

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address THURGA, 19 GLENALLA ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Erection of two storey building to provide 4 x 2 bed self-contained flats with associated parking, involving demolition of existing dwelling

LBH Ref Nos: 43884/APP/2016/2760

Drawing Nos: ASEA/2016/294/PP/03
ASEA/2016/294/PP/04 Rev. 1
ASEA/2016/294/PP/05
ASEA/2016/294/PP/06
ASEA/2016/294/PP/07
ASEA/2016/294/PP/08
Design and Access Statement
ASEA/2016/294/PP/09
Supporting Photographs

Date Plans Received: 18/07/2016 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 29/07/2016

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two-storey building with pitched roof to create 4 x 2 bedroom self-contained flats with associated car parking following demolition of the existing single-storey dwelling.

The site is within the developed area and the principle of residential redevelopment is acceptable. However, the locality is characterised by single-storey detached and single family occupied dwellings. The construction of a substantial two-storey block of flats with a significant rearwards extension of two-storey development significantly increases the intensity of development on this small site. Its close proximity to the boundaries, in particular, No. 21 Glenalla Road, would make it appear particularly cramped and the insignificant gap would make the site and No. 21 Glenalla Road appear to be a single building when seen from the street. There is limited opportunity for landscaping to the front of the site to soften and reduce the impact of development.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would be materially harmful to the character of the local area, resulting in an incongruous form of development.

It would also harm the amenities of occupiers of adjoining dwellings by reason of loss of daylight and sunlight, loss of privacy and an overbearing impact. In addition, it would not deliver a suitable standard of living accommodation for future occupiers.

Finally, it is also considered that the proposal would not provide sufficient or functional car parking which would result in pressure for on-street parking and a risk to highway safety.

It is therefore recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk and design would result in a cramped, unduly intrusive, visually prominent over-development of the site. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the adjoining properties and the visual amenity of the street scene and the wider area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed building by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, height and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 17 and 21 Glenalla Road, by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light, loss of outlook and loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19, BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions and HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would provide habitable rooms with poor levels of amenity in terms of poor levels of natural light, total lack of outlook, lack of a suitable level of privacy and potential disturbance from other occupiers and visitors accessing the property and/or the amenity space and would therefore give rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies BE19, BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal has not demonstrated that sufficient off street parking/manoeuvring/access arrangements would be provided, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision to the Councils approved car parking standard, leading to on-street parking/queuing to the detriment of pedestrian and highway safety and contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), to Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards (Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's 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.
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.
H4	Mix of housing units
OE8	Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
LPP 3.3	(2016) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 3.8	(2016) Housing Choice
LPP 5.13	(2016) Sustainable drainage
LPP 5.14	(2016) Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
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. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the 'Saved' UDP 2012, Local Plan Part 1, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and

other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service. In this case, the draft reasons for refusal were discussed with the applicant who was also advised that in order to produce an acceptable scheme, a materially different form of development would be required.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the Eastern side of Glenalla Road and comprises a detached bungalow with a hipped roof to the front and rear of the property. There is a single-storey flat roofed rear extension. The principal elevation of the property faces South West.

There is a driveway to the side and a detached garage/outbuilding to the rear alongside the boundary with No. 17 Glenalla Road. No.17 Glenalla Road lies to the North and is a detached bungalow, which is similar in appearance to the application property. To the South lies No.21 Glenalla Road, also a detached bungalow. The site has an extensive rear garden, laid to lawn. There is a substantial tree/hedge to the rear boundary and the side boundaries comprise close-boarded fences of approximately 1.8 metres in height.

The street scene comprises detached bungalows, some of which have had roof extensions including side dormer windows. The application site lies within the Developed Area, as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal involves the erection of a two storey building to provide 4 x 2-bed self-contained flats with associated parking, involving demolition of the existing dwelling.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

43884/A/89/2286 19 Glenalla Road Ruislip

Erection of a single-storey rear extension and loft conversion with side dormer extensions

Decision: 07-02-1991 NFA

43884/APP/2001/1654 19 Glenalla Road Ruislip

ERECTION OF FRONT PORCH AND CONVERSION OF ROOF SPACE TO FORM HABITABLE ROOMS INCLUDING INSTALLATION OF SIDE AND REAR DORMERS (APPLICATION FOR / CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT)

Decision: 26-09-2001 GPD

43884/APP/2001/1669 19 Glenalla Road Ruislip

ERECTION OF A REAR EXTENSION WITH A PITCHED ROOF

Decision: 12-09-2001 Approved

43884/C/90/0429

19 Glenalla Road Ruislip

Retention of a pitched roof single-storey rear extension

Decision: 15-08-1990 Approved

Comment on Relevant Planning History

The planning history relates to extensions to the existing dwelling and is not directly relevant to the current proposal.

