

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 111 PARKFIELD CRESCENT RUISLIP

Development: Use of part two, part single storey side and rear extension and part of ground floor of original house as a self contained dwelling, erection of a porch, internal and external alterations and provision of associated parking and amenity space (Part Retrospective Application).

LBH Ref Nos: 68057/APP/2012/3216

Drawing Nos: Location Plan to Scale 1:1250
12/100/2
12/100/1
12/100/3
12/100/5
12/100/4 Rev. A

Date Plans Received: 28/12/2012 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**
Date Application Valid: 10/01/2013

1. **SUMMARY**

This application seeks permission to use an attached two-storey extension/building currently nearing completion at the side of No. 111 Parkfield Crescent as a separate one-bedroom dwelling. This application follows two previous applications for a similar subdivision, the last one of which was dismissed at appeal, to use the extension as a two and then a one-bedroomed dwelling (68057/APP/2011/2934 and 2012/686 refer). This scheme mainly differs from the previous application in that part of the ground floor area of the extended original house would be incorporated into the new attached dwelling and the floor space has been re-configured, involving the blocking up of a rear window and rooflight and new windows in the side, a porch is shown covering both front doors and the front garden has been re-designed.

It is considered that the proposed floor space is now acceptable to afford a suitable standard of residential amenity so as to overcome one of the Inspector's previous concerns.

However, the proposed porch is not considered to constitute permitted development and it would appear as an awkward addition that would disrupt the subordinate appearance of the side extension and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 **Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed development, by reason of the siting and roof design of the porch, would fail to integrate with the subordinate design of the side extension to which it would be attached. As such, the porch would appear as an awkward addition within the street

scene and fundamentally alter the subordinate appearance of the side extension, resulting in an unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached houses, detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene, contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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.

NPPF1

NPPF6

NPPF7

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,

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

Parkfield Crescent forms a residential crescent on the eastern edge of the Borough which is accessed at its northern and southern ends 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 erected on site, and a porch is currently under construction. The original hipped roof of No. 111 Parkfield Crescent has also been converted to a gable end, including the installation of a rear dormer. 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 gated service road which lies within the London Borough of Harrow.

Parkfield Crescent 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 did form 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 which has now been demolished to make way for the extension.

The site forms part of the 'developed area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application is a third application seeking planning permission to use an attached two storey side extension/building as a one-bedroom house. The works include the provision of associated parking and amenity space, together with internal and external alterations.

This scheme differs from the last application (68057/APP/2011/868) considered at appeal in the following respects:-

1. The ground floor of the proposed new unit would be enlarged by utilising more of the ground floor of the original property which has been extended at the rear by re-positioning the ground floor party wall at the rear, involving the re-configuration of the ground floor layout of the properties and alterations to its fenestration, with the removal of a rear ground floor window and rooflight from the single storey rear extension.
2. The ground and first floor layout of the proposed new unit has been altered with the staircase being moved to the front of the property. A small single pane ground floor side window has been increased in size to a double pane window and a new single pane window has been introduced to the first floor side elevation above,
3. The porch has been reduced in depth but increased in width and now incorporates a hipped roof. This would now be shared with a single door on the front, enclosing the front doors of the existing and proposed properties,
4. The front garden layout has been re-configured, with the existing and proposed properties having an off-street parking space in front of them, but now involves a single shared path which would straddle the boundary between the properties, leading to the

porch and landscaping on the boundary of No. 113 and either side of the path.
5. Two parking spaces at the end of each rear garden have been omitted.

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 due to design concerns with the separate use of the plot, inadequate internal floor area, failure to comply with Lifetime Homes standards and inadequate provision for off-street parking for the new and retained house at No. 111 Parkfield Crescent.

This was followed by an application to use the extension as a one-bedroom dwelling, erection of a single storey porch, associated car parking and amenity space (68057/APP/2012/868) which was dismissed at appeal on the 26/11/12.

