

likely different frontage treatments of the two properties in the future, would no longer read as a subordinate extension to No. 111 Parkfield Crescent. As such, the proposed attached house would appear as an unduly cramped and incongruous addition within the street scene, resulting in the formation of an unbalanced and awkward terrace, which would be compounded by the introduction of a front porch which would appear to straddle both front elevations fails to harmonise with the more spacious character of the semi-detached properties that characterise the area. The proposal would therefore harm the visual amenities of the street scene, contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and Hillingdon's HDAS: 'Residential Layouts'.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed attached house, by reason of its restricted internal floor area, would fail to provide a suitable standard of residential amenity for future occupiers and not be capable of satisfying Lifetime Homes standards, contrary to Policy BE19 of the Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), Policies 3.5 and 3.8 of the London Plan (July 2011), the Mayo's Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance: Housing (December 2011) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents 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) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (July 2011) and national guidance.

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)
LPP 3.4	(2011) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2011) Housing Choice
LPP 5.2	(2011) Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 5.7	(2011) Renewable energy
LPP 5.13	(2011) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.15	(2011) Water use and supplies
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.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE8	Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
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

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

Parkfield Crescent forms a residential crescent on the eastern edge of the Borough which is accessed from Field End Road. The application site is located on the eastern side of Parkfield Crescent, some 15m to the north of a right angle bend in the road and forms one of a pair of semi-detached properties. The two storey extension/building has been substantially erected on site, together with a rear dormer to the main roof of the original dwelling. The other semi-detached property, No. 109 is sited to the north and has a single storey rear conservatory. The Borough boundary runs along the rear boundary of the site and is adjoined at the rear by a service road which lies within the London Borough of Harrow. The site forms part of the 'developed area' as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks planning permission to use an attached two storey side extension/building as a one-bedroom house.

This scheme differs from a previous application to use an approved two storey side extension as a self-contained house in that the number of bedrooms has been reduced from two to one, with the first floor front bedroom now shown as a first floor bathroom, a 1.55m wide, 1.28m deep and 2.39m high flat roof porch has been added to the front of the proposed dwelling and one off-street car parking spaces are shown to the proposed and retained houses, both in the front gardens and at the end of the rear gardens. Although they are all marked as existing, the spaces have not been installed at the rear. There has also been minor alteration to the alignment of the new boundary between NO. 111 Parkfield Crescent and the proposed dwelling.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Relevant Planning History

An application for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and single storey rear extension with two rooflights, involving the demolition of an existing detached side garage and rear extension was approved on 10/11/12 (68057/APP/2011/2238).

This was followed by an application to use the two storey attached extension/building as a separate two bedroom dwelling (68057/APP/2011/2934). This was refused on 20th March 2012 for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development, with the introduction of a separate front door, subdivision of the plot, separate parking space and likely different frontage treatments of the two properties in the future, would no longer read as a subordinate extension to No. 111 Parkfield Crescent. As such, the proposed attached house would appear as an unduly cramped and incongruous addition within the street scene, resulting in the formation of an unbalanced and awkward terrace, which fails to harmonise with the more spacious character of the semi-detached properties that characterise the area. The proposal would therefore harm the visual amenities of the street scene, contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and Hillingdon's HDAS: 'Residential Layouts'.
2. The proposed attached house, by reason of its restricted internal floor area, would fail to provide a suitable standard of residential amenity for future occupiers, contrary to Policy BE19 of the Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and Policy 3.5 and Table 3.3 of the London Plan (July 2011) and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: 'Accessible Hillingdon'.
3. The proposed house would fail to satisfy Lifetime Homes standards and as such would fail to adequately meet the needs of disabled persons, contrary to Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (July 2011) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Accessible Hillingdon, January 2010.
4. The development fails to provide adequate off-street parking for the new dwelling and the existing house at No. 111 Parkfield Crescent. As such, it is considered that the proposal would be likely to give rise to additional demand for on-street parking in an area which is poorly served by public transport. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's Adopted Car Parking Standards.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

- | | |
|--------|---|
| PT1.10 | 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. |

PT1.39 To seek where appropriate planning obligations to achieve benefits to the community related to the scale and type of development proposed.

