

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 3 BLOSSOM WAY HILLINGDON

Development: Two storey 6-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling

LBH Ref Nos: **8887/APP/2015/162**

Drawing Nos: FCP/3/2014/B
FCP/3/2014/A
Design and Access Statement

Date Plans received : 23/01/2015

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 23/01/2015

1. SUMMARY

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of an existing house and the erection of a two storey, six bedroom house with a part hipped, part flat (crown)roof and front and rear dormers in its place.

The proposal, which is located opposite, but not within the Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character, would represent a large, incongruous and visually intrusive structure which would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal fails to demonstrate how it can meet all of the Lifetime Homes Standards and it would also be harmful to the amenity of nearby residents through loss of outlook, contrary to both the Hillingdon Local Plan, Part Two, Saved Policies (November 2012 and the London Plan 2011.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, size, scale, bulk and design, including a substantial crown roof, would result in an incongruous and intrusive form of development that would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street

scene and the wider area, including the Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character. It would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic

Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13 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.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by virtue of its siting, size, scale, bulk, height, depth and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 5 Blossom Way and 20 and 21 Honey Hill, by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of the loss of the established side boundary hedges to the front and the majority of the soft landscaped front area, by creating an open parking area and emphasising the appearance of a hard surfaced area, would be detrimental to the, character, appearance and visual amenity of the street scene and the wider area, including the Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character. The proposals is thus, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE19 and BE38 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 has failed to demonstrate that it would meet Lifetime Homes standards to the detriment of future occupiers, contrary to Policies 3.8 and 7.2 of the London Plan (2011) and the Council's adopted supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon.

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 (July 2011) and national guidance.

BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

LPP 3.1	(2011) Ensuring equal life chances for all
LPP 3.3	(2011) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2011) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2011) Housing Choice
LPP 7.2	(2011) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character

3 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 saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies. 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 site is located north-west side of Blossom Way and comprises a 1930s two storey detached chalet bungalow which has been extended by way of single storey rear extensions at either side of the property and front and rear dormer windows. To the north-east lies No. 5 Blossom Way, a detached two storey house with two storey and single storey rear extensions and to the south west are the rear gardens of No. 1 Blossom Way and Nos. 20 & 21 Honey Hill.

The street scene is residential in character and appearance. The south side of Blossom Way is included within the Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character. The north side is mixed in character with a number of modern houses of a more ordinary design.

There are a number of distinctive elements that are important within the streetscape of the area, these include long front gardens and planting, the spacing between the buildings and the traditional colour/materials of the properties. The application site lies within a Developed Area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan, Part One, Strategic Policies.

The topography of Blossom Way is on a steep slope, with the application site located towards the top of the steepest part of the street.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposed scheme is to demolish the existing chalet bungalow and construct a 2 bedroom (with rooms in the roof) six bedroom dwelling house.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

8887/APP/2011/241 3 Blossom Way Hillingdon

Erection of a two storey, 6 x bed detached dwelling involving the demolition of existing dwelling, incorporating a basement level, 8 solar panels to front, sedium planted roof to rear, ventilation shaft to rear, 2 roof lights to rear, light well to front

Decision: 08-04-2011 Approved

8887/APP/2012/410 3 Blossom Way Hillingdon

Two-storey 6-bedroom dwelling house with habitable roofspace and associated parking and landscaping and swimming pool to rear, involving the demolition of existing 4-bedroom dwelling house

Decision: 27-04-2012 Refused

Comment on Planning History

There have been 2 previous applications for similar developments (ie demolition and construction of new dwelling) In 2011 (ref:8887/APP/2011/241) a more contemporary designed dwelling was approved.

However, in 2012 (ref: 8887/APP/2012/410) a revised application with a more traditional appearance was refused. This refusal related generally to poor design, size and site coverage, height, depth and siting would represent an oppressive and visually intrusive development resulting in loss of outlook and would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous and overdominant and failing to harmonise or enhance the established character of the surrounding area. The proposed application is a revised version of the 2012 refusal.

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

The public consultation period ran from 26 January to 16 February 2015. A site notice was displayed opposite the site. There have been 3 neighbour responses received with regard to the proposal. The comments are as follows:

Having looked at the plans, the proposed new build will have a severe impact on my family and property. Point 1 The proposed new build is almost double the size in depth compared to the existing build, with the extra depth engrossed upon our garden/conservatory and general views. The distance between my garden wall/fence and the proposed new build is ONLY 1 meter and approx. 9 Meters from our conservatory. Point 2 The proximity of the proposed new build will have a severe impact on our views and enjoyment of North Hillingdon and importantly the natural sun light received due to the significant proposed siting, size, scale, bulk and proximity of the new build. This will also have a detrimental impact on my family's enjoyment of the garden as well as the views of North Hillingdon from the rear of our property facing North as my property sits on higher ground compared to any other surrounding property. Point 3 Leading from the above point, the proposed new build, will impact the value of my property based on the significant high ground views and natural sun light gained. Point 4 The proposed new build in my view does not fall in line with the appearance against surrounding properties (along honey hill and blossom way). Point 5 The proposed new build side elevation backing onto our property has a number of windows in the plan which will overlook our

bedrooms and bathroom at close proximity which we feel to be invasive and impacting our privacy. In Summary, This is a proposed new build which for the location is un-neighbourly, over dominant, over intrusive, oversized and very bulky looking in appearance.(in my view not in line with the house build character of Honey Hill/Blossom Way.)

we wish to register an objection to the above planning application for the following reasons: The proposed plans for a two-storey 6-bed detached house are totally unsuitable bearing in mind the plot size and close proximity of adjoining properties and as such would present an overbearing and intrusive impact for us as one of the neighbours living adjacent to the rear of the property with an adjoining garden. Looking at the plans in detail, the factors of most concern include the height of the proposed new property and the depth of the two storey elevation at the rear. The new roof line will be approximately 1.7 metres higher than the roof line of the existing chalet bungalow and this coupled with the new dormer windows being similarly higher than the existing would mean that the proposed development would substantially overlook the rear of our house and garden. The depth of the two storey section also projects at the rear approx. 2.5m beyond the two storey line of the adjoining properties No's 5 and 7 Blossom Way, thus bringing the new dwelling even closer to our garden and so enhancing even more the impact of the above roof dormer windows as well as the first floor windows overlooking our property, and the resultant loss of privacy. These factors will undoubtedly have an intrusive impact on our property especially as our garden is also not of great depth (only 12m long) as clearly shown on the site plans.

I am replying to strongly object to this application. Having looked at the plans, the side elevation diagram indicates a three story building (once the habituated loft space is considered) will be built just 1 meter from the boundary of my back garden on the site of the currently standing chalet bungalow (with dormer windows on the upper floor). The height proposed is a significant increase over the current dwelling, making the property excessively large and overbearing to my property. In addition the proximity of the new build to the rear of my property will severely impact the amount of sunlight my garden is able to receive which will not only affect the garden itself but will have a detrimental impact upon my family's enjoyment of the garden and property. In addition, there are two windows in the plans which will overlook my home and garden. This will impact our privacy. In summary, I strongly feel the siting, size, scale, bulk and proximity of the proposed development is unneighbourly, over-dominant and intrusive and contrary to your Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007) and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions. The extension will dominate outward views from our ground floor and first floor windows, resulting in 3 Blossom Way being excessively large and overbearing to our property. This impact is made greater, given the short length of our rear garden which would result in a distance of just 12 meters from the rear wall of our property to the construction of the three story building (one floor in the loft space).

OFFICERS COMMENTS: the issues that the neighbours have written about are dealt with in more detail within the main body of the report.

Access officer:

Planning approval is sought to demolish the existing dwelling house and to erect detached 6 bedroom house to provide 4 off street parking spaces. In assessing this application, reference has been made to London Plan July 2011, Policy 3.8 (Housing Choice) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document "Accessible Hillingdon" adopted May 2013.

The Design & Access Statement states the proposal is to meet the Lifetime Home Standards, but the requisite specifications are not included in the plans. Compliance with

all 16 Lifetime Home standards (as relevant) should be shown on plan. The following access observations are made:

1. Level access should be achieved. A fall of 1:60 in the areas local to the principal entrance and rear entrance should be incorporated to prevent rain and surface water ingress. In addition to a levels plan showing internal and external levels, a section drawing of the level access threshold substructure, and water bar to be installed including any necessary drainage should be submitted.
2. The scheme does not include provision of a downstairs WC compliant with the Lifetime Home requirements. To this end, a minimum of 700mm should be provided to one side of the toilet pan, with 1100mm in front to any obstruction opposite.
3. A minimum of one bathroom on the first floor should be designed in accordance with Lifetime Home standards. At least 700mm should be provided to one side of the WC, with 1100mm provided between the front edge of the toilet pan and a door or wall opposite.
4. To allow the entrance level WC and first floor bathroom to be used as a wet room in future, plans should indicate floor gulley drainage.
5. The plans should indicate the location of a future 'through the ceiling' wheelchair lift.

Conclusion: revised plans should be requested as a prerequisite to any planning approval. In any case, an additional Condition, as set out below, should be attached to any planning permission:

ADDITIONAL CONDITION

Level access shall be provided to and into the dwelling houses, designed in accordance with

technical measurements and tolerances specified by Part M to the Building Regulations 2010 (2004 edition, incorporating 2010/13 amendments), and shall be retained in perpetuity.

