

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 20A KEATS WAY WEST DRAYTON

Development: Two storey, 2-bed attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space (Part Retrospective).

LBH Ref Nos: 18417/APP/2016/1878

Drawing Nos: ZF/16/01/KW/07
ZF/16/01/KW/05 Rev. B
ZF/16/01/KW/03 Rev. A
ZF/16/01/KW/04 Rev. A
ZF/16/01/KW/01 Rev. A
ZF/16/01/KW/06 Rev. A
ZF/16/01/KW/02 Rev. A

Date Plans Received: 17/05/2016 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 17/05/2016
Date Application Valid: 29/06/2016 09/09/2016
28/06/2016

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey, 2-bed attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space (Part- Retrospective) and follows the consideration of two similar applications which were refused and dismissed at appeal.

Whilst the internal layout of the proposed dwelling has been amended to overcome the Inspectors concerns in relation to standard of internal accommodation, concerns are maintained in respect of the serious shortfall of the outdoor amenity space which has been exacerbated by the erection of detached outbuildings within the application site and a secondary rear canopy (which is not identified on the submitted plans). The proposal therefore fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said units. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation for future residents contrary to BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

The 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 its failure to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said unit would result in an over-development of the site detrimental to the residential amenity of existing and future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE19 and BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

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 - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

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.
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
LPP 3.3	(2016) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2016) Housing Choice
NPPF1	NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF6	NPPF - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF7	NPPF - Requiring good design

3 I59 **Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies**

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant saved policies (referred to as policies from the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan - Saved Policies September 2007), then London Plan Policies (2016). 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.

4

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. The Council's supports pre-application discussions. However, the submitted application form demonstrates that the applicant choose not to seek pre-application advice.

We have been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

5

The applicant is advised that the submitted plans do not accurately reflect the development on site. The plans do not include the rear secondary extension.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the west side of Keats Way and comprises a modest two storey end of terrace house. The site is within an area of residential development, as identified in the Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies (September 2007).

The property has been extended to the rear with a single storey extension and to the side with a two storey extension.

The dwelling has an area of hardstanding to the front, to the north is a public footpath which is directly adjacent to the flank elevation. To the south, east and west of the site are residential dwellings.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey, 2-bed attached dwelling with associate parking and amenity space (Part- Retrospective).

3.3 Relevant Planning History

53368/APP/2010/1505 20a Keats Way West Drayton

Conversion of existing dwelling to 2 three-bedroom dwellings (Retrospective application.)

Decision: 30-09-2010 Refused **Appeal:** 16-05-2011 Dismissed

53368/APP/2011/2384 20a Keats Way West Drayton

Two storey, 3-bed attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space (Retrospective)

Decision: 14-08-2012 Refused **Appeal:** 22-01-2013 Dismissed

Comment on Relevant Planning History

The site accommodates a modest two storey end of terrace house, situated on the West side of Keats Way within the Ward of West Drayton.

Planning approval was granted for a two storey side and single storey rear extension in November 2005; however the owner did not build these extensions in accordance with the approved plans.

A subsequent enforcement investigation resulted in an enforcement notice being issued by the Council on the 19 December 2007, for the unauthorised erection of a first floor rear extension, the unauthorised erection of a mono-pitched roof over the approved single storey rear extension and non-compliance with the approved drawings for the erection of a two storey side and single storey rear extension.

The owner appealed against the Council's decision to issue the enforcement notice and the appeal was upheld by the Planning Inspectorate and the notice was quashed on the 30 May 2008.

53368/APP/2010/1505 - Conversion of existing dwelling to 2 three-bedroom dwellings (retrospective) was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would provide an indoor living area of an unsatisfactory size for the occupiers of one of the proposed dwellings. The proposal would therefore give rise to a substandard form of living accommodation for future occupiers contrary to Policies BE19 and H7 (iv) of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and design principles 4.7 and 4.8 of the Council's Design Guide 'Residential Layouts'.

2. The proposed development fails to provide sufficient off street parking provision which meets the Council's approved parking standards to service the proposed dwellings. The development would therefore lead to additional on street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety and is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's adopted car parking standards.

3. The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate with the size and layout of the proposed dwellings. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation for future residents contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), and the Council's HDAS (SPD): 'Residential Layouts'.

