rear garden amenity space, and a two storey side extension to the existing dwelling (No.82).

The proposed two storey side extension would be set in 1m away from the new eastern boundary of the proposed dwelling, and it would be 2.7m wide, 5.8m deep and have a matching hipped roof that would be set down from the main roof ridge of the existing dwelling by 0.8m. The side extension would be set back from the front wall of the dwelling by 1.6m on both floors.

The proposed dwelling would be set in 1m from its eastern boundary and 4m from the western boundary with the Hayes End Drive highway. The proposed dwelling would have a dual-pitch hipped roof to height of 9.6m and it would have an overall width and depth of 9m and 7.8m. The front elevation would be stepped with the recessed section set back 1m from the projecting section, and set down 0.6m from the main roof ridge. A chimney would be installed in the eastern side roofslope. The dwelling would comprise a living room, kitchen / dining room, hallway, cloakroom and study on the ground floor and three bedrooms with two bathrooms on the first floor. Two off-street parking spaces would be

provided in the part paved front garden of the proposed dwelling and additional paving would be created in the retained front garden of the existing dwelling to provide an additional off-street parking space.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Planning History

There is no planning history for the site.

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

Nine responses were received from neighbouring residents expressing objection to the proposal. The grounds of objection are summarised below:

- The proposal will result in additional vehicular traffic and increased unavailability of parking in the area.
- The proposed will block out natural daylight to, and overlook the adjacent properties on Hayes End Drive.
- The proposal will obstruct the view of the Green Belt lane and will exceed the building lines of adjacent properties.
- The proposal is totally out of keeping with the area and will reduce the open spacious character of the junction corner.
- The proposal would be a safety hazard to vehicles and pedestrians as a result of the location of the dwelling right on the edge of a junction corner already enclosed by a brick wall, the location of a drive close to the junction and congestion of heavy construction vehicles (lorries) when entering / existing the road.
- Generation of mud, dirt and noise nuisance from related construction works.
- Over-development of the site and insufficient garden space.

INTERNAL CONSULTEE

Trees Officer:

While the character of the garden contributes to the visual amenity of the area, there are no trees or distinctive features which should be retained. There are no Tree Preservation Orders and no Conservation Area designations affecting trees within the site.

LANDSCAPE CONSIDERATIONS:

- No trees or other landscape features of merit will be affected by the proposal.
- The parking arrangement for the existing house is awkward - with one off-street space parallel to the road and house. If the boundary with the new build was moved to the west, it would be a more efficient use of space to have two spaces arranged side by side / perpendicular to the road.
- With regard to the new build proposal, again the car park arrangement is extremely tight for the car parked against the boundary.
- The proposed garden for the new house wraps around the side of the building, providing some scope for planting but limited useable amenity space for the occupants.
- If the application is recommended for approval, landscape conditions should be imposed

to ensure that the proposals preserve and enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS: No objection, subject to the above observations and RES9 (parts 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6).

6. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

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

BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.

BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.

BE22 Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.

BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.

BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.

BE38 Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.

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

HDAS-LAY Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006

LDF-AH Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010

LPP 3.3 (2015) Increasing housing supply

LPP 3.4 (2015) Optimising housing potential

LPP 3.5 (2015) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 3.8 (2015) Housing Choice

LPP 7.2 (2015) An inclusive environment

LPP 7.4 (2015) Local character

In addition:

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

The application site is located in a predominantly residential area and on a very prominent corner plot with considerable open space to the west at the junction of Mellow Lane East and Hayes End Drive.

The adopted Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) SPD: Residential Layouts (July 2006), gives advice on sunlight and daylight considerations, and specifies that where a two or more storey building abuts a property or its boundary, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible domination, overbearing and overshadowing. Paragraph 4.9 of the HDAS SPD specifies that in order to both protect the existing outlook from and to ensure that there is adequate daylight received to habitable rooms, kitchens and gardens of adjacent dwellings, a minimum distance of 15m is required. The HDAS SPD further specifies that as a guide, the distance between facing habitable room windows in adjoining/adjacent residential properties should not be less than 21m.

TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

The proposed two storey side extension would not project beyond the rear building line of the existing dwelling and it would have an obscure-glazed first floor rear window serving a non-habitable bathroom. The side extension would have a blank western flank wall and it would not project beyond the return building line that fronts Hayes End Drive. As such, it is considered that the two storey side extension would not have any adverse implications for the protection of neighbouring amenity.