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.

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.

H4 Mix of housing units

OE8 Development likely to result in increased flood risk due to additional surface water run-off - requirement for attenuation measures

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

LPP 3.3 (2016) Increasing housing supply

LPP 3.4 (2015) Optimising housing potential

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 3.8 (2016) Housing Choice

LPP 5.13 (2016) Sustainable drainage

LPP 5.14 (2016) Water quality and wastewater infrastructure

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

Neighbours were notified on 02/08/2016 and a site notice was displayed on 24/08/2016. At the end of the notification period there were 34 individual replies and a petition with 22 signatures objecting on the following grounds:

- (1) The development is out of keeping and character with the surrounding area which is characterised by single-storey development;
- (2) The design is poor and does not accord with the predominant character of development in the street and the orientation with a side access is out of keeping;
- (3) The merits of the scheme are unsubstantiated, in particular the stated need for this form of development;
- (4) The development will set a precedent;
- (5) The development does not have enough on-site parking and will generate an unacceptable level of on-street parking in an area of parking stress;
- (6) The traffic generation will raise issues of safety and will make servicing of other properties in the street worse.

OFFICER COMMENT: The issues raised are discussed in the main report.

Internal Consultees

Trees and Landscape Officer:

no objections subject to conditions. This site is occupied by a bungalow (with a large footprint relative to the size of the plot) in a residential street characterised by bungalows. The whole of the front garden has been paved to provide off-street parking.

COMMENT: There are no TPO's or Conservation Areas affecting the site and no visible trees or other soft landscaping from the street. The Design & Access Statement makes no analysis or reference to landscape, contrary to good practice.

The proposed layout perpetuates the use of the front garden for parking for three cars in a layout which will not work (The two cars parked parallel to the kerb cannot manoeuvre if the third (disabled) parking space is occupied.

The layout of the front garden fails to provide 25% soft landscape, as recommended in Hillingdon's design guidance.

This appears to be an over-development of the site which will be detrimental to the character of the area. However, if the application is recommended for approval, landscape conditions should be

imposed to ensure that the proposals enhance the character and appearance of the site.

RECOMMENDATION: Conditions RES9 (parts 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6)

Highways Officer:

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of a new block of four flats.

Pedestrian access would be provided through a side alley; however there is no clear separation between the pedestrian route and vehicular movements. This raises safety concerns regarding potential collisions between vehicles manoeuvring to park and pedestrians accessing the site.

Vehicular access would be through an existing crossover that would need to be extended over the whole width of the plot. It is considered that the crossover, in its new configuration, would be in line with current design and visibility standards.

The proposed layout shown on drawing no. ASEA/2016/294/PP/04 has three parking spaces marked but it appears that the internal parking space parallel to the front elevation could not be accessed if the other two were occupied. It is therefore concluded that only two parking spaces could be realistically provided under the current layout.

The area has a PTAL of 2, which is deemed poor. Even if the council were to make an exception and require one parking space per flat, as opposed to the current standard of 1.5 parking spaces per flat, the parking space provision would still be 50% less than what would be deemed the absolute minimum provisions. In this respect, the proposals do not comply with Policy AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, 2012 (Part 2).

Additionally it is noted that Glenalla Road is a narrow highway and has a high demand for on street parking. As a result, it is considered that the increase in demand for kerbside parking arising from the lack of sufficient parking spaces would result in indiscriminate parking to the detriment of highway safety. With this in mind, the current proposals would be contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, 2012, (Part 2).

The provision of 4 cycle parking spaces in the entrance lobby is in line with current borough policy. It is noted that the average distance between the refuse bins and the public highway is approximately 30m. This is contrary to BS5906: 2005, which recommends that the distance over which containers are transported by collectors should not normally exceed 15m for two-wheeled containers, and 10m for four-wheeled containers.

In summary, it is considered that the development would be contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, (Part 2) and an objection is raised in relation to the highways aspect of the proposals.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

The NPPF has a requirement to encourage the effective use of land by re-using previously developed land. The site lies within an established residential area where there is no objection in principle to the intensification of the residential use of the site, however, this is subject to all other material planning considerations being acceptable, in accordance with the national, regional and local policies.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan (2016) seeks to ensure that the 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 relative density range shown in Table 3.2. Development proposals which compromise this policy should be resisted.