4. The application has failed to demonstrate that the dwellings would be designed to 'Lifetime Homes' standards. The development is therefore contrary to Policy 3A.5 of the London Plan (February 2008) and the Local Development Framework Accessible Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document (January 2010).

An appeal was subsequently dismissed. The appeal Inspector found in favour of the appellant in terms of the parking provision. However the Inspector advised that the deficiencies in the layout of the accommodation and the appellant's failure to demonstrate the proposal could provide convenient, flexible and adaptable accommodation to 'Lifetime Homes' standards, made the scheme unacceptable.

Application reference 53368/APP/2011/2384 for the Two storey, 3-bed attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space (Retrospective) was refused for the following

reasons:

1. The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate with the size and layout of the proposal and thus results in over-development of the site detrimental to the residential amenity of future occupiers contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The floor area for the proposed dwelling is below the minimum required for a three-bedroom, two storey dwelling. As such the proposal would fail to provide a satisfactory residential environment for future occupiers, contrary to Policy BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), Policy 3.5 and Table 3.3 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3. The proposal would fail to meet all relevant Lifetime Home Standards to the detriment of the residential amenity of future occupiers and contrary to policies 3.1, 3.8 and 7.2 of the London Plan (2011) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon.

An appeal was subsequently dismissed. The appeal inspector upheld the first two refusal reasons relating to inadequate outdoor amenity space and quality of accommodation for future occupiers.

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

Part 2 Policies:

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.

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
LPP 3.3	(2016) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2016) Housing Choice
NPPF1	NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF6	NPPF - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
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

5 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 1.7.16 and a site notice was displayed to the front of the site which expired on 2.8.16. 1 letter of comment has been received from a neighbouring property advising that the rooms within the outbuilding were re-built in 2015.

NERL Safeguarding - No Objection

Heathrow safeguarding - No objection subject to crane informative.

Internal Consultees

Highways Officer:

The existing dwelling is an end of terrace with driveway parking for 1 car accessed from an existing crossover. Along the side of the property is a public footway. The PTAL value for the site is 2 (poor) which is likely to lead to a strong reliance on the private car for trip making. The application is a revision of a previous scheme that was refused at appeal and that in turn was a revision of an earlier scheme that was refused at appeal. The earlier scheme (53368/APP/2010/1505) was refused on a number of counts and lack of off-street parking was one of the grounds. The Inspector at that particular appeal deemed that lack of off-street parking was not a sufficient grounds for refusal (but other grounds were) on the basis that on-street parking stress was not significant at that time (2011). It could be construed that this consideration has given precedent in this application but that was the view of the Inspector as a result of a site visit 5 years ago. The next appeal did not mention off-street parking provision as part of the deliberations.

The plans show no changes to the existing parking at the site so it is assumed that with a new two bed dwelling in place an additional car parking space should be provided off-street. Given the existing parking stress and the previous Inspector's comments at appeal this issue does not constitute a significant impact.

There is no cycle parking shown in the plans provided but this can be conditioned for at least one secure covered cycle parking space for both the existing and new dwelling. On the basis of the above comments I have no significant highway concerns with this application.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

The site lies within an established residential area where there would be no objection in principle to the intensification of the residential use of the site, subject to all other material planning considerations being acceptable, in accordance with Policy H7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan seeks to ensure that new development 'takes into account local context and character, the design principles in Chapter 7 and public transport capacity development should optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range shown in Table 3.2. Development proposals which compromise this policy should be resisted.'

The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1B. The London Plan range for sites with a PTAL of 1B in a suburban area is 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare and 50-75 units per hectare. Based on a total site area of 0.0261 ha the proposal would result in a residential density of approximately 76 units per hectare or 383 HR/Ha. The proposed development would exceed the residential densities stated above. However, density is only one indicator of whether development is appropriate or not and other considerations such as impact on the character of the area, internal floor areas and external amenity space are more relevant considerations in this case.

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

Not relevant to the consideration of 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

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to maintain the quality of the built environment including providing high quality urban design. Furthermore Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) resist any development which would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or would fail to safeguard the design of existing and adjoining sites.