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.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

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:

NPPF1

NPPF6

NPPF7

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

23 neighbouring properties have been consulted on this scheme and a planning notice has been displayed on site. 9 residents have responded, making the following comments:-

- (i) This is the third attempt to gain permission for an additional unit at this address after the North Area Planning Committee had unanimously rejected a very similar application (68057/APP/2012/868) which was also dismissed at appeal as the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would not provide adequate living conditions for the occupiers. There does not appear to be any real change since last application was rejected and so this should be rejected again,
- (ii) The porch will have two doors and its size is totally out of keeping with the other houses in the street,
- (iii) Single porch covering entrances to both houses would not disguise the fact that the development would be for two houses which would be unsightly and a very small house would not in keeping with existing family properties on Parkfield Crescent,
- (iv) The development is already an eyesore as it now overlooks the access road and rear gardens in Torbay Road due to the removal of trees and bank which would have obscured the development,
- (v) The main difference to the plans from the previously rejected application are that the developer has reduced the bedrooms from two to one in the part of the development which is new, but a dormer room extension has now been built in the loft space of the existing property at 111 Parkfield Crescent effectively increasing the bedrooms from two to three bedrooms which affords him the same number of bedrooms as previous,

- (vi) When planning permission was agreed for the building as an extension under planning application 68057/APP/2011/2238, the side elevation facing No. 113 Parkfield Crescent had no windows. The new application now includes two windows which will reduce our privacy,
- (vii) The two side windows may prejudice prospects of developing adjoining property,
- (viii) Knocking down part of what was the outside wall of the existing house at 111 Parkfield Crescent, taking room space from the existing house and utilising this to increase the floor space in the new property does not sound legal and would dramatically reduce the room sizes of the existing house and be impractical, with very poor room sizes to the occupiers of both properties with No. 111 having their new neighbours living in their back room,
- (ix) The footprint of the downstairs area of the new house will be bigger than that of the upstairs which would not benefit the occupiers of the properties and would only serve to give the developer the permission he needs,
- (x) Access has been created onto service road at rear which is only subject to easements for the benefit of the adjoining Torbay Road properties. No easements exist for property outside of Harrow or Parkfield Crescent. Object to application if they are going to use service road which is already congested,
- (xi) If permission is granted, the developments will provide at least 3 bedrooms in the existing property (which includes a newly built dormer extension) and at least one bedroom in the new property which effectively doubles the bedroom availability with no real increase in parking spaces. Developer originally sought to provide parking spaces at the back of the rear garden which cannot now be accessed as the adjoining service road is now gated and only residents of Torbay Road, South Harrow have permission to access the service road. The new application does not provide enough off street parking.
- (xii) Application form contains incorrect answers as the developer last year without any consultation with Harrow or local residents removed a stand of trees to the rear of the property to create new access at the rear, creating mayhem and mess. Torn down trees still in garden, 15 months on and this has been added to with building rubble and fly tipping which has created a health hazard, attracting vermin. Assume the developer is responsible for restoring this bank and trees otherwise others may assume they can do the same,
- (xiii) Development represents a security risk to neighbouring properties due to trees and shrubbery having been removed, allowing easy access at the rear of the properties,
- (xiv) The local amenities and services are not adequate and not designed to cope with an influx of extra dwellings,
- (xv) Approval would set precedent for similar units at other properties within the street,
- (xvi) Applicant has ignored rules and protocol and already completed this project,
- (xvii) This whole development is all about money and is at the expense of neighbouring residents,

Harrow Council:

Raises no objections to the proposed development.

MOD Safeguarding - RAF Northolt:

There are no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

Internal Consultees

Environmental Protection Officer:

There are no concerns regarding noise on this application.

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 proposed conversion into two self contained dwellings represents an improvement over the

existing premises in terms of accessibility.

Conclusion: Acceptable from an accessibility perspective.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION

Level or ramped 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 2000 (2004 edition), 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.

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 58 u/ha and 204 hr/ha, the latter of which is only very marginally above the Mayor's habitable room guidance.

