

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address LAND FORMING PART OF 147 CORNWALL ROAD RUISLIP

Development: 1 x two storey attached 2-bed dwelling with habitable roof space and 1 x two storey detached 2-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space involving installation of vehicular crossover to side.

LBH Ref Nos: 70023/APP/2014/1815

Drawing Nos: TAC - CR 05 Rev. A
TAC - CR 06
TAC - CR 01
TAC - CR 02 Rev. A
TAC - CR 03 Rev. A
TAC - CR 04 Rev. A

Date Plans Received: 27/05/2014 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 10/06/2014

1. SUMMARY

The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of 1 x two storey attached 2-bed dwelling with habitable roof space and 1 x two storey detached 2-bed dwelling-bed dwellings with associated parking and amenity space involving installation of vehicular crossover to side.

The loss of the garden would have an unacceptable visual impact on the area and it is considered that the size, siting and design of the proposed dwellings, due to the prominent corner location to the rear and side of the donor property would be an over dominant and visually intrusive form of development within the established streetscene in Cornwall Road and Rosebury Vale. It would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area resulting in a material harm to the visual amenities of the streetscene and the wider area.

The proposal would also result in the loss of a tree which is highly visible from the street and this loss would have a detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the area.

The proposed crossovers exceed the Council's standard allowable width and would give rise to conditions detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety as well as a reduction in existing on street parking capacity particularly during the evenings when demand is at its peak. As such, it is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims of Policy AM7 of the Local Plan.

The proposal fails to provide sufficient amenity space and would result in substandard living conditions for future occupants. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to policies in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies (November 2012), Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the SPD HDAS: Residential Layouts: and The London Plan (2011)

For these reasons, the planning application is recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by virtue of the inappropriate development of garden land would erode the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the site and surrounding neighbourhood. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (July 2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of the size, scale, bulk, design and siting of the proposed unit, no. 147A, would result in a cramped, overly dominant and visually intrusive form of development which would significantly reduce the feeling of openness on this corner plot and the visual separation between the building lines facing Cornwall Road and Rosebury Vale. It would be detrimental to the visual amenity, character and appearance of the street scene and the area in general. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal by reason of the presence of a significant level of hardstanding and vehicle parking in close proximity to the proposed dwellings, would result in a cramped, overly dominant and visually intrusive form of development. It would be detrimental to the visual amenity, character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area in general. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal fails to provide sufficient amenity space for either of the proposed dwellings, resulting in sub-standard living conditions for future occupants. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

5 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed dwelling at no.146B, due to its siting and proximity to the proposed dwelling at no.147A would result in an overdominant and unacceptable impact on the amenity of the future occupiers of no. 147A contrary to Policy BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Lay

6 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed crossovers results in excessively wide crossovers giving rise to conditions detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety as well as a reduction in existing on street parking capacity particularly during the evenings when demand is at its peak. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS:

Residential Layouts.

7 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would result in the loss of a tree, which is highly visible from the street scene and has a positive impact on the amenity of the residential area overall. The loss of this tree would be detrimental to the character and amenity of the area and has not been justified. Accordingly the development would be contrary to Policies BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

INFORMATIVES

1 I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies.

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

2

It is noted that there are various discrepancies and inconsistencies within the submitted plans particularly in respect of the dwelling labelled as 147A as shown on drawings TAC-CR 02 Rev A and TAC-CR 05 Rev A. It would not be possible to build a development which would accord with all of the submitted plans and you are advised of the need to ensure consistent drawings should you be minded to submit any further applications.

3

You are advised that should the development be allowed at a subsequent appeal it would represent chargeable development under both the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (£35 per sq.m) and Hillingdon's CIL (£95 per sq.m). At this time it is estimated that the liability would be £6,807.11 for Mayoral CIL and £17,385.00 for Hillingdon CIL. The actual Community Infrastructure Levy would be calculated were your development to be permitted at appeal and a separate liability notice will be issued by the Local Planning Authority. Should you require further information please refer to the Council's Website www.hillingdon.gov.uk/index.jsp?articleid=24738

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the northern side of Cornwall Road and the eastern side of Rosebury Vale junction in Ruislip. It lies south of Wealdstone Football Club Ground which covers an expansive grassed area between the Cornwall Road, Shenley Avenue, Rosebury Vale and Cranley Drive where entry and egress is situated. The site comprises a period two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse paired with no 145 Cornwall. The plot is positioned at an oblique angle given its corner plot location. To the rear of the site lies no. 1 Rosebury Vale and rear garden amenity which is north facing. To the front is hardstanding for 2 car parking spaces. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, with a mixture of semi detached and terraced properties.

