

Report of the Corporate Director of Planning & Community Services

Address 1, 4, 5 & 6 SCHOOL APPROACH FREDORA AVENUE HAYES

Development: Single storey one-bedroom detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, involving demolition of existing 3 garage units

LBH Ref Nos: 63421/APP/2009/1411

Drawing Nos: 452
Design & Access Statement
450 D
451 C

Date Plans Received: 29/06/2009 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 29/06/2009
Date Application Valid: 07/07/2009

1. **SUMMARY**

The proposal by reason of its scale and siting would detract from the character of the area surrounding the site and would have an overbearing impact on the street scene.

The proposed dwelling would not accord with the Council's requirements relating to car parking.

Additionally, the application would be likely to block access to the Health Care centre (which is located on land adjoining the site). Given the nature of the medical use, such an access restriction which would render the Health Care centre unusable and effectively sterilise the future redevelopment potential of that adjoining site.

Refusal is recommended.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 **Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, incongruous building alignment, layout and scale, represents an over-development of the site, that would result in an overbearing, unduly intrusive, visually prominent and inappropriate form of development that would not harmonise with the existing street scene and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Layouts.

2 NON2 **Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposal fails to provide adequate parking in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards and would give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway safety being contrary to Policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would result in the loss of access to adjoining land to the Southeast which accommodates a Health Care Centre, the loss of access would make the health care centre unusable, leading to its loss, contrary to policy R11 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would result in the loss of access to adjoining land and effectively prevent any planned expansion or future development proposals on what is a large brownfield site. As such the proposal is contrary to policy BE14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

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) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (February 2008) and national guidance.

AM14	New development and car parking standards.
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
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.
CACPS	Council's Adopted Car Parking Standards (Annex 1, HUDP, Saved Policies, September 2007)
HDAS	'Residential Developments'
LPP 3A.5	London Plan Policy 3A.5 - Housing Choice
LPP 3A.17	London Plan Policy 3A.17 - Addressing the needs of London's diverse population

LPP 4B.1	London Plan Policy 4B.1 - Design principles for a compact city.
LPP 4B.5	London Plan Policy 4B.5 - Creating an inclusive environment.
AM9	Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities
LPP 3A.6	Quality of new housing provision
BE14	Development of sites in isolation
R11	Proposals that involve the loss of land or buildings used for education, social, community and health services

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises of 2 blocks of garages, parts of the rear gardens of 7 and 9 Fredora Avenue and a portion of road (known as School Approach).

Adjoining the site to the northwest are the rear gardens of 5, 7 and 9 Fredora Avenue. To the northeast, the site is adjoined by the rear gardens of 15 and 16 Pine Place.

To the southwest the site is adjoined by a two storey dwelling accommodating the care taker of Grange Park Infant and Junior School. To the southwest the site is adjoined by the Grange Park (NHS) Clinic.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

Full planning permission is sought to demolish the three garages on the north-western side of School Approach and construct a single storey dwelling, with a bedroom in the roof space.

The proposed dwelling would feature a pitched roof and a dormer to the rear (northwest). One garage on the south-eastern side of School Approach would provide parking for the proposed dwelling.

The frontage of the proposed dwelling would be set back approximately 1.6m from the footpath along School Approach.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Relevant Planning History

There have been a number of planning applications considered by the Council in relation to this site. A summary of these applications is set out below:

Planning application (Ref: 63421/APP/2007/2482) which sought approval to develop 2 x 2 bedroom semidetached dwellings on the site was refused by the Council in February 2008 for three reasons:

1. The appearance of the proposal was unacceptable and the cramped layout would have provided poor living conditions for future occupiers,
2. The proposed arrangement of habitable rooms in relation to amenity space would have resulted in an unacceptable loss of privacy,

3. The proposed dwellings were not designed to comply with Life Time Homes standards.

Planning application (Ref: 63421/APP/2008/1079) which sought approval to develop 2 x 2 bedroom maisonettes on the site was refused by the Council in October 2008 for three reasons:

1. The appearance of the proposal was unacceptable and the cramped layout would have provided poor living conditions for future occupiers,
2. Inadequate amenity space was proposed for future occupiers.
3. The proposed dwellings were not designed to comply with Life Time Homes standards.