The density matrix, however, is only of limited value when looking at small scale development such as that proposed with this application. In such cases, it is often more appropriate to consider how the development harmonises with its surroundings and its impact on adjoining occupiers.

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

Not applicable to this application.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not applicable to this application.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to this application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

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 NPPF Paragraph 60 states that planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality of initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms of styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. Paragraph 61 states that visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

Paragraph 63 states that great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs but paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

The proposal would replace the existing bungalow on the application site and introduce a two-storey development with pitched roof along the frontage. There are no examples of development of this scale and form in the vicinity which is particularly characterised by single-storey dwellings. The applicant has shown local examples of larger scale development in the vicinity in the submitted Design and Access Statement. However, where dwellings have been extended through roof extensions or rear extensions, these have been generally characterised by subordinate and sympathetic extensions. The predominant character, therefore, is one of single-storey development with roof and single storey extensions as opposed to pure two-storey development in the form proposed.

The proposal would produce a two-storey development which would be approximately 0.5

metres from the boundary with No. 21 Glenalla Road to the South and just over 1 metre from the boundary of No. 17 to the North. It is also substantially higher and a completely different form than both of these properties and with most of the other properties in the vicinity. Whilst the developer has not produced a verified street-scene drawing, it is considered that, as a result, the development would appear cramped as well as much more dominant in the street scene than its immediate neighbours and nearby properties. The close proximity of the development to the boundaries would emphasise the cramped nature of the development. In particular, the close proximity with No. 21 Glenalla Road means that the developments would be effectively merged into one building when seen from many public viewing angles in Glenalla Road.

The suggested depth of this proposal is to the depth of the existing bungalow as extended, this excessive depth of the development would be visible from the remaining gap between the new block and No. 17 Glenalla Road, further emphasising the harm associated with this form of development. The proposed car parking would almost completely fill the front garden with car spaces. Whilst the existing house has a front garden generally comprising hard-standing, there is a small wall across part of this which helps soften the impact. The proposal would remove this and the only landscaping would be to the rear of the cars and low-level. Paragraph 4.34 of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts states that large, unbroken areas of car parking in front of new developments will be resisted by the Council and paragraph 4.37 states that car parking at the front of buildings will not always be achievable, as a result of retaining and enhancing the local character of the area. Thus, the importance of avoiding losing the feeling of enclosure and definition between pavement and private space, the opportunity to provide planting or soft landscape areas is emphasised. In this case there is no effective means of softening the impact of the development.

Overall, having regard to the excessive height of the proposed development in its particular local context, and its excessive depth and proximity to the side boundaries, the proposal would result in a incongruous form of development which would be severely detrimental to the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the Council's Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan.

7.08 Impact on neighbours

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) seeks to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents in a number of ways. The effect of the siting, bulk and proximity of a new building on the outlook and residential amenity of these adjoining occupiers are considered under Policy BE21, whilst potential impacts on daylight/sunlight (Policy BE20) and privacy (Policy BE24) are also assessed.

Paragraph 4.9 of the SPD, HDAS: Residential Layouts further advises that all residential developments and amenity spaces should receive adequate daylight and sunlight and that new development should be designed to minimise the negative impact of overbearing and overshadowing proposals. It goes on to advise that 'where a two storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible domination'. Generally, 15m will be the minimum acceptable distance between buildings. Furthermore a minimum of 21m overlooking distance should be maintained. Any development must also be considered against the detailed advice in the SPD HDAS:

Residential Extensions which assists in determining the impact of redevelopment on neighbours amenities.

Paragraph 4.11 of the SPD gives advice on sunlight and daylight considerations, and that a 45 degree line of sight principle will be applied to new development, to ensure the amenity of adjoining occupiers and future occupiers are protected. Paragraph 4.12 of the SPD requires a minimum of 21m distance between facing habitable room windows in new and adjacent properties to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy.

Whilst the proposal raises no adverse issues in terms of distance to properties to the front and rear, where it will be seen across the street or there is strong intervening screenings, there are major concerns relating to the impact of the development on the adjoining properties, Nos. 17 and 21 Glenalla Road. The proposed two-storey building would project approximately 5m to the rear of these single-storey properties. The development is only 0.5 metres away from the common boundary with No.21 Glenalla Road. Whilst accepting that the existing dwelling is also extremely close to the boundary, this is single storey. The two-storey proposal would create a dominant form of development which would, it is considered, result in loss of amenity to the occupiers of No. 21 Glenalla Road by reason of loss of light and overbearing impact, notably to the side roof dormer window facing towards the application site but also to a rear ground floor window which appears to be the only form of natural light to the kitchen of that property. It is considered that the proposal would result in a serious loss of light and outlook for the occupants of No. 21 Glenalla Road.