NEW DETACHED DWELLING

The proposed dwelling would also maintain the rear building line of the existing dwelling. However, the proposed dwelling would project beyond the closest adjacent dwelling on the return building line that fronts Hayes End Drive, No. 84 Hayes End Drive. The proposed dwelling would have a shorter rear garden than the retained garden for the existing dwelling (in terms of depth), and its rear elevation would be set away from the rear (southern) boundary with No. 84 Hayes End Drive by 3m and 5m at the nearest and furthest points respectively. The proposed dwelling would be significantly less than the required minimum 15m separation distance, and the very close proximity of ground and first floor rear windows in the proposed dwelling to the rear boundary is such that they would not maintain an acceptable degree of separation between adjacent No. 84 Hayes End Drive. The very close proximity of the rear facing windows to the rear boundary is such that they would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking and overshadowing of the front garden and northern flank wall of No. 84 Hayes End Drive. As will be highlighted in a later section, the close proximity of the rear windows to the blank flank wall of the adjacent property is such that it would result in severely restricted outlook from those windows.

Given the above considerations, the proposed dwelling would result in an obtrusive and over-dominating appearance and an unacceptably oppressive and overbearing impact on the occupants of the closest adjacent property at No. 84 Hayes End Drive. As a result of not maintaining adequate separation distances to the adjacent property, the proposed dwelling would result in direct overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy to that neighbouring property, contrary to Policies BE19, BE20, BE21, BE22 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the related guidance in the HDAS SPD: Residential Layouts (July 2006).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) specifies that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings and the public realm contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place.

Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) specifies that the layout and appearance of new development should 'harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area'. The NPPF (2012) notes the importance of achieving design which is appropriate to its context specifying that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions'.

TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

The width of the proposed two storey side extension to the existing dwelling would be less than half the original 6m width of the dwelling. The two storey side extension would be set in from the eastern boundary of the proposed dwelling by 1m, have a matching hipped roof that is set down from the ridge of the main dwelling and set back from the front wall on both floors by more than 1m. The side extension would therefore comply with the related guidance contained in paragraphs 5.1, 5.6, 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10 of the adopted Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) SPD: Residential Extensions (December 2008), which require two storey side extensions at semi-detached dwellings to be set back a minimum of 1m from the side boundary of the property for the full height of the building, have a minimum set back of 1m from the main front building line, have a roof height that is lowered by at least 0.5m from the main roof, have a roof design that follows that of the existing roof, and have a width that is between half and two-thirds of the main dwelling. If the two storey side extension was the only subject element of this proposal, it is considered that it would retain an acceptable visual gap to the western side of the site and constitute a subordinate and sympathetic addition to the appearance of the existing dwelling.

NEW DETACHED DWELLING

With regards to the proposed two-storey detached dwelling, it is instructive to note that the overall stepped width of 9m for the dwelling is such that it would be 3m wider than the existing dwelling on the site. Notwithstanding the set-in of 4m of the proposed dwelling from the western boundary with the Hayes End Drive highway, the width of the proposed dwelling in combination with that of the existing dwelling is such that it would result in an excessive extension of the front building line along the northern boundary of what is very considerable open space on a prominent corner plot junction. As stated above in the 'Site and Locality' section, a characteristic feature of the immediate locality is corner plot/junction properties with considerable open spaces to their sides. These open spaces, together with the expansive area of woodland adjacent to the northern side of the Mellow Lane East/Hayes End Drive T junction, provide considerable visual relief in what is a densely built up area. The open space between the existing dwelling on the site and the western boundary is unusual in that it is significantly substantial than most of the open spaces in adjacent sites. It is also instructive to note that the building line on the return frontage along Hayes End Drive is fairly established in terms of uniformity. It is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling attempts to reference the established hipped roofscape and design detailing of the existing and neighbouring dwellings in the locality. However, the western side of the proposed building would protrude considerably beyond the front building line of properties fronting onto Hayes End Drive and its two storey height and overall bulk would combine to give it an incongruous and overly-dominating appearance so close to the corner junction. The proposed dwelling would have a footprint of approximately 70sq.m, which would be less than half of the area of its sub-divided site. However, its footprint and orientation on the site is such that it would have a constrained depth of 5m for its rear garden (at the furthest point). As such, the sub-division of the site to provide an additional dwelling would result in over-development of the site and a severe

loss of the site's distinctive spaciousness. The proposal would therefore significantly detract from the distinctive and spacious open character of the Mellow Lane East and Hayes End Drive junction and the general spacious character of development in the area.

