

## Report of the Corporate Director of Planning & Community Services

**Address** GARAGE REAR OF 8 KINGSEND RUISLIP

**Development:** Two storey two-bedroom detached dwelling with associated parking.

**LBH Ref Nos:** 27853/APP/2009/1773

**Drawing Nos:** 12/CH/R/01  
BS 5837 Compliance Report  
IP-01  
TCP-01  
TPP-01  
Tree Survey Details  
Design & Access Statement

**Date Plans Received:** 11/08/2009      **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

**Date Application Valid:** 15/09/2009

### 1. **SUMMARY**

This application fails to overcome the reasons for refusal of the previous scheme and the Inspector's comments. The proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, would not provide sufficient amenities for future occupiers and would not meet Lifetime Home Standards.

### 2. **RECOMMENDATION**

#### **REFUSAL for the following reasons:**

#### **1            NON2            Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed house, by reason of its overall size, siting and design, would represent an incongruous form of development which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition, character and appearance of adjoining residential properties. Furthermore, the proposal would appear cramped on the application site and would fail to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, contrary to policies BE4, BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

#### **2            NON2            Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed house, by reason of its siting in relation to nos.22, 24 and 26 Regency Drive, would result in an overdominant/visually obtrusive form of development when viewed from the rear windows of those houses and a significant increase in overshadowing onto those properties. As such, the proposal would constitute an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity, contrary to policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

#### **3            NON2            Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposal, by reason of the siting of the rear private amenity space in relation to nos.22, 24 and 26 Regency Drive, would be directly overlooked from the first floor

habitable room windows of those properties causing an unacceptable loss of privacy to the future occupiers of the proposed house. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

**4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The internal size of the proposed dwelling is inadequate and would not provide an acceptable standard of amenity for future occupiers, contrary to policy 4B.1 of the London Plan, policies BE19 and H7 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

**5 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposal fails to meet the requirements of lifetime homes to the detriment of future occupiers and is thus contrary to London Plan policy 4B.5 and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon.

**6 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposal fails to provide an adequate amount of amenity space for the future occupiers of the property and as such would result in an overintensive use of the garden to the detriment of the future occupiers of the property, the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy BE23 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) 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) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (February 2008) and national guidance.

BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
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.

H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS	Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions (adopted in August 2006 and to form part of the emerging Local Development Framework documents):
	4.1 Density
	4.6 Unit Size
	4.9 Sunlight/Daylight
	4.12 Privacy
	4.15 Garden Space for Houses
	4.23 Elevation Treatment
	4.39 Cycle Parking
	4.40 Waste Management
	Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Accessible Hillingdon (adopted in August 2006 and to form part of the emerging Local Development Framework documents)
LPP 4A.3	London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.
LPP 4B.1	London Plan Policy 4B.1 - Design principles for a compact city.
LPP 4B.5	London Plan Policy 4B.5 - Creating an inclusive environment.

### 3. CONSIDERATIONS

#### 3.1 Site and Locality

The application site, measuring 0.019ha, comprises land located to the north of 8a/8b Kingsend and is currently occupied by lock-up garages accessed from a driveway along the west side of that property. To the east lies a public car park owned by the Council, to the north lies Princess Lane, to the north west lie the rear gardens of 22-28 (even) Regency Drive, a terrace of two storey houses, to the south west lies 2-20 Regency Drive, a purpose built residential apartment block and to the south lies 8b and 8c Kingsend. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and appearance and the application site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

#### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

The previously refused scheme proposed the erection of a two storey detached house with carport and associated amenity space, involving the demolition of 4 lock-up garages (2 from the block of garages and 2 garages along the northern end of the site). The new house was located immediately to the north of the remaining block of lock-up garages. It measured 11.7m wide, 5.2m deep, 5.2m high at eaves level and be finished with a hipped roof on all sides, 7m high at ridge level. The front elevation of the new house (west facing) comprised front gable features with brickwork on the ground floor and tile facing on the first floor and roof. It also comprised the front door and ground floor windows with a blank facade on the first floor. No windows, apart from 2 rooflights were proposed on the east facing elevation.

The ground floor provided a living room and kitchen and the first floor provided two bedrooms with north and south facing windows, and a bathroom. A carport attached to the front elevation of the house extending to the side boundary with Regency Drive was also

proposed. It measured 7.5m deep, 5.1m wide reducing to 3.2m wide, and 2.9m high, finished with a flat roof supported by columns. The proposed carport also acted as a porch over the front entrance. Private amenity space was proposed at the northern end of the application site.