The only external alterations proposed is the insertion of a front door. The proposal would not be considered to have a negative impact upon the visual amenity of the site or the surrounding area in compliance with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

7.08 Impact on neighbours

The proposal does not result in substantial alterations to the external appearance of the building. The proposal is not therefore considered to cause undue harm to occupants of neighbouring properties from increased overlooking, although there is the potential for an increased intensity of use of the property and the amenity space. However, it is considered that the subdivision of the property, without any further extensions being proposed, would not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to nearby properties. The proposal would

therefore comply with Local Plan Part 2 Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24.

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

On 25 March 2015, the Government introduced new technical housing standards in England, which comprise of new additional 'optional' Building Regulations on water and access, and a nationally described space standard (referred to as "the new national technical standards"). These new standards came into effect on 1 October 2015. The Mayor of London has adopted the new national technical standards through a minor alteration to The London Plan.

The Housing Standards (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) March 2016 sets out the minimum internal floor spaces required for developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants. A 4 person 2 bedroom dwelling is required to provide an internal floor area of 79m². The proposed dwelling, at an internal floor area of 83 square metres would comply with this advice. Furthermore the proposed dwelling would achieve a satisfactory level of light and outlook. The current proposal, with the alterations to the internal layout to create 2 rather than 3 bedrooms therefore overcomes the previous reason for refusal which was upheld at appeal.

The 2010 application and subsequent appeal also raised concerns about the ground floor middle room of the proposed unit which had no outlook, natural light or ventilation. The submitted plans show a re-configured ground floor layout which removes this habitable room to create one larger habitable room which achieves a satisfactory outlook and levels of light, thereby overcoming this concern. It is considered therefore that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the extension, would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with the Mayor of London's Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016).

Section 4 of the Council's SPD HDAS: Residential Layouts states that developments should incorporate usable, attractively laid out and conveniently located garden space in relation to the dwellings which they serve.

The 2011 appeal identified a significant shortfall in the level of outdoor amenity space. The applicants have advanced the case that the living conditions for the future occupants is acceptable given the improvement to the internal layout. However the concerns raised in respect of the outdoor amenity space provision has not been overcome. Furthermore, a secondary extension/canopy has been erected to the rear of the property which is not identified on the submitted plans, which further reduces the level of outdoor amenity space. This exacerbates the provision over that which was deemed unacceptable by the Inspector. The applicants have submitted revised plans to identify the extent of the outbuildings, although no plans have been received to show the internal layout of the outbuildings or the secondary canopy to the rear.

The Inspector in the 2011 appeal decision identified a shortfall in the provision of outdoor amenity space. He stated:

"The appellant refers to an appeal decision (APP/R5510/A/10/2141192, dated 16 May 2011) by a previous Inspector for the conversion of an existing dwelling at 20a Keats Way to 2 three-bedroom dwellings. In that appeal, the garden of the undivided property was about 100 square metres and the Inspector found that the equal subdivision of that (which would result in two gardens of about 50 square metres) would be enough to meet the domestic needs of the occupiers of the two dwellings in quantitative and qualitative terms. The current proposal offers a smaller garden at the appeal property, some 25% less than the

HDAS seeks, and that must weigh against the current appeal."

The submitted plans do not accurately reflect the amount of external amenity space available to both the retained property and proposed two bedroom dwelling. It was noted at the site visit that a secondary canopy has been added to the rear of the proposed dwelling and a detached outbuilding is built along the rear boundary of each of the proposed and retained dwellings. The submitted plans do not indicate the separation of the rear garden and the planning statement accompanying the application acknowledges that the amenity space does not meet the Council's standards.

The proposal therefore fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said units. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation for future residents contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.10 Traffic impact, Car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) considers whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety. Policy AM14 states that new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards.

The existing dwelling is an end of terrace with driveway parking for 1 car accessed from an existing crossover. Along the side of the property is a public footway. The PTAL value for the site is 2 (poor) which is likely to lead to a strong reliance on the private car for trip making.

The application is a revision of a previous scheme that was refused at appeal and that in turn was a revision of an earlier scheme that was refused at appeal. The earlier scheme (53368/APP/2010/1505) was refused on a number of counts and lack of off-street parking was one of the grounds. The Inspector at that particular appeal deemed that lack of off-street parking was not a sufficient grounds for refusal (but other grounds were) on the basis that on-street parking stress was not significant at that time (2011). It could be construed that this consideration has given precedent in this application but that was the view of the Inspector as a result of a site visit 5 years ago. The most recent appeal did not mention off-street parking provision as part of the deliberations.