Turning to No. 17 Glenalla Road, there are side facing windows within that property along the common boundary with the application site both at ground floor and a dormer window within the roof. The proposed development includes 4 upper floor bedroom windows, two ground floor bedroom windows and the main entrance door to the proposal. Objectors have referred to side entrances not being characteristic of the area. In reality there are a number of examples including the entrance to the current property on the site and also that to No. 17 Glenalla Road.

In terms of No.17 Glenalla Road, the proposal has an unacceptable impact for a number of reasons. First, the proposed development will be visually dominant and overbearing for occupiers. Second, the occupiers of the property are likely to experience loss of privacy as a result of the number and orientation of windows. Third, in the absence of a submitted daylight and sunlight assessment, it is considered that the occupiers will experience loss of light and finally, it is considered that the occupiers will experience an unacceptable loss of amenity by reason of the level of activity and disturbance that is likely to be generated along this narrow passageway. This includes movement of occupiers to and from the four flats, visitors and general callers. Whilst a level of screening is proposed in the form of fencing and some planting to the front of ground floor bedroom windows, which would reduce the impact somewhat, it is unlikely that this would be to a level which would reduce the loss of amenity to a material degree.

As such, it is considered that the proposed building would result in an overly dominant, visually intrusive and an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity in terms of overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light, loss of outlook and loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies BE19, BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions and HDAS: Residential Layouts.

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 and they have been adopted by The Mayor of London in the form of Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016). This sets out how the existing policies relating to Housing Standards in The London Plan should be applied from March 2016. Table 3.3 sets out how the minimum space standards stemming from the policy specified in the 2012 Housing SPG should be interpreted in relation to the national standard.

Table 3.3 of the Amendment specifies that the minimum internal floor space area/standard for a 2 bedroom (3 person) flat is 61 square metres. The nationally described space standards defines the Gross Internal Area (GIA) or internal floor space area of a dwelling as 'the total floor space measured between the internal faces of perimeter walls that enclose a dwelling. This includes partitions, structural elements, cupboards, ducts, flights of stairs and voids above stairs. At a floor space of minimum 61 square metres the proposed flats would adhere to this minimum standard.

The development has been orientated so that on the side facing No. 21 Glenalla Road, the main habitable rooms on the first floor face over the front and rear or are at a height where they would obtain natural light from over the roof of the adjoining development. At ground floor two of the bedroom windows and all the kitchen windows face directly over the narrow common passageway on the side adjoining No. 17 Glenalla Road or the boundary facing No.21. The proposed front door to the flats is also within that area. It is considered that this would result in an oppressive outlook for occupiers and would provide little or no natural light to these rooms. A small landscaped area has been shown to the front of these windows, presumably to reduce disturbance from occupiers of the other flats or visitors passing close to the windows. However, in order for this to be effective, the screening is likely to be so high that it will introduce its own adverse impact on the interior environment of those bedrooms. If this was low enough not to result in an oppressive interior environment, occupiers are likely to not have sufficient privacy as a result of people being able to see into the windows. Obscure glazing, if fitted, would also result in an inadequate standard of accommodation. Occupiers of the upper floor units are liable to experience overlooking from the side facing dormer window of No. 17 Glenalla Road and if these windows are to be obscure glazed, would result in habitable rooms having no outlook.

Paragraph 4.17 of the SPD requires developments to incorporate usable, attractively laid out and conveniently located garden space in relation to the flats they serve. The Council's minimum requirement is for 25 sqm per flat of amenity space. The proposal provides a dedicated space of 50 sqm for one of the ground floor flats and a communal space of 130 sqm for the other three flats. The dedicated space is accessed direct from the rear of the flat and the communal space is reached by a short walk from the main entrance and is shown to be gated. This totals 180 sqm which exceeds the minimum requirement for 4 flats of 100 sqm. Therefore the proposal provides amenity space of sufficient size commensurate to the size of the units.

In view of the design it is considered that occupiers of the ground and first floor flats would not enjoy a reasonable level of amenity and as such the proposal would give rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future

occupiers. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies BE19, BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Pedestrian access would be provided through a side alley, however there is no clear separation between the pedestrian route and vehicular movements to the front of the site. There is a small path but vehicles would need to cross over this in order to manoeuvre in and out of the car park spaces. This raises safety concerns regarding potential collisions between vehicles manoeuvring to park and pedestrians accessing the site.