This current application attempts to overcome the reasons for refusal of the previous scheme by proposing a two storey 2 bedroom detached house located some 2.5m from the northern site boundary and approximately 0.7m widening to 1.3m along the eastern site boundary, of the site. The front elevation would face 22-28 (even) Regency Drive, comprising a stepped front elevation measuring 5.1m wide at which point it would step back 1.4m for a further 2.5m wide and 3.4m deep along the northern flank elevation. The rear elevation would measure 7.6m wide and the southern flank wall would be 4.7m wide. The main part of the house would be 4.9m high at eaves level and 6.7m high at ridge level incorporating a hipped roof on all sides. It would be finished in brickwork on the ground floor with render on the first floor.

A canopy is proposed above the front entrance and a ground floor window, and two first floor windows, both fitted with obscure glass, are proposed on this elevation. A chimney stack and ground and first floor windows are proposed on the rear elevation. The recessed element of the house would be finished with a gable end, half hipped roof incorporating a catslide roof at front supported by a column, some 2.5m high at front. The roof would be set 0.6m below the roof ridge of the main part of the house.

The proposed house would comprise a living room, kitchen/dining room and WC on the ground floor with 2 bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor. The first floor habitable room windows would face north, east and south, with non-habitable room windows facing west. The private amenity space would be relocated to the south, enclosed by a 2.2m high close boarded fence and accessed via French windows, with 2 off-street parking spaces beyond, immediately to the north of the lock-up garages. Hard paving is proposed along the southern elevation of the house providing pedestrian access to the house.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

27853/APP/2008/1288 Garage Rear Of 8 Kingsend Ruislip

ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY TWO-BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLINGHOUSE WITH ATTACHED FRONT CAR PORT (INVOLVING REMOVAL OF EXISTING GARAGES).

**Decision:** 06-01-2009 Refused

**Appeal:** 21-05-2009 Dismissed

#### Comment on Relevant Planning History

The above application was refused by the North Planning Committee on 23 December 2008 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed house, by reason of its overall size, siting, bulk, scale and design would represent an incongruous form of development which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition, character and appearance of adjoining residential properties. The proposal would therefore detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area generally, contrary to policies BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposal, by reason of the siting of the rear private amenity space in relation to nos.24, 26 and 28 Regency Drive, would be directly overlooked from the first floor

habitable room windows of those properties causing an unacceptable loss of privacy to the future occupiers of the proposed house. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3. The proposal having regard to the size of the proposed two bedroom house would fail to provide an adequate amount of amenity space for the future occupiers of the property, and as such would result in an overintensive use of the remainder of the garden to the detriment of the future occupiers of the property, the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and the character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy BE23 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

An appeal was lodged and subsequently dismissed in May 2009, with the Inspector commenting as follows on the main issues:

"However, because of the location and shape of the plot, the new house would look incongruous built immediately alongside the remaining old pre-cast garages with the kitchen window in line with and very close to the nearest garage door. The 'front' elevation would also be of an unsatisfactory design with no first floor windows. From the public realm of the car park and Princess Lane, the blank eastern elevation over 11m long and about 5.2m to the eaves, close to the boundary fence, would be an unattractive and overbearing feature.

The Council states that the proposal would provide about 50.5m<sup>2</sup> of private amenity space compared to the appellant's statement of 57m<sup>2</sup>. I have no explanation as to why the figures vary. Nevertheless, the HDAS requires new two bedroom dwellings to provide a minimum of 60m<sup>2</sup> of private amenity space and the proposal clearly fails to satisfy this requirement.

Furthermore, HDAS states that there should be a minimum distance of 15m between two storey properties and neighbouring gardens to avoid overdomination and a minimum distance of 21m to reduce overlooking. I accept that because of the orientation of the proposed building and its upper windows, there would be no significant overlooking of neighbouring properties. However, the private amenity space would only be between 10.5m and 11.5m from the properties on Regency Drive and despite landscaping and a proposed 2m high fence, the privacy of the future occupants of the dwelling would be compromised to an unacceptable extent by potential overlooking from nearby first floor windows."

#### **4. Planning Policies and Standards**

##### **UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan**

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

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Policies:

BE4                    New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas

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.
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS	Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions (adopted in August 2006 and to form part of the emerging Local Development Framework documents): 4.1 Density 4.6 Unit Size 4.9 Sunlight/Daylight 4.12 Privacy 4.15 Garden Space for Houses 4.23 Elevation Treatment 4.39 Cycle Parking 4.40 Waste Management  Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Accessible Hillingdon (adopted in August 2006 and to form part of the emerging Local Development Framework documents)
LPP 4A.3	London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.
LPP 4B.1	London Plan Policy 4B.1 - Design principles for a compact city.
LPP 4B.5	London Plan Policy 4B.5 - Creating an inclusive environment.