The plans show no changes to the existing parking at the site and it is assumed that with a new two bed dwelling in place an additional car parking space should be provided off-street. Given the existing parking stress and the previous Inspector's comments at appeal this issue does not constitute a significant impact and the Highways Officer has confirmed that no objection is raised.

There is no cycle parking shown in the submitted plans. However, a condition to secure the provision of covered secure cycle storage space could be imposed if the application were recommended for approval.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

These issues are covered in other sections of the report.

7.12 Disabled access

No objection is raised in accessibility terms.

Application reference 53368/APP/2011/2384 was refused for failing to meet Lifetime Home Standards. This reason was not upheld by the Inspector in the subsequent appeal.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) requires the retention of landscape features of merit and new landscaping and planting where possible. No trees would be lost by the proposal and that both the front and rear gardens area of little landscape merit. The application is considered acceptable in accordance with Policy BE38 of the Local Plan.

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Not applicable to this application.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable to this application.

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 comments are addressed in the sections above.

7.20 Planning obligations

CIL

The Council adopted its own Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on August 1st 2014 and the Hillingdon CIL charge for residential developments is £95 per square metre of additional floorspace. This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £35 per sq metre.

Therefore the Hillingdon & Mayoral CIL Charges for the proposed development of 180sq metres of additional floorspace are as follows:

Hillingdon CIL = £8449.79

Mayoral CIL = £3308.52

Total = £11758.31

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application.

7.22 Other Issues

No other issues raised.

8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

General

Members must determine planning applications having due regard to the provisions of the development plan so far as material to the application, any local finance considerations so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations (including regional and national policy and guidance). Members must also determine applications in accordance with all relevant primary and secondary legislation.

Material considerations are those which are relevant to regulating the development and use of land in the public interest. The considerations must fairly and reasonably relate to the

application concerned.

Members should also ensure that their involvement in the determination of planning applications adheres to the Members Code of Conduct as adopted by Full Council and also the guidance contained in Probity in Planning, 2009.

Planning Conditions

Members may decide to grant planning consent subject to conditions. Planning consent should not be refused where planning conditions can overcome a reason for refusal. Planning conditions should only be imposed where Members are satisfied that imposing the conditions are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Where conditions are imposed, the Council is required to provide full reasons for imposing those conditions.

Planning Obligations

Members must be satisfied that any planning obligations to be secured by way of an agreement or undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The obligations must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind to the development (Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy 2010).

Equalities and Human Rights

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the Council, in considering planning applications to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunities and foster good relations between people who have different protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The requirement to have due regard to the above goals means that members should consider whether persons with particular protected characteristics would be affected by a proposal when compared to persons who do not share that protected characteristic. Where equalities issues arise, members should weigh up the equalities impact of the proposals against the other material considerations relating to the planning application. Equalities impacts are not necessarily decisive, but the objective of advancing equalities must be taken into account in weighing up the merits of an application. The weight to be given to any equalities issues is a matter for the decision maker to determine in all of the circumstances.

Members should also consider whether a planning decision would affect human rights, in particular the right to a fair hearing, the right to respect for private and family life, the protection of property and the prohibition of discrimination. Any decision must be proportionate and achieve a fair balance between private interests and the public interest.

9. Observations of the Director of Finance

Not applicable to this application.

10. CONCLUSION

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey, 2-bed attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space (Part- Retrospective) and follows the consideration of two similar applications which were refused and dismissed at appeal.

Whilst the internal layout of the proposed dwelling has been amended to overcome the Inspectors concerns in relation to standard of internal accommodation, concerns are maintained in respect of the serious shortfall of the outdoor amenity space which has been exacerbated by the erection of detached outbuildings within the application site and a secondary rear canopy (which is not identified on the submitted plans). The proposal therefore fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality commensurate to the size and layout of the said units. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation for future residents contrary to BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

11. Reference Documents

The London Plan (2016).
Hillingdon Local Plan Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
Mayor of London's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (November 2012)
Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016)
Parking Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016)
Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts (July 2006)
Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon (January 2010)
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Contact Officer: Nicola Taplin

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 2016 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

**20A Keats Way
 West Drayton**

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

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

Planning Application Ref:

18417/APP/2016/1878

Scale:

1:1,250

Planning Committee:

Central & South

Date:

September 2016



HILLINGDON
 LONDON