It is noted that the submitted plans show the provision of soft landscape side and rear gardens with permeable paving in the front garden for off-street parking spaces. Notwithstanding the proposed provision of soft and hard landscaping, the proposed development by reason of its size, scale, bulk and siting in this open prominent and very spacious position along a road junction would result in the loss of an important and distinct visual gap characteristic to the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore represent an over-development of the site to the detriment of the character and the visual amenities of the area and to this existing open area of the streetscene. Therefore the proposal is 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), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts (July 2006).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

See immediate section below.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) considers whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

The objection from neighbouring residents in respect of additional traffic and parking availability are noted. Policy AM14 of the Local Plan specifies that new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards. The immediate locality has a very low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1b. The submitted plans show that two off-street parking spaces would be provided within the frontage of the new 3-bed dwelling and two for the existing, which in numerical terms, is considered sufficient. However, the proposal involves the provision of an excessively wide crossover, when combined with the existing, close to a junction and the layout of the parking for the existing dwelling is such that it would require a considerable number of manoeuvres to access the parking space sited at 90 degrees to the road. Thus, in reality it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not result in highway and pedestrian safety issues and that sufficient parking provision has been made. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

The London Plan and the HDAS SPD (Residential Layouts) set out the minimum internal floor space standards required for residential developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants.

NEW DETACHED DWELLING

Table 2 in Paragraph 4 (Design Guidance) of the HDAS SPD recommends that two-storey houses with three bedrooms should have a minimum internal floor space area of 81 sq.m. The proposed dwelling would have an approximate internal floor area of 132 sq.m, which significantly exceeds the required minimum. The three bedrooms would be double rooms and have floor areas that exceed the required minimum of 12 sq.m for double bedrooms (as recommended by The London Plan). The proposed dwelling would therefore provide

habitable rooms and units with adequate floor spaces and layouts.

However, and as stated in the above 'Impact on Neighbours' section, the proposed dwelling would have ground and upper floor rear windows serving habitable living room/kitchen/dining room and bedroom windows. These rear windows would be sited 5m and 6m away (at the nearest and furthest points) from the blank northern flank wall of the closest adjacent property to the rear at No. 84 Hayes End Drive. The very close proximity of the rear windows to the flank wall of the adjacent property is such that it would result in severely restricted outlook for any future potential occupants from those habitable windows. Given that the proposed dwelling would not result in the proposed habitable rooms maintaining an adequate outlook, the proposal would fail to provide a satisfactory living environment for future occupants and would be contrary to the requirements of the HDAS SPD: Residential Layouts (July 2006), Policy BE20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy 3.5 of The London Plan (2011)

Paragraph 4.15 and paragraph 5.13 of the Residential Layouts and Residential Extensions HDAS SPDs specify that developments should incorporate usable, attractively laid out and conveniently located garden space in relation to the residential units they serve. It should be of an appropriate size, and appropriate to the character of the area. The submitted plans show the provision of a private rear garden amenity space with approximate area of 65sq.m for the proposed dwelling. This would comply with the required minimum of 60 sq.m for a three-bedroom dwelling.

TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

The proposed two storey side extension to the existing dwelling would result in the existing dwelling comprising four bedrooms. However, the sub-division of the site is such that it would result in a retained rear garden amenity area of approximately 65sq.m for the existing dwelling. This retained area represents a significant shortfall of 35sq.m, given that the HDAS SPDs require a minimum area of 100 sq.m for a four-bedroom dwelling. It is therefore considered that as a result of the subdivision and over-development of the site by reason of its coverage by the existing and proposed dwellings, the host dwelling would fail to provide adequate private external garden amenity space for the occupants, contrary to the requirements of Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the requirements of the HDAS SPD: Residential Layouts (July 2006) and HDAS SPD: Residential Extensions (July 2008).

ACCESS

In terms of inclusive access provision, The London Plan Policy 3.8 requires all new housing to be built to Lifetime Homes Standards. The Council's SPD HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon also requires all new housing to be built to Lifetime Homes Standards. It is considered that if the application was considered acceptable in all other respects, a condition could have been imposed to secure Lifetime Homes Standards.

7.6 Other Issues

THE PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

In terms of the acceptability of the principle of the application development, Policy 3.4 of The London Plan (2011) promotes the optimisation of housing output within different types of location. Policies 3.8 of The London Plan and H7 of the Local Plan (Part Two) also encourage the Council to provide a range of housing choices in order to take account of

the various different groups who require different types of housing. Consideration will also be given to the accessibility of the site to services and amenities.

Having regard to the London Plan and the Council's policies and guidelines, it is considered that in general, there is no objection to the principle of an intensification of use on the existing residential site. It is considered that the proposal would provide an increase in smaller housing stock within the Borough and is acceptable in principle, as it would provide additional housing within an area of high public transport accessibility.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

The London Plan (March 2015)

Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (November 2012).

Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts

Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions

Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon

National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Victor Unuigbo

Telephone No: 01895 250230