## 5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- **28th October 2009**

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

## 6. Consultations

### External Consultees

30 adjoining owner/occupiers and the Ruislip Residents' Association consulted. The application has also been advertised as a development that affects the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. A petition from 3 separate petitioners totalling 97 signatories has been received making the following comments:

"We, the undersigned, petition Hillingdon Council to oppose the plans on the rear of the site of 8 Kingsend to protect our neighbourhood, in particular:

To preserve the character of this part of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. It will not make a

positive contribution or enhancement to the character of the area contrary to the general principle of policy BE4 of the Hillingdon UDP.

To disallow a development that would fail to harmonise with the surroundings and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), the HDAS and PPS3.

To oppose a new development with limited private amenity space. Overlooking from the rear of the properties in Regency Drive will cause material harm to the living conditions of future occupants of the proposed dwelling, contrary to the HDAS and Policies BE23 and BE24 of the UDP.

To avoid more garden grabbing - this proposal will reduce the shared amenity space currently enjoyed by residents in the four existing flats at 8 Kingsend;

To disallow this infill style of development - The position of the proposed access would result in noise, fumes, pollution and light, nuisance from the extra cars accessing the proposed house which will be detrimental to the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring residents at 6, 8 , 8b, 8c and 8d Kingsend and Regency Drive."

Ward Councillor

I am writing to submit my objections to the above proposal. I believe this fails to harmonise with the street scene, and would result in a cramped development, with inadequate amenity space. The additional vehicle movements would compound existing problems in Kingsend.

### **Internal Consultees**

#### **CONSERVATION OFFICER**

This site falls within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. It currently comprises a garage court to the rear of no 8 Kingsend. It is bounded to the west by the properties fronting Regency Drive and to the east by the public car park located behind the commercial frontage of the High Street.

Kingsend was developed in the early 20th century by the original owners of the estate, Kings College, who developed the area very much in line with Garden Suburb principles. Thus the street has a spacious feel and contains well designed and reasonably sized properties, most of which are detached, set in good sized gardens.

Whilst the design of the new building has greatly improved on that of the previous submission, the front elevation, however, still appears rather unresolved architecturally, particularly the two small windows at first floor level. The site nevertheless remains small and awkwardly shaped and the proposed new building sits uncomfortably within it. As such, the new building would appear rather ad hoc and to have been shoe horned into the space, even more so than the properties within Regency Drive. As such it would be at odds with the prevailing character of area and potentially create an undesirable precedent within this recently designated Conservation Area.

#### **TREES/LANDSCAPE**

There is one small tree on the site and 13 small trees close to the site. Most of the trees have been reduced in the last year or so and have low amenity values, albeit they provide some low level screening between the site and adjacent properties. The exception is the mature ornamental plum (T30 on TPO 259), which is located off-site, close to the entrance to the site. This tree forms part of a group feature on the Kingsend frontage and has a moderate amenity value.

The scheme makes provision for the long-term retention all of the off-site trees, which will be protected by the existing boundary fencing. There is also space for landscaping.

The application includes a tree protection method statement (part of the BS 5837 Compliance Report [90291], but does not include details of services, which could affect some of the trees. These details can however be required by a condition, to ensure that the trees are not affected.

Subject to conditions TL1 (services), TL2, TL5, TL6, TL7, and TL21 (modified to require that the works accord with the approved method statement), the proposed development is acceptable in terms of Saved Policy BE38 of the UDP.

## HIGHWAYS

The proposal site is located on the northern side of Kingsend, approximately 22m southeast of its junction of Regency Drive. Kingsend is a Classified Road and is designated as a Local Distributor Road within the Council's Unitary Development Plan.

The highway considerations on a previous application ref. 27853/APP/2008/1288, which was refused by the Council, concluded that given the proposal would result in loss of garages and the proposal is for one dwelling, it would not result in intensification in use of the access. No highway objection was, therefore raised on the previous application.

Consequently, the proposals are not considered to merit refusal on highway grounds.

## WASTE MANAGEMENT

The dwelling must have a food waste grinders included as standard as part of the kitchen sink unit to allow residents to indirectly recycle their food wastes by grinding it and washing it down into the waste water system for composting by the relevant water company.

Also, the development would have to have some kind of bin store area or designated area for the refuse to be collected from near the kerbside. Our collectors' vehicle will not go down the driveway to collect refuse, recycling from a house built that far from kerbside.

The dwelling house should incorporate in its design, storage provision for an average of 2 bags of recycling and 2 bags of refuse per week plus 3 garden waste bags every 2 weeks.