Part 2 Policies:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)
LPP 3.4	(2011) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2011) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2011) Housing Choice
LPP 5.2	(2011) Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
LPP 5.3	(2011) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 5.7	(2011) Renewable energy
LPP 5.13	(2011) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.15	(2011) Water use and supplies
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.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE8	Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
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

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

22 neighbouring properties were consulted and 11 responses have been received, making the following comments:-

- (i) The proposal, using the extension/building as a separate dwelling would appear cramped and out of keeping with the spacious character of the rest of the street which comprises all semi-detached houses, with the exception of one detached house. This application, if approved, would create an unbalanced 3 house terrace which would be an eyesore,
- (ii) The proposed porch with a front door for the existing house and a side door for the new house is contrived and the new house will still look unsightly and out of keeping with existing properties on Parkfield Crescent,
- (iii) Proposal would overlook neighbouring house at 109 Parkfield Crescent,
- (iv) Main difference to plans is that the number of bedrooms has been reduced from two to one, but this can easily be increased back to two if developer gains permission for these two properties. The developer has also installed a dormer into the loft space of the original house, increasing the number of bedrooms without permission and effectively affording the same number of bedrooms as previously,
- (v) House would still only provide 50sqm, which represents a serious shortfall in satisfying minimum standards of the London Plan and would not afford an adequate quality of life for its future occupiers,
- (vi) On street parking is limited and there is not sufficient space to allow extra cars to park. The developer has suggested that off-street parking will be provided within the existing plot of 111 Parkfield Crescent, but there is not enough space at the front of the site, suggesting that the developer intends to use the rear of the back garden which has been cleared of trees, bushes and a large mound without permission. This would entail accessing the site from the rear service road which is within the London Borough of Harrow which might soon be gated and I have been advised that this would also require separate planning permission which has not been granted,
- (vii) Application form is incorrect as this states that there are no trees or hedges on or adjacent to the proposed development site and/or that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character. Developer has destroyed an earth bank and trees, adversely affecting the character of the area and removing bird and wildlife habitat,
- (viii) No site notice has been posted on any lamp post or public place,
- (ix) When constructing the loft conversion (which I still do not know if permission was required for this or not) the builders have caused damage to my property on two occasions, with the knocking through of walls which could be a fire risk,
- (x) Proposal will exacerbate existing problems with the sewers blocking,
- (xi) The site is untidy and skip has not been emptied for weeks and is overflowing with rubbish spilling into street,
- (xii) Previous officer's report indicated that the Council's Planning Enforcement and Anti-social behavioural team would be investigating any breaches, but no action has been taken,
- (xiii) Proposal would de-value neighbouring property as it would become an end of terrace property,
- (xiv) Application seems no different from last application that was turned down by the Council,
- (xv) Latest site plan shows two existing car parking spaces at the end of the back gardens with access via the rear 'access road'. Before work commenced on current extension, there was a 20m foot high boundary hedge and fence across full width of the original rear garden of No. 111 which was cut down by the builders,
- (xvi) Access road is solely for use by residents of Torbay Road, within adjoining London Borough of Harrow. No other properties in Parkfield Crescent have any rear access for parking and I doubt if Harrow Council would be happy with non-residents using their facilities. My understanding was that access only needed temporarily for the delivery of building materials and would be closed off again once work complete,
- (xvii) Use of rear access will make neighbourhood less safe,

- (xviii) Use of rear access will result in disturbance and reduce amenity,
- (xx) Porch extension involves tight right hand bend behind the door so would not be wheelchair accessible,
- (xxi) Front door has already been built in different position,
- (xxii) Pavement is used to dump rubbish,
- (xxiii) Application should be considered at committee.

Cllr Shirley Harper-O'Neill: Requests that this application is presented to committee.

South Ruislip Residents' Association: No response.