REASON: to ensure adequate access for all, in accordance with London Plan policy 3.8, is

achieved and maintained, and to ensure an appropriate standard of accessibility in accordance with the Building Regulations.

Landscape officer: Saved policy BE38 seeks the retention and utilisation of topographical and landscape features of merit and the provision of new planting and landscaping wherever it is appropriate.

* No trees or other landscape features of merit will be affected by the proposal.

* Drawing No. FCP/3/2014/B indicates a similar site layout with an increased area of hard-standing for off-street parking in the front. A reasonable area should be retained as soft landscape in the front (at least 25%).

* The Design & Access Statement confirms that 'there is ample space both to the front and rear of the site for hard and soft landscaping'. It also requests that landscape details are submitted and approved under conditions.

* Boundary hedges should be protected during the demolition and construction phase.

* 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 RES6, RES7, RES8, COM9 (parts 1, 2, 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:

BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
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.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.1	(2011) Ensuring equal life chances for all
LPP 3.3	(2011) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2011) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2011) Housing Choice
LPP 7.2	(2011) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4	(2011) Local character

In addition:

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

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

The Hillingdon Local Plan, Part Two, saved Policies (November 2012) contains policies that seek to safeguard the amenities of residential occupiers with reference to sunlight/daylight (BE20), bulk and proximity (BE21) and privacy (BE24).

Paragraph 4.9 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts advises that all residential developments and amenity spaces should receive adequate daylight and sunlight and that new development should be designed to minimise the negative impact of overbearing and overshadowing. It goes on to advise that 'where a two storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible domination'. Generally, 15m will be the minimum acceptable distance between buildings. Furthermore a minimum of 21m overlooking distance should be maintained.

The proposal proposes the demolition of the existing chalet bungalow and the erection of the new build dwelling. The existing dwelling has a floor area of some 222 square metres which includes 55.5 sqm within the loft space. The existing dwelling has an overall ridge height of 6.4m, with an eaves height of 2.7m. The main house measures 7.9m deep and there are various single-storey ground floor extensions creating a built form with an overall depth of 15.9m along the boundary with no 5 Blossom Way and a maximum depth of 13m along the shared boundaries with 20 and 21 Honey Hill.

In comparison the proposed dwelling would have a ridge height of 8.15m, with an eaves height of 5.2m. The ground floor would also include a single-storey flat roof extension and the overall depth of the house at ground floor level would be 15.3m with the first floor having a slightly reduced depth of 12.7m. The height of the roof has been kept artificially low with the inclusion of a part hip, part flat 'crown' roof which gives it a squat appearance out of proportion with the main elevations.

There would be 2 obscurely glazed first floor windows (serving en-suite bathrooms) within the west elevation (facing towards the rear of the dwellings in Honey Hill. On the east side there is proposed 1 similar size obscure glazed window on the first floor also serving a further bedroom.

The rears of the affected properties within Honey Hill (namely no's 20 and 21) are 11m and 13m respectively. The proposal would introduce a two storey wall within 11m and 13m respectively of the rear elevation habitable room windows at No. 20 and 21 Honey Hill. This is well below the distance recommended in the HDAS of 15m and therefore it is considered that the proposed house would have an overbearing and visually intrusive impact upon these properties, contrary to Local Plan policy BE21.

The HDAS recommends a separation distance of 21m between habitable facing windows. The windows on the side elevations serve bathrooms and are to be obscurely glazed. There is a distance of 11m between the side flank wall and the habitable rooms on the rear of 20 Honey Hill. However as the bathroom windows would be obscurely glazed it would not be considered that these windows would create any direct overlooking. There would be some oblique overlooking from the rear first floor and rear dormer windows mainly into the rear gardens of no's 19 and 20 Honey Hill which may give a perceived sense of being overlooked by these windows. However, they are of a sufficient distance from the rear rooms and patio areas of these properties and it is not considered that the amount of overlooking would result in a significant loss of privacy which would warrant a refusal based on these grounds.

On the east side no 5 Blossom Way has a single-storey side extension which is built up to the common boundary. On the first floor there is a side window facing towards the application property. The separation distance between the 2 properties would only be around 3m. At the rear there is an existing two-storey extension on the rear of no 5 and the proposed new dwelling would be more or less in line with this extension. It is considered that the proposed new dwelling would not result in any loss of residential amenity to this property.

However, due to its unneighbourly impact in terms of height, bulk and over-dominant appearance on no's 20 and 21 Honey Hill it is considered that the proposal would fail to comply with local plan policy BE21 which states that planning permission will not be granted for new development which by reason of its siting, bulk and proximity, would result in a significant loss in residential amenity.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

Policies BE13 and BE19 relate to character and appearance and requires that the layout and appearance of developments harmonise with the existing street scene and other features of the area (BE13) and complement or improve the amenity and character of the area (BE19). BE23 relates to amenity spaces and requires new development to retain or maintain sufficient garden space commensurate with the original dwelling and the HDAS guidelines suggest that 100 square metres of private garden area should be retained for a 4+ bedroom house.