The application site does not fall within a Conservation Area and there are no trees

protected by a TPO. The site forms part of the Developed Area of the Borough as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission to erect 1 x two storey and 1 x two storey with habitable roof space 2-bed, detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space involving installation of vehicular crossover to side.

Dwelling labelled 147A on the submitted plans would be detached and approximately 4.7m at the front and 7.5m wide at the rear as the dwelling is positioned along the highway boundary at an oblique angle. It would be 6.7m deep at two storey and 8.7m including the single storey element and finished with a pitched roof, 5.4m high at the eaves and 7.5m high at the ridge. Its entrance faces on to Rosebury Vale set back from the highway at an oblique angle. The proposed dwelling would be finished externally in brick, slate roof tiles and have casement style windows. It would be accessed via a new driveway and crossover. There would be two parking spaces to the rear of the site and a bin store that would be located behind. A rear garden of approximately 36sqm would be created. Internally, the dwelling would provide a living room, kitchen and dining room on the ground floor and two bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor with a gross internal floor area of approximately 80sqm. Fenestration would be located to the front and rear elevations at both ground and first floor levels plus a side facing window, in the east elevation, to serve a stairwell at ground floor.

Dwelling labelled 147B on the submitted plans would be a detached property and approximately 6.2m wide, 6m deep at two storey and 8.3m including single story rear element and finished with a pitched roof. It would be 5.8m high at the eaves and 7.8m high at the ridge. Its entrance faces on to Rosebury Vale set back from the highway. The proposed dwelling would be finished externally in brick, slate roof tiles and have casement style windows. It would be accessed via a newly formed driveway and have a small frontage within which there would be two parking spaces and a bin store. A side garden space of approximately 27sqm would be created. Internally, the dwelling would provide a living room, kitchen and dining room plus a W/C on the ground floor and one bedroom and a bathroom on the first floor and second bedroom in the loft with a gross internal floor area of approximately 85sqm. Fenestration would be located to the front and rear elevations at both ground and first floor levels plus two side facing windows, in the south elevation, to serve the WC and stairwell at ground and first floor respectively.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Relevant Planning History

There is no relevant planning history in the evaluation of this planning application.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012)
London Plan (July 2011)
National Planning Policy Framework
HDAS: Residential Layouts
Supplementary Planning Guidance - Community Safety by Design
Supplementary Planning Guidance - Noise
Supplementary Planning Guidance - Air Quality
HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon

UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

LPP 3.3 (2011) Increasing housing supply

LPP 3.4 (2011) Optimising housing potential

LPP 3.5 (2011) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 5.3 (2011) Sustainable design and construction

LPP 7.4 (2011) Local character

AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.

AM14 New development and car parking standards.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

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

BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.

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

BE22 Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.

BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.

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

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

OE1 Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area

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

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development

NPPF7 NPPF - Requiring good design

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

10 no. neighbouring occupiers and Ruislip Residents Association were consulted 12 June 2014 and the proposal was advertised in the local press on 14 July 2014. In addition, a site notice was displayed from 14 July 2014. There have been three responses one of which is a petition consisting of a many number of local residents against the planning application. In summary the objections

were based on the following:

- (i) Not in keeping with the character of Rosebury Vale on which it would have the biggest visual impact.
- (ii) 1 Rosebury Vale look like a mid-terrace and will significantly reduce his existing daylight and privacy.
- (iii) Development will have a negative impact on the character of Rosebury Vale.
- (iv) Over development of a small piece of land
- (v) Loss of garden amenities - this is a form of garden grab
- (vi) Development is not a continuation of a terrace but change of character of area with proposal to have two new detached dwellings.
- (vii) Loss of parking
- (viii) Detract from the open character of that part of the street.

Internal Consultees

Highways Officer:

The proposal is for two houses, one adjacent to no 147 and the other adjoining No 1 Rosebury Vale.

The existing house has a hard standing in the front garden providing 2 parking spaces accessed from an existing single cross over in Rosebury Vale. There is also an additional single cross over from Rosebury Vale at the rear boundary with No 1. The plans show two double width cross overs in Rosebury Vale to serve the new dwellings one existing and one proposed. The existing cross over is single width not double as shown.