Planning application (Ref: 63421/APP/2008/1069) which sought approval to develop 2 x 2 bedroom maisonettes on the site was refused by the Council in October 2008 for three reasons:

1. The appearance of the proposal was unacceptable and the cramped layout would have provided poor living conditions for future occupiers,
2. The proposed arrangement of habitable rooms in relation to amenity space would have resulted in an unacceptable loss of privacy,
3. The proposed dwellings were not designed to comply with Life Time Homes standards.

Planning application (Ref: 63421/APP/2008/3340) which sought approval to develop 2 x 2 bedroom semi-detached dwellings on the site was refused by the Council in February 2009 for three reasons:

1. The appearance of the proposal was unacceptable,
2. The small size and poor layout of the dwellings would have provided cramped living conditions for future occupiers,
3. Insufficient amenity space was proposed.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

- PT1.13 To seek to ensure the provision of 8000 additional dwellings in the Borough between 1 January 1987 and 31 December 2001.
- PT1.10 To seek to ensure that development does not adversely affect the amenity and the character of the area.
- PT1.16 To seek to ensure enough of new residential units are designed to wheelchair and mobility standards.

Part 2 Policies:

- AM14 New development and car parking standards.
- AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
- 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.
CACPS	Council's Adopted Car Parking Standards (Annex 1, HUDP, Saved Policies, September 2007)
HDAS	'Residential Developments'
LPP 3A.5	London Plan Policy 3A.5 - Housing Choice
LPP 3A.17	London Plan Policy 3A.17 - Addressing the needs of London's diverse population
LPP 4B.1	London Plan Policy 4B.1 - Design principles for a compact city.
LPP 4B.5	London Plan Policy 4B.5 - Creating an inclusive environment.
AM9	Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities
LPP 3A.6	Quality of new housing provision
BE14	Development of sites in isolation
R11	Proposals that involve the loss of land or buildings used for education, social, community and health services

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

FIRST ROUND OF CONSULTATION

The application was advertised on the Council's web site, a notice was erected on the site. Letters were sent to 20 near by occupiers including Grange Park Infant and Junior School and the Medical Centre (adjoining the application site to the southeast). Additionally, a letter was also sent to the Hillingdon Primary Care Trust and a notice was erected on the site.

In response to the notification, 9 submissions were received objecting to the proposal. In summary the submissions raised the following concerns:

1. The proposal would result in overlooking of rear gardens and properties at 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13 Fredora Avenue and the school caretakers dwelling,
2. The proposed appearance of the building would be out of keeping with the character of the area,
3. The proposal would exacerbate existing flooding problems and overload drainage systems,
4. The proposal would exacerbate existing on street car parking problems,

5. The proposal would increase vehicle movements and therefore pose a hazard to pedestrians using School Approach.
6. The proposal would result in the loss of portions of rear yards for 7 and 9 Fredora Avenue.
7. The small size of the site and scale of proposed development represent an overdevelopment of the site.
8. The proposal may result in restrictions to, or the loss of, access from Fredora Avenue to the school, the school care takers house and the medical clinic,
9. Impacts (e.g. dust and noise) associated with construction would adversely impact upon school children and the amenity of residents,
10. The side alley/accessway along the southern side of the proposed dwelling represents a security risk.

In addition, a petition signed by 50 persons was also received which simply raised objection to the application.

HILLINGDON PRIMARY CARE TRUST

The proposal may result in restrictions to, or the loss of, access from Fredora Avenue to the medical clinic,

THAMES WATER

There are public sewers crossing the site. No building works are to be permitted within 3m of the pipes without Thames Water approval.

SECOND ROUND OF CONSULTATION

In response to concerns raised by the Council in relation to disabled access, and car parking, the Applicant submitted revised plans. These revised plans were renotified on 23 November 2009.

In response to the second round of consultation, a further letter was received from the Hillingdon Primary Care Trust (NHS) which raised the following concerns:

- (i) Submitted plans state that there is no right of access across the application site to the health care centre. The Primary Care Trust (PCT) is concerned that access to the clinic could be cut off by this development. This would isolate the health care centre, and prevent its use as a health centre.
- (ii) The PCT is developing a health care strategy for Hillingdon that will require more services to be delivered from their existing buildings. The clinic adjacent to the application site is likely to be required to take on additional services as this strategy is realised. This planning application if successful is likely to prevent the PCT from developing the site further. The access issue may lead to the closure of the health centre.