Vehicular access would be through an existing crossover that would need to be extended over the whole width of the plot. The proposed layout shown on drawing no. ASEA/2016/294/PP/04 has three parking spaces marked but the internal parking space parallel to the front elevation could not be accessed if the other two were occupied. It is therefore concluded that only two parking spaces could be realistically provided under the current layout.

The area has a PTAL of 2, which is deemed poor. Even if the Council were to make an exception and require one parking space per flat, as opposed to the current standard of 1.5 parking spaces per flat, the parking space provision would still be 50% less than what would be deemed the absolute minimum provisions. Additionally it is noted that Glenalla Road is a narrow highway and has a high demand for on street parking. As a result, it is considered that the increase in demand for kerbside parking arising from the lack of sufficient parking spaces would result in indiscriminate parking to the detriment of highway safety. In this respect, the proposals do not comply with Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

In addition, the proposed car parking effectively takes up all the frontage of the site. Paragraph 4.36 of the HDAS states that the loss of significant vegetation to accommodate car parking is likely to make a proposal unacceptable. It is accepted that the majority of the front of the existing site is already hard-surfaced. However, there is a partial front wall and some limited planting which softens the existing development. The proposal, on the other hand, has no front wall and only limited landscaping which would be up against the front elevation of the proposed flats and while cars are present, would offer no softening impact.

The provision of 4 cycle parking spaces in the entrance lobby is in line with current borough policy.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

These issues are covered in Section 7.07 of the report.

7.12 Disabled access

If the scheme were to be considered acceptable a condition would be recommended to secure the development was built to M4(2) in accordance with Policy 3.8c of the London Plan.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

The Trees and Landscape Officer recommends standard conditions in the event of a

decision to approve.

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Not applicable to this application.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

The Design and Access Statement confirms the following as a proposed schedule of measures, which could be incorporated into the method of construction.

- The achievement of a higher SAP rating by insulating floors, roof, walls and improved glazing.
- The provision of low-energy lighting and user controls.
- The provision of high efficiency condensing boiler and thermostatic radiator valves.
- The installation of water meter, devices for water leak detection, water efficient taps, water efficient toilets and low output showers.
- All timber used in the construction will be from sustainable sources.

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 issues raised are covered in the main body of the report.

7.20 Planning Obligations

The Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule was adopted on 1st August 2014. The additional habitable floor space created will be chargeable at £95 per square metre.

On the 1st April 2012 the Mayoral Community Structure Levy came into force. The London Borough of Hillingdon falls within Charging Zone 2, therefore, a flat rate fee of £35 per square metre would be required for each net additional square metre added to the site as part of the development.

The development would result in an additional 134 square metres of development which would generate a Hillingdon CIL charge of £14,502.53 and a Mayoral charge of £5,678.48.

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application.

7.22 Other Issues

It is noted that the average distance between the proposed refuse bins and the public highway is approximately 30m. This is contrary to BS5906: 2005, which recommends that the distance over which containers are transported by collectors should not normally exceed 15m for two-wheeled containers, and 10m for four-wheeled containers. This reflects the general matter dealt with throughout the report, of over-development of the site, since the containers are set so far back on the site in order to accommodate the development.

The applicant refers in the Design and Access Statement to the need for additional small units within the Borough. Whilst this is acknowledged, any provision must be balanced with other environmental, character and amenity issues. This position is made clear in paragraph 14 the NPPF which confirms that any adverse impacts must outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole. The applicant has not made a claim that this is innovative or exceptional development.

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 site is within the developed area and the principle of residential redevelopment is acceptable. However, the locality is characterised by single-storey detached and single family occupied dwellings. The construction of a substantial two-storey block of flats with a significant rearwards extension of two-storey development significantly increases the intensity of development on this small site. Its close proximity to the boundaries, in particular, No. 21 Glenalla Road, would make it appear particularly cramped and the insignificant gap would make the site and No. 21 Glenalla Road appear to be a single building when seen from the street. There is limited opportunity for landscaping to the front of the site to soften and reduce the impact of development.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would be materially harmful to the character of the local area, resulting in an incongruous form of development.

It would also harm the amenities of occupiers of adjoining dwellings by reason of loss of daylight and sunlight, loss of privacy and an overbearing impact. In addition, it would not deliver a suitable standard of living accommodation for future occupiers.

Finally, it is also considered that the proposal would not provide sufficient or functional car parking which would result in pressure for on-street parking and a risk to highway safety.

It is therefore recommended for refusal.

11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
The London Plan (2016)
The Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016)
Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016)
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon
National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Cris Lancaster

Telephone No: 01895 250230