A minimum acceptable width of footway between cross overs is 1.2 m. The proposal together with the neighbour's dropped kerb will result in a dropped kerb 20 metres long. The Council has guidelines in respect of the construction of vehicle cross overs. Generally single width accesses of 2.44m width increasing to about 4.58m at the kerb line for accesses serving single dwellings and double width crossovers for joint accesses with adjoining neighbours are considered acceptable.

The proposed cross overs significantly exceed the Council's standard allowable width. Excessively long crossovers give rise to conditions detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety as well as a reduction in existing on street parking capacity particularly during the evenings when demand is at its peak. Similar cross overs in the vicinity permitted in the past are not in accordance with the Council's current requirements. As such the application cannot be supported on highway grounds.

Flood and Water Management Officer:

The site lies in a Critical Drainage Area, however is just outside the area likely to be at risk of surface water flooding, therefore subject to the imposition of a condition to ensure surface water is controlled and flood risk not increased the development would be acceptable in this respect.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

Paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that 'Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.'

The London Plan (July 2011) aims to provide more homes within a range of tenures across the capital meeting a range of needs, of high design quality and supported by essential social infrastructure.

In terms of new housing supply, the Borough of Hillingdon has been allocated a minimum target of 4,250 in the period from 2011-2021. The form of such housing should provide a mix of dwelling types in different locations with those at higher densities providing for smaller households focused on areas with good public transport accessibility.

London Plan Policy 3.5 (Quality and design of housing developments) states that "housing developments should be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context and to the wider environment, taking account of strategic policies in the Plan to protect and enhance London's residential environment and attractiveness as a place to live. Boroughs may in their LDFs introduce a presumption against development on back gardens or other private residential gardens where this can be locally justified".

The London Plan comments (in Paragraph 3.34) that "Directly and indirectly back gardens play important roles in addressing many of these policy concerns, as well as being a much cherished part of the London townscape contributing to communities' sense of place and quality of life. Pressure for new housing means that they can be threatened by inappropriate development and their loss can cause significant local concern. This Plan therefore supports development plan-led presumptions against development on back gardens where locally justified by a sound local evidence base..."

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that "new development should not result in the inappropriate development of gardens and green spaces that erode the character and biodiversity of suburban areas and increase the risk of flooding through the loss of permeable area".

The construction of two new dwellings on this site would effectively represent "garden grabbing" with a significant area of the existing garden to No. 147 Cornwall Road taken and which currently provides an undeveloped open/green space between the side of adjoining dwellings thereby separating them from the return building frontages. As this land is not otherwise previously developed, the proposal should be considered as an inappropriate form of development in this locality and is thus contrary to the objectives of the NPPF, London Plan Policy 3.5 and Hillingdon Local Plan Policy BE1.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan (2011) advises that Boroughs should ensure that development proposals achieve the highest possible intensity of use compatible with local context and the site's public transport accessibility. The London Plan provides a density matrix to establish a strategic framework for appropriate densities at different locations.

The site has a PTAL of 2 and is located within a suburban setting. The London Plan provides for a residential density between 50 - 95 u/ha. The proposed density for the site would be 20 units/ha, which is below London Plan guidance. However, given the context of the site and existing low level density of the surrounding development, the density is considered appropriate in this case.

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

The proposal will not impact on any heritage assets.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

The proposal does not raise any concerns in respect of airport safeguarding.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to this application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Policies BE13 and BE19 seek to resist any development

which would fail to harmonise with the existing streetscene or would not complement the character and amenity of the residential area in which it is situated. Policy BE22 states a requirement for all new buildings of two or more storeys to be set back a minimum of one metre from the side boundary for its full height.

With consideration to the visual impact of the proposal on the immediate surrounding area, the new dwellinghouse, no. 147B, would be set in line with no. 1 Rosebury Avenue and no. 147B would be set behind the semi-detached donor property at the corner of Cornwall Road and Rosebury Vale.

Turning to no. 147B, it would be a detached dwelling and would continue the building pattern of the row of terraced properties so would not be out of keeping with the character of the streetscene in Rosebury Vale. However, the proposal would further close the visual gap between the separate terraces on Cornwall Road and Rosebury Road and the built form of the dwelling itself would be viewed in conjunction with the significant area of hardstanding and car parking proposed in close proximity of the dwelling. The overall impact of this part of the development would have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.

Turning to no. 147A, the dwelling would be detached and set in 1m from the donor property. It would continue the front building pattern but not the return building. In addition, given the high visibility of the corner location, and on a very tight area of land substantiated by abutting the boundary with a highway with no separation it would be an overly dominant and incongruous dwelling in the streetscene.