Internal Consultees

HIGHWAYS ENGINEER

The Council's car parking standards allow for a maximum of two spaces. This maximum level of provision is appropriate where on street parking is limited and under pressure and where the public transport accessibility level (PTAL) is low.

The site is located in an area with a PTAL of 2 (on a scale of 1 to 6 where 1 is low and 6 is high) and on street parking is limited and under considerable pressure. In this case 2 car parking spaces should be provided.

The applicant revised he plans to indicate provision of 2 car parking spacves, in a stacked arrangement. The second parking space indicated in the revised plans would encroach over the

footway, and is not considered acceptable.

Traffic generation from the proposed use would not cause any unacceptable impacts on the highway. The proposal would effectively remove three vehicle crossovers and enable a continuous pedestrian foot path to be provided along School Approach. This would ensure separation of pedestrians and cars, improving pedestrian safety.

TREES AND LANDSCAPE OFFICER

Raise no objection subject to imposition of standard condition TL5 and TL6 on any planning permission.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION UNIT

Raise no objection subject to imposition of a condition on any consent to ensure areas of landscaping and garden soils are tested to ensure that they are suitable for use.

WASTE AND RECYCLING CO-ORDINATOR

No objection subject to the imposition on any consent of conditions to ensure dwelling has adequate refuse storage facilities and a food waste grinder in kitchen.

ACCESS OFFICER

Raise no objection.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

The proposal relates to the construction of a residential dwelling in an established residential area. The existing garages are not required to be provided as garages as part of a legal agreement or planning condition.

There are no objections to the proposal in principle.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

The site is located in an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2. London Plan recommended guidelines for sites with this level of PTAL indicate that a density of between 150-250 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) or 50-90 units per hectare (u/ha) is appropriate.

The application site has an area of approximately 230sqm (including the road), as such the proposal represents a density of 86hr/h or 43 u/ha. Taking into account the road, the proposal would be in keeping with the guidance set out in the London Plan.

A portion of the site forms part of the road leading to the care takers house, the medical centre and school. If the road is not taken into account, then the proposed density would equate to 78 u/ha or 156 hr/ha, again within guidance set out in the London plan.

7.03 Impact on archaeology/CAs/LBs or Areas of Special Character

The site is not located in a Conservation Area, nor is it near to any buildings of historical importance.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not relevant in this case.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

The site is not located in or adjacent to the Green Belt.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

The proposed dwelling would be set approximately 4m from the side elevation of the school caretakers dwelling (southwest of the site), and approximately 4m forward of the caretakers dwelling (leaving a 1.5m back between the front of the proposed dwelling and the footpath).

The layout and siting of the proposal (4m forward of the existing caretakers dwelling) would result in an incongruous building alignment, which is not considered to harmonise with the existing street scene, nor is it considered to improve the character of the area contrary to policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies) 2007.

The concerns outlined above are considered to have been brought about by the very small size of the useable site area and the scale of development proposed.

7.08 Impact on neighbours

Policy BE20 requires new residential developments to be designed so as to ensure adequate daylight and sunlight is maintained to existing dwellings.

Policy BE24 states that the development should be designed to protect the privacy of future occupiers and their neighbours.

Section 5.30 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) states that the protection of privacy, particularly of habitable rooms and external private amenity space, is an important feature of residential amenity.

Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) provides further guidance in respect of these matters, stating in particular that the distance between habitable room windows should not be less than 21m, and that a 15m setback should be maintained to the rear of surrounding properties.

The proposed building is oriented to the front of the site facing the access road and would be sited at least 18m from the main rear elevations of adjoining properties in Fredora Avenue to the north of the site.

It would also be sited more than 21m from the rear elevations of properties facing Pine Place, on the north-eastern side of the site. It would be set approximately 4m from the side elevation of the neighbouring care takers dwelling.

The proposed building would be located approximately 4m forward of the front wall of the School care takers dwelling and 1.6m back from its rear wall. The proposed building would not breach a 45° line of sight taken from first floor habitable room windows of the adjoining care takers dwelling. There would be no windows proposed in its flank walls that may result in overlooking of habitable rooms in the neighbouring dwelling.

The application would not result in an unacceptable loss of light to existing dwellings. Nor would the proposal result in overlooking of habitable rooms.