## **7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES**

### **7.01 The principle of the development**

Paragraph 3.4 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement Residential Layouts advises that backland development must seek to enhance the local character of the area. The plot should be of a sufficient depth to accommodate new housing in a way, which provides a quality residential environment for new and existing residents. Backland development on plots of less than 80sq.m is unlikely to be acceptable.

The immediate area is residential in character and appearance and residential development on Brownfield land within residential areas is encouraged by PPS3. The size of the plot exceeds 80sq.m. Therefore, the use of the land for residential purposes is acceptable in principle, subject to it complying with the policies and standards of the Council.

### **7.02 Density of the proposed development**

The proposed scheme would have a density of 211 habitable rooms per hectare. This is at the lower end but within the London Plan density range (200-350 habitable rooms per



hectare) in respect of habitable rooms per hectare based on the site's Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 4. Accordingly, no objection is raised purely on the issue of density.

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

In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector stated at paragraph 6 that "However, because of the location and shape of the plot, the new house would look incongruous built immediately alongside the remaining old pre-cast garages with the kitchen window in line with and very close to the nearest garage door. The 'front' elevation would also be of an unsatisfactory design with no first floor windows. From the public realm of the car park and Princess Lane, the blank eastern elevation...., would be unattractive and overbearing".

Since the refusal of planning permission for the previous scheme in December 2009, the application site has been included within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The character of the area comprises spacious streets and well designed and reasonably sized properties, in keeping with the 'Garden Suburb' principles. Most of the houses are detached and set in reasonably sized gardens.

The proposed development is considered to be at odds with the character of the area. The site is small and awkwardly shaped and the proposed new building would appear cramped within the site. It is acknowledged that the houses in Regency Drive are also not characteristic of the area, however these were built before the conservation area was extended to cover this part of Ruislip Village. However, when compared to the houses in Regency Drive, the proposal would appear even more cramped and rather ad hoc and as such, it is considered that the proposal would not be in keeping with the prevailing character of the conservation area.

It is considered that the design of the new building is an improvement over the previously refused scheme. Attempts have been made to produce a design that would relate satisfactorily with the suburban style and character of the area. Although the proposed design would, by the most part, appear in keeping with the appearance of other houses in the surrounding area, the front ground and first floor windows, by reason of their size, would appear disproportionate to the remainder of the house and should be much larger, given that this is on the principle elevation of the house. This together with the cramped appearance of the house within the site, results in a form of development that would not harmonise with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Overall, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, contrary to policies BE4, BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and paragraph 4.23 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Layouts.

### **7.04 Airport safeguarding**

This is not applicable to this application.

### **7.05 Impact on the green belt**

This is not applicable to this application.

### **7.06 Environmental Impact**

This is not applicable to this application.

### **7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area**

This is addressed at section 07.03.

### **7.08 Impact on neighbours**

With regard to residential amenity, paragraph 4.9 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts advises that where a two or more storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible overdomination. The distance provided will be dependant on the bulk and size of the building but generally, 15m will be the minimum acceptable distance. It should be noted that a minimum 21m overlooking distance should be complied with.

In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector stated at paragraph 9 that 'However, the private amenity space would only be between 10.5m and 11.5m from the properties on Regency Drive and despite landscaping and a proposed 2m high fence, the privacy of the future occupants of the dwelling would be compromised.'

There are no residential properties to the north and east that would be adversely affected by the proposed development. As the windows proposed on the first floor elevation facing west would provide natural light to non-habitable rooms, they can be fitted with obscure glass to prevent overlooking onto the private amenity space of 2-20 and 22-28 Regency Drive.

From the submitted plans, the proposed development would be sited some 12.5m from 22 Regency Drive, 11m from 24 Regency Drive, 14m from 26 Regency Drive, and some 29m from 8b and 8c Kingsend. Although the proposal would maintain sufficient distances from the properties in Kingsend, it would not retain sufficient distances between 22, 24 and 26 Regency Drive. Therefore, the proposal would represent a visually intrusive and overdominant form of development when viewed from those properties and a significant increase in overshadowing onto those properties during the morning hours, contrary to policies BE20 and BE21 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and paragraph 4.9 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts.

The existing 6m high trees along the northern boundary of 8c Kingsend would prevent overlooking from the proposed first floor south facing bedroom windows. However, nos.24, 26 and 28 Regency Drive would be located within 21m and would still overlook the rear private amenity area of the proposed development, despite the 2.2m high fence enclosing the amenity space, resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the future occupiers of the proposed development. As such, the proposal would fail to overcome the second reason for refusal of the previous scheme and the Inspector's comments, contrary to policy BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and paragraph 4.12 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts.