Section 5.11 of the SPD: Residential Layouts (2006) states the intensification of sites within an existing streetscape if carefully designed can enhance the appearance of the surrounding area and the form and type of development should be largely determined by its townscape context. New developments should aim to make a positive contribution to improve the quality of the area, although they should relate to the scale and form of their surroundings. The design, width and size of the proposed dwellings would broadly match the donor property and no.1 Rosebury Vale. The oblique siting of the proposed property no. 147A with no separation against the highway boundary would result in cramped form of development. It is considered due to the proposed siting, site coverage and design, the proposal would result in an out of keeping and incongruous feature, and thereby over-development

In view of the above, it is considered the proposal would result in a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the streetscene and the wider area, and as such would fail to comply with Part 1 Policy BE1 and Part 2 Policies BE13, BE15, BE19 & BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.08 Impact on neighbours

The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Residential Layouts (HDAS) provides a range of design guidelines, addressing setbacks, overlooking and shadowing to neighbouring occupiers. Sections 4.9 of the SPD: Residential Layouts, in relation to new dwellings, states all residential developments and amenity space should receive adequate daylight and sunlight, including habitable rooms and kitchens. The daylight and sunlight available to adjoining properties should be adequately protected. Where there are two or more storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible over-domination, and 15m will be the minimum acceptable distance. Specifically, the building should not impinge within 21m of the 45

degree line drawn from the roof lights in principal and rear roof slopes of the dwelling.

The proposed dwellings would be two storeys. The rear elevation of no. 147B would be sited some 11m from the nearest wall of no.147A. This creates an overdominant and cramped form of development where sunlight and daylight into habitable rooms that face in this direction would be affected contrary to HDAS - Residential Layouts (2012) and part 2 Policies BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

With regard to loss of privacy and outlook, no. 147B would not overlook no. 1 Rosebury Vale to a demonstrable level as the 45 degree angle would not be breached by the proposal. Notwithstanding this, the donor property and no. 147A would fall within 21 metres of the side boundary of this dwelling thus breaching the 45 degree rule. This would lead to an oppressive outlook for future and existing occupants given its close proximity out of habitable rooms. It is noted that general overlooking exists in these areas between existing properties, yet the minimal distances involved are considered likely to result in a material loss of privacy to the occupiers of these adjoining properties despite at no. 147B there would be side garden amenity that increases the separation distance.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of the future occupants and adjoining residents and therefore the proposal is considered contrary to Policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Section 4.12 of the SPD, New Residential Layouts.

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

The London Plan (July 2011) in Policy 3.5 sets out the minimum floor areas required for proposed residential units in order to ensure that they provide an adequate standard of living for future occupants. It states that a two bedroom dwellings should have at least 60sqm of internal floorspace. Table 3.3 of HDAS - Residential Extensions (2012) expects standards which are slightly higher at 63sqm.

The gross internal floorspace for the proposed two bedroom dwellings would be approximately 80sqm and 85sqm. These floor areas would meet the aforementioned required standards. Therefore, the amount of floor area is acceptable for future occupants to reside in accordance with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (November 2012) and Table 3.3 of HDAS - Residential Extensions (2012).

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Policy BE23 states that new residential buildings or extensions should provide or maintain external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of existing and future occupants which is usable in terms of its shape and siting. The supporting text relating to this policy emphasises the importance of protecting private amenity space and considers it a key feature of protecting residential amenity. Paragraph 3.13 of the SPD, the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts (July 2006) recommends that a house with two bedrooms should have at least 60sqm of associated usable garden space.

Each dwelling would have rear gardens that are shallow in depth, would be in the shade for most of the morning due to orientation and at 36sqm and 27sqm would fall below the Council's adopted standards for external amenity space. As such, the proposal would fail to provide adequate provision of private amenity space for the future occupants of the proposed dwellings by some margin, resulting in substandard living conditions contrary with part 2 policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: UDP saved policies (2012).

It is noted, the doner property would retain 90sqm which is considered acceptable.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Policy AM7 considers the traffic generation of proposals and will not permit development that is likely to prejudice the free flow of traffic or pedestrian safety generally.

Highway officer comments were not supportive of this scheme based the existing house has a hard standing in the front garden providing 2 parking spaces accessed from an existing single cross over in Rosebury Vale. There is also an additional single cross over from Rosebury Vale at the rear boundary with No 1. The plans show two double width cross overs in Rosebury Vale to serve the new dwellings one existing and one proposed. The existing cross over is single width not double as shown.