It would be possible for overlooking of the rear gardens of the neighbouring caretakers dwelling and dwellings fronting Fredora Avenue to occur from the first floor bedroom window of the proposed dwelling.

In this case, the nature of residential development along Ferdora Avenue is such that

overlooking of rear gardens is an integral feature of these properties. Given this and the size of the rear gardens of properties fronting Fredora Avenue, it is not considered that refusal of the application could be sustained for this reason

The alignment of the proposed unit to the school house is such that there would be overlooking of a small part of the rear garden of this property.

It should be noted that the five previous schemes proposed at the application site would have resulted in greater levels of overlooking of rear garden areas. In determining each of the previous applications, the Council did not raise objection to overlooking of rear garden areas.

Given that the level of overlooking from the current scheme would be less than that from earlier schemes (to which the Council did not raise an objection in relation of overlooking of garden areas), it is not considered that refusal of the current application could be sustained for this reason.

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

The Council's HDAS (SPD) 'Residential Layouts' provides recommended standards relating to floor space. It suggests that a 1-bedroom house maintain a minimum gross internal floor space of 50sqm. The proposed dwelling would have a floor area of approximately 68sqm in line with Council design criteria.

Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies) 2007 requires that new residential buildings should provide external amenity space, which is usable in terms of its shape and siting. The Council's design guide 'Residential Layouts' specifies a minimum amount of 40sqm of amenity space for a 1 bedroom house. In this case 60sqm of amenity space is proposed, no objection is raised to the proposal in this regard.

7.10 Traffic impact, Car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Parking for the proposed development would be provided in one of the three retained garages opposite the proposed building. The applicant revised the plans to provide a second parking space immediately in front of the garage (in a stacked arrangement).

To understand if parking provision was acceptable, the application was referred to the Council's Highways Engineer who raised objection to the second parking space, noting that it would encroach over the foot way, and as such was not acceptable.

The application is not considered to comply with Policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and is unacceptable.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

As previously stated, there is concern that the siting of the proposed dwelling, coupled with the small size of the site would mean that the proposal would not harmonise with the existing street scene and surrounding context and would be unduly intrusive, visually prominent and is considered to be an inappropriate form of development.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal fails to respect the established character of the area, contrary to Policy 4B.3 of the London Plan, Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and relevant design guidance.

The plans indicate that a small pathway would be provided along the side of the proposed

dwelling and the boundary with the property to the southwest (the school caretaker's property). To ensure that this pathway is not subject to antisocial behaviour, it is considered that a condition should be imposed on any permission granted requiring that the gate providing access to the pathway be moved such that it is in line with the front of the house.

7.12 Disabled access

The application was referred to the Council's Access Officer who advises that the internal layout shown on the revised plan complies with Life Time Homes standards. As such no objection is raised to the proposal in this regard.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not relevant in this case.

7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

The application was referred to the Council's Landscape and Tree Officer who raised no objection subject to imposition of standard conditions TL5 and TL6 on any planning permission.

7.15 Sustainable waste management

The application is for a single residential dwelling. There is considered to be adequate space within the site to accommodate refuse and bicycle parking facilities.

As the scheme is for a single dwelling and not flats, no objection is raised with regard to waste storage facilities.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not relevant in this case.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

Subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions on any consent granted, there would be no objection to the scheme in terms of flooding or drainage.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

No relevant in this case.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

With regard to issues raised in relation to flooding, the site is not located in an area identified as being at risk of flooding, and while Thames Water have made it clear that approval would be required to ensure drainage proposals were appropriate and to prevent any damage to the sewer system, these issues could be dealt with adequately through the imposition of an appropriate condition, and are not considered to warrant refusal of the application.

Equally, concerns in relation to potential impacts during the construction phase could be dealt with adequately through the imposition of an appropriate condition on any consent granted, and these concerns are not considered to warrant refusal of the application.

In response to the second round of consultation (relating to amended plans) the following concerns were raised by the Hillingdon PCT:

- (i) The plans state that the surgery does not have any right of access over the land.
- (ii) If access to the surgery were to be blocked, the surgery would have to close;
- (iii) There is no other accessway to the health clinic, if access to the surgery were to be

blocked, the site would be isolated and its future development would be prevented.

This is considered in detail in Section 7.22 of this report. There is considerable concern that any restriction of access to the adjoining site to the southeast (which accommodates a Health Care Centre) would isolate that land and lead to the closure of the medical centre, contrary to policies BE14 and R11 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

Other responses to the notification of the application raised a number of other concerns which have either been addressed in the body of the report, could be dealt with by way of a condition on any permission granted or are not material planning considerations.

7.20 Planning obligations

Not relevant in this case.

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Note relevant in this case.

7.22 Other Issues

Policy R11 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) states the following:

"R11 the local planning authority will assess proposals which involve the loss of land or buildings used or whose last authorised use was for education, social, community and health services by taking into account whether:-

- (i) there is a reasonable possibility that refusal of permission for an alternative use would lead to the retention and continued use of the existing facility;
- (ii) adequate accessible alternative provision is available to meet the foreseeable needs of the existing and potential users of the facility to be displaced;
- (iii) the proposed alternative use accords with the other policies of this plan and contributes to its objectives."

The plans submitted to the Council for approval are annotated with the following statement:

"ROADWAY This section of which belongs to our client and is part of this planning application Note School, Surgery and Caretakers residence do NOT HAVE ANY RIGHT OF ACCESS OVER THIS LAND."

Furthermore, this annotation falls within the land covered by the red line boundary (i.e. land forming part of the planning application).

There are a number of access ways to the school. However, access to the Health Care Centre is only afforded via School Approach.

Should the access to the land accommodating the Health Care Centre be closed, patients, ambulances etc would not be able to reach the centre. The Health Centre would become unusable and would close. In this regard, the notations on the plans are of considerable concern.

Given the potential for this planning proposal to prevent access to the Health Care centre (and result in the loss of the surgery), the application is not considered to accord with policy R11.

Policy BE14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) states the following:

"BE14 permission will not be granted for the development of sites in isolation if the design fails to safeguard the satisfactory re-development of adjoining sites which have development potential."

The only access road to the health care centre is across the application site. If access was to the health care centre were to be blocked, then the expansion of services within the Health Centre as part of a Hillingdon wide health strategy (as has been indicated as being potentially needed by the PCT) would be prevented.

Given the potential for the subject application to isolate and sterilise the future redevelopment of the adjoining site (i.e. the land accommodating the health care centre) the application is not considered to accord with policy BE14.

8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

When making their decision, Members must have regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies. This will enable them to make an informed decision in respect of an application.

In addition Members should note that the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA 1998) makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights. Decisions by the Committee must take account of the HRA 1998. Therefore, Members need to be aware of the fact that the HRA 1998 makes the European Convention on Human Rights (the Convention) directly applicable to the actions of public bodies in England and Wales. The specific parts of the Convention relevant to planning matters are 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).

Article 6 deals with procedural fairness. If normal committee procedures are followed, it is unlikely that this article will be breached.

Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 are not absolute rights and infringements of these rights protected under these are allowed in certain defined circumstances, for example where required by law. However any infringement must be proportionate, which means it must achieve a fair balance between the public interest and the private interest infringed and must not go beyond what is needed to achieve its objective.

Article 14 states that the rights under the Convention shall be secured without discrimination on grounds of 'sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status'.

9. Observations of the Director of Finance

10. CONCLUSION

The proposal by reason of its scale and siting would detract from the character of the area surrounding the site and would have an overbearing impact on the street scene.

The proposed dwelling would not accord with the Council's requirements relating to car parking.

Additionally, the application would be likely to block access to the Health Care centre (which is located on land adjoining the site). Given the nature of the medical use, such an access restriction which would render the Health Care centre unusable and effectively sterilise the future redevelopment potential of that adjoining site.

11. Reference Documents


Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, Saved Policies September 2007, Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statements (July 2006), including Accessible Hillingdon and Residential Layouts, and the London Plan (February 2008)

Contact Officer: Matthew Duigan

Telephone No: 01895 250230



Notes

 Site boundary

For identification purposes only.

This copy has been made by or with the authority of the Head of Committee Services pursuant to section 47 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (the Act). Unless the Act provides a relevant exception to copyright.

© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. London Borough of Hillingdon 100019283 2009

Site Address	
1,4,5 and 6 School Approach Fredora Avenue Hayes	
Planning Application Ref:	Scale
63421/APP/2009/1411	1:1,250
Planning Committee	Date
Central and South	November 2009

LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON

Planning & Community Services

Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111



HILLINGDON
LONDON