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

Not applicable to this application.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not applicable to this application.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to this application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

The Inspector in considering the previous scheme (68057/APP/2012/868) noted in para. 7 that 'use of the permitted extension as a separate dwelling would introduce changes to the appearance of the development that reflect separate occupation.' The Inspector went on to state in paragraphs 7 and 8 that:-

'the extension would acquire a front door which would lead to a change in focus of the importance of the extension and reduce the subservience of the extension to the main dwelling. The addition of the front porch to screen the front door would add increased emphasis to this change and, because of its position and forward projection, would reduce the importance of the existing front door of the original house to a subordinate element.

These alterations would create changes to the front elevation and the way it addresses the street scene that would be opposed to the fundamental balanced appearance of semi-detached houses in the area and lead to a cramped appearance.'

The Inspector at paragraph 9 also noted the previous front garden layout with separate parking spaces and paths, divided by a line of landscaping clearly divided the frontage into two distinct elements.

The Inspector concluded on this issue at paragraph 10 that 'overall, the changes would lead to harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan 1998 [UDP] and adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions 2008 [SPD:HDAS], which carries considerable weight'. The Inspector's decision letter is attached as Appendix 1.

The applicant attempts to address these concerns by re-designing the front garden layout and now a shared path would lead to a shared porch that would conceal both of the two front doors, with a car parking space in front of each of the houses. The front garden layout would prevent the the site being read as two individual plots.

As regards the porch, the plans show a porch on the existing and proposed plans, but a porch is only now being constructed on site. The application claims that the porch constitutes permitted development.

Class D of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2008 (as amended) states that:

'Permitted development

D. The erection or construction of a porch outside any external door of a dwellinghouse.

Development not permitted

D.1 Development is not permitted by Class D if-

- (a) the ground area (measured externally) of the structure would exceed 3 square metres;
- (b) and part of the structure would be more than 3 metres above ground level; or
- (c) any part of the structure would be within 2 metres of any boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse with a highway.'

Although the proposed porch would satisfy the measurement criteria, it has not been built outside an external door but extends across two doors and beyond the flank wall of the original property. The porch therefore also needs to be considered under the criteria of Class A, which amongst other criteria, excludes development from being permitted development if it would extend beyond a wall which fronts the highway. As such, it is not considered that the porch constitutes permitted development and therefore needs to be considered as part of this application.

The porch has been sited to screen the two front doors and has been added to part of the existing single storey element of the side extension and the recessed part of the original property. As such, it appears as a second generation extension which adds a further roof element to the front elevation. By straddling the original property and the subordinate extension, the porch detracts from the subordinate design of the original side extension by obscuring the boundary between the two. The porch would therefore change the front

elevation and how the extended property addresses the street and the balanced appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties. As such, the porch would appear as an awkward addition and this scheme does not overcome the Inspector's concerns regarding the previous appeal. The scheme fails to comply with Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.08 Impact on neighbours

The new porch is sufficiently remote from the side boundaries so that it would not have any material impact upon the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. The two side windows in the side elevation of the extension/attached building would serve an open plan kitchen on the ground floor (which would have its main outlook to the rear) and a bathroom on the first floor. Any potential for the loss of privacy to the neighbouring property (No. 113) could be mitigated with suitable boundary fencing on the ground floor and the first floor window being obscure glazed and non-openable on the first floor, which could have been controlled by condition had the application not of been recommended for refusal.

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. Furthermore, the Council's Environmental Health Officer does not raise any objections to the application. As such, the scheme is considered to comply with Policies BE20, BE21, BE24 and OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

In considering the previous appeal, the Inspector considered that although adequate amenity space and outlook to the rooms would be provided, the attached house would fail to provide an adequate standard of accommodation, contrary to 'Lifetime' homes standards, policies 3.5 and 3.8 of the London Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: 'Accessible Hillingdon'.