A minimum acceptable width of footway between cross overs is 1.2 m. The proposal together with the neighbour's dropped kerb will result in a dropped kerb 20 metres long. As such, The Council has guidelines in respect of the construction of vehicle cross overs. Generally, single width accesses of 2.44m width increasing to about 4.58m at the kerb line for accesses serving single dwellings and double width crossovers for joint accesses with adjoining neighbours are considered acceptable.

The proposed crossovers excessively exceed the Council's standard allowable width. Excessively long cross overs give rise to conditions detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety as well as a reduction in existing on street parking capacity particularly during the evenings when demand is at its peak. Similar cross overs in the vicinity permitted in the past are not in accordance with the Council's current requirements. As such, it is therefore considered to be contrary to the aims of Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Policy AM14 states the need for all development to comply with the Council's adopted parking standards. The Council's maximum parking requirement for off street parking (ie. within the curtilages of the properties) would require two parking spaces for the proposed dwellings. The PTAL score for the site is 3 (moderate) and as a result it is considered that the maximum level of spaces should be provided.

The proposed plans indicate that two spaces per dwelling would be provided creating hardstanding to the front and crossovers on to Rosebury Vale. This would achieve the standard parking provision, as set out in the Council's parking standards. It is considered that the proposal comply with Local Plan Policy AM14 in this regard.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

See character and appearance section and disabled access section.

The proposal is not considered to raise any concerns in respect of security.

7.12 Disabled access

London Plan Policy 3.8 requires all new housing to be built to Lifetime Homes Standards. The Council's SPD HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon also requires all new housing to be built to Lifetime Homes Standards. The Council's Access Officer has advised that the proposal complies with the Lifetime Homes Standards and is therefore in accordance with London plan Policy 3.8.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two Policy BE38 seeks the protection and retention of existing trees and landscape features of merit and considers where appropriate the provision of additional landscaping as part of a proposed development.

There are no trees protected, or otherwise, on the site, but there are two mature trees within the amenity space of the application site. At least one of these trees would be lost to accommodate the development regardless of protective measures. This tree is highly visible from the street scene and its loss would have a detrimental impact on the character and amenity of the residential area overall.

Accordingly, the development is considered contrary to Policies BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Section 4.40 - 4.41 of the SPD: Residential layouts deals with waste management and specifies bin stores should be provided for, and wheelie bin stores should not be further than 9m from the edge of the highway. Bin stores are shown to be provided on the front boundary of each plot.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Subject to a condition securing compliance with level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes the development would achieve an appropriate level of sustainable design were the development considered acceptable in other respects.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

The site lies in a Critical Drainage Area, however is just outside the area likely to be at risk of surface water flooding. Accordingly, a condition to ensure the provision of sustainable drainage and water management within the development would achieve policy compliance were the development considered acceptable in other respects.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

The proposal is not considered to give rise to any concerns relating to Noise or Air Quality.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The matters raised have been covered in the main body of the report.

7.20 Planning Obligations

The proposal would not necessitate any obligations under S106 as all impacts would be adequately mitigated through payments of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

7.22 Other Issues

None.

9. Observations of the Director of Finance

Not applicable to this application.

10. CONCLUSION

It is considered, due to the proposed size, siting and design, the proposed dwellings are considered out of keeping in relation to its surroundings resulting in a visually intrusive form of development, resulting in a material harm to the visual amenities of the streetscene and the wider area. The proposal fails to provide sufficient amenity space, detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety and reduction in existing on street parking capacity and would result in substandard living conditions for future occupants. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to policies in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1-

Strategic Policies (November 2012), Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the SPD HDAS: Residential Layouts: and The London Plan (2011) and is recommended for refusal.

11. Reference Documents


Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012)
London Plan (July 2011)
National Planning Policy Framework
HDAS: Residential Layouts
Supplementary Planning Guidance - Community Safety by Design
Supplementary Planning Guidance - Noise
Supplementary Planning Guidance - Air Quality
HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon

Contact Officer: Scott Hackner

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 2014 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address

**Land Forming Part Of 147 Cornwall Road
 Ruislip**

Planning Application Ref:
70023/APP/2014/1815

Planning Committee
North

Scale
1:1,250

Date
August 2014

**LONDON BOROUGH
 OF HILLINGDON**
 Residents Services
 Planning Section

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



HILLINGDON
 LONDON