The street scene is characterised by a mix of modern and inter-war period housing. However, they are typically of a "suburban" design with traditional brick built elevations with hip and gable end roofs. As stated above the south side of Blossom Way is included within the Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character and therefore any proposed new dwelling being within the immediate area must preserve and enhance that special character.

The existing chalet bungalow is large in comparison with the adjacent 2 storey dwelling house. It occupies much of the width of the plot with only a 1m gap on the east side. It is built up to the boundary on the west side.

The proposed new dwelling would be slightly less wide and a gap of 1m on both sides is proposed. However, it is considered that the proposed house would appear overly large in terms of its footprint given that it would be considerably larger than those of the adjacent residential properties.

It is acknowledged that the applicant has taken into consideration the comments on the previously refused scheme concerning the blandness of the design and issues with the overly large dormers. However, despite the tweaking of the design and the addition of features such as the porthole design and brick quoins fundamentally the design remains as an overly large 'box' like structure with a squat crown roof which does not generally feature within the locality as part of its character. The front gable projection is in proportion with the masonry elevations of the dwelling but would create an over dominant element within the streetscape, particularly given the topography of the road. The proportions of the roof are disproportionately shallow due to the squat 'crown' roof which appears to have been chosen to reduce the height of the new dwelling so that it would not over dominate its neighbours. Both front and rear dormers although centralised in their position on the roof slopes do not line up with the fenestration below and have a squat awkward appearance which further distract from the relatively larger proportions of the windows below. Combined with the odd appearance of the roof and dormers, the design of the dwelling remains as visually incongruous and overly-dominant and fails to harmonise or enhance the established character of the surrounding area and thus does not comply with Local Plan policies BE13 and BE19.

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

see below

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Access into the site is via two existing crossovers which allow access and egress to the site in a forward gear. Cycle storage is shown to be within a shed in the rear garden which would be a usual place to store family bicycles. The off-street vehicle parking is commensurate with the size of the proposed dwelling and would be acceptable under Local Plan Policy AM14.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

The London Plan Policy 3A.5 requires all new housing to be built to 'Lifetime Homes' standards. The Council's HDAS 'Accessible Hillingdon' also requires all new housing to be

built to 'Lifetime Homes' standards.

The Council's Access Officer has advised that the proposed house does not comply with these standards.

The plot is spacious and the garden area retained would be in excess of the HDAS: Residential Layouts guidelines which require amenity area of a minimum of 100 square metres for 4+ bedroom dwellings. It is considered that the rear garden area is more than sufficient for the amenity of the occupiers of the property in accordance with Policy BE23.

The internal room sizes and overall floor areas are larger than those as recommended by the London Plan policy 3.5 and each room offers a good outlook.

Policy BE38 seeks the retention and utilisation of topographical and landscape features of merit and the provision of new planting and landscaping wherever it is appropriate.

Although the landscape officer did not raise any objections, he stated that the boundary hedges should be protected during the construction phase. The plans indicate that there would be 1m high fencing/brick walls to the front boundaries of the property thus the assumption is that the hedge on both sides of the front garden would be removed. Hedges and trees are a prevailing feature within the locality and the removal of these soft landscaping features would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. Given also that there is currently a fairly large section of soft landscaping in the middle section of the front garden which is shown to be substantially reduced (although the Design & Access Statement suggests that at least 25% of soft landscaping would remain) and the front garden mainly to be laid to gravel, the fencing/brick walls would add to the hard landscaping creating a completely different feel to the somewhat green streetscape and this would be unacceptable under the auspices of Policy BE38.

7.6 Other Issues

The CIL liability for the proposal should it be approved has been calculated at £30,934.17.

In conclusion, despite there being revisions to the previous refused scheme, the dwelling remains overly large due to its width, height and depth and the impact that it would have on the residential amenities of the properties in Honey Hill (namely no's 20 and 21) by means of over dominating the rear and visually intrusive within the street scene. Compounded with the loss of the front hedging and the majority of the soft landscaped front garden this would create a visually stark appearance within this mostly verdant landscape which would be out of character with the visual amenities of the prevailing street scene. The proposal is contrary to Policies BE13, BE19, BE20, BE21, BE24 and BE38 of the Hillingdon local Plan, Part Two, Saved Policies (November 2012) and the recommendation is to refuse.

8. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012);
The London Plan (July 2011);
National Planning Policy Framework;
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts (July 2006);
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon (May 2013);

Contact Officer: Carol Grant

Telephone No: 01895 250230