London Borough of Harrow: No response

MoD Safeguarding - RAF Northolt: There are no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

Internal Consultees

Access Officer:

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 January 2010.

The proposal dwelling would be acceptable for visitors using wheelchairs, however, to incorporate all 16 Lifetime home standards (e.g. provision for a through floor lift or temporary bed space) into the proposal would likely result in a home with insufficient Gross Internal Floor Area.

The Lifetime Home Standards could not reasonably be incorporated within the proposed self-contained house.

Conclusion: Unacceptable

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

This is an established residential area where there would be no objection in principle to the creation of additional residential units, subject to the scheme satisfying normal development control criteria. These are dealt with in the various sections of the report.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan (July 2011) advises that Boroughs should ensure that development proposals maximise housing output having regard to local context, design principles, density guidance (contained in Table 3.2 of the London Plan) and public transport accessibility. Table 3.2 identifies a density matrix to establish a strategic framework for appropriate densities at different locations.

The density matrix is only of limited value when looking at small scale infill development such as that proposed within this application. In such cases, it is often more appropriate to consider how the scheme harmonises with its surroundings. However, the site is located within a suburban area and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1a (where 6 is the most accessible and 1 the least). Using the Mayor's guidance, taking the smallest average habitable room unit size of 2.7 - 3.0, the matrix recommends a density of 50 - 75 u/ha and 150-200 hr/ha. This proposal equates to a density of 68 u/ha and 136 hr/ha, which is below the Mayor's habitable room guidance.

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

Not applicable to this site.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not applicable to this application.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

The site is not located within or close to the Green Belt and therefore no Green Belt issues are raised by this application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

Parkfield Crescent forms a residential crescent which has a fairly uniform character, mainly comprised of semi-detached properties with a defined front building line and similar plot widths, separated by shared drives which give vehicular access to garages in their rear gardens. No. 111 Parkfield Crescent is one of the more unusual properties in the street in that it has a wider frontage which allowed a detached garage to be provided at the side of the house.

It was previously noted in the officer's committee report on the previous application (68057/APP/2011/2934) that the proposed attached house would have an identical footprint, bulk and overall design as compared to the two storey extension approved on 10/11/2011 (68057/APP/2011/2238), with the only external difference to the building being to the fenestration detail and door openings. The extension was set back at first floor level and therefore considered to have an acceptable subordinate appearance and was set off the side boundary by 1m to leave an appropriate undeveloped gap in accordance with Policy BE22 of the saved UDP.

However, as a new attached house, it was previously considered that the two storey building would no longer be read as an extension, with boundary fencing marking the boundaries, different treatment of the front elevations and gardens, proposed inclusion of an additional front door, separate parking provision etc. The original 9.3m plot width would be sub-divided into 4.8m and 4.5m wide plots. This compares to the relatively uniform typical plot width along this part of Parkfield Crescent of 6 to 7m. Also, the semi-detached houses have typical front elevation widths of 4.9 to 5.5m as compared to the 3.4m width of the new house. As such, it was considered that as a new house, the development would appear unduly cramped within the street scene, with a cluttered appearance, given the siting and proximity of the front doors. Furthermore, the proposal would introduce a terrace into Parkfield Crescent. It was considered that the resultant terrace would have an un-balanced appearance and taken together with the very cramped appearance of the new attached house, the proposal would appear as an incongruous and awkward addition to the street scene, detrimental to its visual amenities.

The current proposal attempts to overcome the first reason for refusal of the previous scheme with the addition of a front porch in the hope that this would help to conceal the appearance of the use as two separate dwellings by hiding one of the front doors. Also, in a covering letter, the agent suggests that a condition could be attached which would prevent the subdivision of the plot at the front.