#### **7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers**

In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector stated at paragraph 8 that "the HDAS requires two bedroom dwellings to provide a minimum of 60sq.m of private amenity space and the proposal clearly fails to satisfy this requirement."

The internal size of the proposed house would be approximately 60sq.m which would fail to meet the requirements of paragraph 4.6 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts which recommended 63sq.m for 2 bedroom houses. The habitable rooms have adequate outlook and would receive sufficient natural light, in accordance with London Plan Policy 4A.3. With regards to the Lifetime Home Standards, an informative was attached to the previously refused scheme advising the application to comply with these standards. However, the ground floor WC would not be of a sufficient size to accommodate wheelchair users, there is insufficient width adjacent to the main

stairs to accommodate a stair lift if required in the future and the doors are less than 900mm wide. Therefore the proposal would fail to provide sufficient internal amenities for future occupiers, contrary to policies BE19 and H8 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), policies 4B.1 and 4B.5 of the London Plan and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statements: Residential Layouts and Accessible Hillingdon.

With regards to amenity space, paragraph 4.16 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts sets out the criteria that would be applied to determine the usable private amenity space for new houses. Given this, the area to the rear (east) of the new house would not meet these criteria. However, the areas to the north and south of the application property would provide usable private amenity space. These areas would equate to approximately 57sq.m which would not meet the requirements of paragraph 4.15 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layout, which advises 60m<sup>2</sup> for two bedroom houses.

Therefore the proposal fails to provide sufficient private amenity space contrary to policy BE23 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and paragraph 4.15 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts.

The insufficient size of the dwelling and its amenities is symptomatic of a cramped form of development. The proposal fails to overcome the third reason for refusal of the previous scheme and the Inspector's comments.

#### **7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety**

The proposal would result in the loss of 4 lock-up garages. However the loss of these garages would not result in a significant increase in on-street parking.

The Council's parking standards require two parking spaces for the proposed house. Two off-street parking spaces are proposed and there would be sufficient space for vehicles to manoeuvre in forward gear onto Kingsend, in accordance with policy AM14.

The highway considerations on a previous application ref. 27853/APP/2008/1288, which was refused by the Council, concluded that given the proposals would result in loss of garages and the proposal was for a single dwelling, it would not result in intensification in use of the access. No highway objection was therefore raised on the previous application. Consequently, the proposals are not considered to merit refusal on highway grounds.

#### **7.11 Urban design, access and security**

This is addressed at section 07.03.

#### **7.12 Disabled access**

This is not applicable to this application.

#### **7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing**

This is not applicable to this application.

#### **7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology**

The scheme makes provision for the long-term retention of all of the off-site trees, which will be protected by the existing boundary fencing. There is also space for additional landscaping, which can be secured by planning conditions should planning permission be granted. Therefore, the proposal would comply with policies BE38 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

#### **7.15 Sustainable waste management**

The application site is some 45m from Kingsend and the existing access is too narrow for

refuse vehicles to enter the site and too long for collectors to pick up waste from the property. However, the application does indicate the provision of bin storage areas within the site and the previous application was not refused on the basis of inadequate provision for refuse storage. Thus, if a scheme was considered acceptable a condition requiring a suitable management scheme, including waste collection could be attached.

**7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability**

This is not applicable to this application.

**7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues**

This is not applicable to this application.

**7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues**

This is not applicable to this application.

**7.19 Comments on Public Consultations**

The third party comments raised are addressed in the report.

**7.20 Planning Obligations**

The proposal would not result in a net increase of 6 habitable rooms and therefore, a contribution towards additional school facilities in the West Ruislip ward is not being sought.

**7.21 Expediency of enforcement action**

This is not applicable to this application.

**7.22 Other Issues**

There are no other relevant issues.

**8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor**

This is not applicable to this application.

**9. Observations of the Director of Finance**

This is not applicable to this application.

**10. CONCLUSION**

For the reasons outlined above and that the proposal would be contrary to the aforementioned policies of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), this application is recommended for refusal.

**11. Reference Documents**

London Plan 2008

Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007)

Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Layouts

Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Accessible Hillingdon

**Contact Officer:** Sonia Bowen

**Telephone No:** 01895 250230



**Notes**



Site boundary

For identification purposes only.

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

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

Site Address

**Garage rear of  
8 Kingsend, Ruislip**

Planning Application Ref:

**27853/APP/2009/1773**

Planning Committee

**North**

Scale

**1:1,250**

Date

**January 2010**

**LONDON BOROUGH  
OF HILLINGDON  
Planning &  
Community Services**

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



**HILLINGDON**  
LONDON