As compared to the previous scheme, this proposal involves the enlargement of the ground floor area of the proposed attached house and a re-configuring of the layout. The Inspector on the previous appeal noted that there was no standard for a one-bedroom house, with the nearest comparable standard being 50sq.m for a one-bedroom flat, although the Inspector did note that as a standard for a flat, account would not be made for the additional circulation space required in a house, such as the stairs. The current proposal would provide a total floor area of 55sq.m, with the stairs accounting for approximately 5sq.m of that area on the ground and first floors.

The Inspector also had specific regard to the 23sq. m minimum standard required for the combined living area (living, dining and kitchen areas) and the minimum 12sq.m required for a double bedroom which the previous scheme failed to satisfy (providing 15.3sq.m and 10.4sq.m respectively). This scheme now fully complies with these two standards.

The Council's Access Officer now advises that the current scheme is acceptable from an access point of view, subject to a condition requiring level/ramped access.

Adequate amenity space would still be provided and all habitable rooms would have adequate outlook. The proposed attached house satisfies all relevant floor space standards as would the existing house.

The proposal is considered to provide adequate internal floor space, and has overcome the Inspector's second reason for dismissing the previous appeal. The scheme complies

with policies 3.5 and 3.8 of the London Plan (July 2011) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: 'Accessible Hillingdon'.

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 on the frontage of each dwelling. The Inspector in considering the previous appeal stated at paragraph 19 that:-

'Bearing in mind the latest adopted standards in TLP, the existing provision of one parking space on the front of each property would be sufficient to meet the minimum required and although the site is in an area with a low public transport accessibility level [PTAL], there are no special circumstances put forward that would require a higher level of provision.'

This scheme does not alter the off-street car parking provision within the front garden area or make material changes to its layout that was previously considered acceptable by the Inspector. As there has been no material changes in policy or site circumstances in the interim, this assessment continues to be valid and no objections can be raised to the proposal on parking grounds. The scheme complies with Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.11 Urban design, access and security

Security

The proposal does not represent any threat to security and the access road at the rear has now been gated.

7.12 Disabled access

See Section 7. above.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

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.

This scheme does show significant areas of landscaping in the front garden whereas in the wider area, extensive hardstanding in the front gardens of properties is characteristic of Parkfield Crescent. A condition could therefore have been added to ensure that an appropriate 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 Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.15 Sustainable waste management

There is adequate space available within the front garden on each side of the shared path to accommodate refuse and recycling which could have been conditioned had the application not of been recommended for refusal.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Had the application not of been recommended for refusal, a condition could have been added to any permission, seeking energy efficiency measures.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

Not applicable to this application.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to this application.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The material planning concerns raised by neighbouring residents have been considered in the officer's report.

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

Not applicable to this application.

7.22 Other Issues

This application does not raise any other material planning issues.

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

Not applicable to this application.

10. CONCLUSION

Although the scheme is considered to provide adequate floor space and therefore

overcomes one of the Inspector's reasons for dismissing the previous appeal, it is not accepted that the porch constitutes permitted development. It therefore needs to be considered as part of this application and as such, the porch unduly disrupts the subordinate design of the originally approved side extension, altering the balanced appearance of the semi-detached houses, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the street scene.

The scheme is recommended for refusal.

11. Reference Documents

NPPF (March 2012)

London Plan (July 2011)

Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Housing

Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007)

HDAS: Residential Layouts

HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon



Consultation responses

Contact Officer: Richard Phillips

Telephone No: 01895 250230



reation Ground

<p>Notes</p> <p> Site boundary</p> <p>For identification purposes only.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>© Crown copyright and database rights 2013 Ordnance Survey 100019283</p>	<p>Site Address</p> <p align="center">Land forming part of 111 Parkfield Crescent Ruislip</p>		<p>LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON</p> <p>Residents Services</p> <p>Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111</p>
	<p>Planning Application Ref:</p> <p align="center">68057/APP/2012/3216</p>	<p>Scale</p> <p align="center">1:1,250</p>	 <p align="center">HILLINGDON LONDON</p>
	<p>Planning Committee</p> <p align="center">North</p>	<p>Date</p> <p align="center">April 2013</p>	