The porch would incorporate the front door into the proposed house on its side. It is considered that it would only be partially successful as the two doors would still be seen in close proximity to one another and still discernible as such from the south. The porch would also appear as an awkward addition as it partially encroaches upon the main front elevation of No. 111 Parkfield Crescent. Although a condition could prevent the physical subdivision of the front gardens, with different occupiers, the front gardens would be likely

to take on different characters, readily identifying the two separate dwellings which would accentuate the cramped nature of the proposal. Furthermore, with separate owners, it is likely that the external appearance of the two front elevations would alter and differ over time, again accentuating the narrow, incongruous frontage of the proposed dwelling. Unlike a restriction on the subdivision of the front gardens, it is considered that a condition to control the maintenance and treatment of the frontages of the separate properties would not be enforceable.

The use of two storey side extension as a separate dwelling and the proposed porch would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to policies BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Hillingdon HDAS: 'Residential Layouts'. The first reason for refusal of the previous application has not been fully overcome.

7.08 Impact on neighbours

As previously considered, the building works have already been granted permission as an extension. As such, the impact of the development in terms of potential for overdominance and loss of sunlight have already been considered and found to be acceptable. As regards the potential for overlooking, the only material difference between the proposed building works is a side window in the new house which would serve a bathroom. However, as this would be at ground floor level, any potential for the loss of privacy to the neighbouring property at No. 113 could be mitigated with suitable boundary fencing which could be controlled by condition.

As regards the potential for additional noise and general disturbance, it is considered that there would be no significant difference between the plot being used as one large house as compared to two smaller houses. As such, the scheme complies with Policies BE20, BE21, BE24 and OE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

In order for new residential units to provide an adequate standard of residential accommodation, the London Plan (July 2011) and the Council's HDAS: 'Accessible Hillingdon' establish minimum floor space standards. However, these documents do not include a standard for a one-bedroom house, with minimum floor areas only specified for two or more bedroom houses. The nearest comparable standard is for a one-bedroom flat, which should provide a minimum internal floor space of 50sqm. The internal floor area of the proposed house is 52.2sqm. Furthermore, all the proposed habitable rooms would provide adequate outlook and natural lighting for the future occupiers of the property. As regards amenity space, both properties would provide 63sqm of rear amenity space which is adequate to satisfy the Council's standards for a 2 to 3 bedroom house.

The Mayor has also published Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance: Housing (December 2011) which provides more detailed guidance and specifies that the combined minimum floor area for the living, dining and kitchen spaces for a two person unit should be 23sqm and the minimum floor area of a double bedroom should be 12sqm. The proposal, with its kitchen and lounge would have a combined area of 15.3sqm and the first floor bedroom would be 10.4sqm. As such, the proposed space would not satisfy the Mayor's guidelines.

Furthermore, Policy 3.8 of the London Plan (July 2011) advises that all new housing development should be built in accordance with Lifetime homes standards. Further guidance on these standards is provided within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Accessible Hillingdon, January 2010.

The Council's Access Officer advises that although the proposed dwelling would be acceptable for visitors using wheelchairs, to incorporate all 16 Lifetime home standards into the proposal such as provision for a through floor lift or a temporary bed space, there would be insufficient floor space remaining to allow the proposed property to provide adequate internal floor space to afford an adequate standard of residential amenity.

Therefore, Lifetime Home Standards could not reasonably be incorporated within the proposed self-contained house. As such, the proposal fails to provide an adequate standard of residential amenity for its future occupiers and fails to satisfy Lifetime Homes standards, contrary to Policies 3.8 of the London Plan, Policy BE19 of the Council's Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), the Mayor's Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance: Housing (December 2011) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Accessible Hillingdon, January 2010. The second and third reasons for refusal of the previous application have not been fully overcome.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

This is an area that has a low PTAL score of 1a (where 6 represents the highest level of accessibility and 1 the lowest).

The application shows an off-street car parking space in the front gardens of the proposed dwelling and the retained house and shows existing spaces (1 per dwelling) at the end of each of the rear gardens, accessed from the adjoining rear service road to give a total of 2 spaces per unit, in compliance with the Council's maximum off-street car parking standards. Of these, it is only the front garden spaces that have already been installed.

There is nothing to suggest that the proposed spaces in the rear garden would be prevented from being accessed from the adjoining service road. The proposed house would therefore have adequate off-street parking to satisfy the Council's maximum parking standards.

Although 111 Parkfield Crescent is not included within the application site boundary and therefore no control could be exercised to secure the implementation of the second space at the rear, it is considered that the scheme has demonstrated that adequate space could be available for a second space if the occupiers had need.

It is therefore considered that the scheme complies with Policy AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's Adopted Car Parking Standards and has overcome the fourth reason for refusal of the previous application.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

- Private amenity space

Design guidance requires two and three bedroom houses to provide a minimum of 60sqm of usable amenity space. The plans show that No. 111 Parkfield Avenue would retain 79sqm of its rear garden and the new house would have 74sqm of rear amenity space. Furthermore, it is considered that this amenity space would be usable, receiving adequate levels of sunlight.

7.12 Disabled access

This is dealt with in Section 7.09 above.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application, given the nature of the proposed development.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

It appears that a number of trees have been removed to the rear of the site, but trees at the rear of gardens on Parkfield Crescent are generally immature, self-seeded, often multi-stemmed and have no great amenity value. The Council's Tree Officer has previously advised that these trees would not/would not have constrained the development.

Extensive hardstanding in the front gardens of properties is characteristic of Parkfield Crescent. A condition could have been added to ensure that a front garden landscaping scheme would have been submitted, had the application not of been recommended for refusal. As such, the scheme complies with Policy BE38 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

7.15 Sustainable waste management

There is no requirement for proposals for houses with individual curtilages to identify where refuse will be stored as this would be largely a matter for the new occupiers. However, the submitted plans do show that there would be available space within the front garden with one off-street parking space.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Had the application not of been recommended for refusal, a condition could have been added to any permission, requiring details of a scheme to demonstrate how Code 3 for Sustainable Homes could be satisfied.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

The application does not lie within an area prone to flooding. A condition could have been added to any grant of permission to ensure a sustainable drainage scheme was provided.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

This application raises no specific noise or air quality issues.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The matters raised in the consultation responses have mainly been dealt with in the main report. The only exceptions to this are:- point (iv) and (xxi) which are noted, the display of a notice on site is not a statutory requirement (point viii), points (ix), (x), (xi), (xiii) and (xxii) do not raise specific planning matters, as regards point (xiii), this matter is on-going and as regards points (xvii and xviii), the use of the service road by two additional properties is not likely to have any significant greater impact on crime/incidence of anti-social behaviour and disturbance than current usage.

7.20 Planning Obligations

Given the scale and nature of the scheme, there would be no requirement for a contribution in accordance with Policy R17 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

The site is subject to an enforcement investigation.

7.22 Other Issues

There are no other relevant planning issues raised by this application. Although some local residents have raised planning enforcement concerns these are not matters which can be addressed through this planning report.

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

Although the two storey attached development is acceptable as an extension, it is not acceptable as an attached house. It has been designed as a subordinate extension and as an attached house, the development appears unduly cramped in a road which has a reasonably uniform character, mainly comprising semi-detached houses of a similar size and more spacious siting, separated by their shared drives. This would be compounded by the introduction of the proposed porch which would appear as an awkward addition on an unbalanced terrace which would further accentuate the incongruous addition into the road. Furthermore, the house does not satisfy the Mayor's draft minimum floor space standards for living dining and kitchen space and bedroom space and the Access Officer advises that the floor space would be restricted if all 16 Lifetime Homes standards were implemented.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

11. Reference Documents

NPPF (March 2012)
London Plan (July 2011)
Mayor's Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance: Housing (December 2011)
Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007)
HDAS: Residential Layouts (July 2007) & Accessible Hillingdon (January 2010)
Consultation responses

Contact Officer: Richard Phillips

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 and database rights 2012 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address

**LFPO 111 Parkfield Crescent,
Ruislip**

Planning Application Ref:

68057/APP/2012/868

Planning Committee

North

Scale

1:1,250

Date

**July
2012**

**LONDON BOROUGH
OF HILLINGDON**
Planning,
Environment, Education
& Community Services

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON