

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address THURGA, 19 GLENALLA ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Single storey rear extension, enlargement of roof to create additional habitable roof space to include 4 side dormers and conversion of dwelling into 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed self-contained flats with associated parking, amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front

LBH Ref Nos: 43884/APP/2017/401

Drawing Nos: Design & Access Statement
ASEA/2016/327/PP/01
ASEA/2016/327/PP/02
ASEA/2016/327/PP/03
ASEA/2016/338/PP/04
ASEA/2016/327/PP/05
ASEA/2017/338/PP/06

Date Plans Received: 03/02/2017 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 09/03/2017

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks full planning permission for erection of a single storey rear extension, enlargement of roof to create additional habitable roof space to include 4 x side dormers and conversion of dwelling into 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed self-contained flats with associated parking, amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front.

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 extensions significantly increase 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 overlooking and loss of privacy.

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.

The application is referred to committee as a result of a petition of 45 signatures.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the size and scale of the side dormer windows 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 material 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 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

3 159 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.

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 proposed scheme involves erection of a single storey rear extension, enlargement of roof to create additional habitable roof space to include 4 x side dormers and conversion of dwelling into 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed self-contained flats with associated parking, amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

43884/APP/2016/2760 Thurga, 19 Glenalla Road Ruislip

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

Decision: 16-11-2016 Withdrawn

Comment on Relevant Planning History

An application for erection of two storey building to provide 4 x 2 bed self-contained flats with associated parking, involving demolition of existing dwelling was withdrawn in 2016.

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 13/03/2017 and a site notice was displayed on 16/03/2017.

By the end of the consultation period a petition of 45 signatures, 25 objections and 1 comment were received raising the following issues:-

- (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.
- (3) The development will set a precedent;
- (4) 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;
- (5) 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 - This site is occupied by a bungalow which is characteristic of this residential street. The whole of the front garden has been paved over to provide off-street parking, which is

detrimental to the character and appearance of the street - and contrary to Hillingdon's design guidance for front gardens. COMMENT This application follows the withdrawal of a previous application ref. 2016/2760, the scope of which was far more ambitious. Further to previous comments which were critical, the extent of this proposal is more modest, with most of the development extending upwards within the footprint of the building. The parking arrangement in the front, for two cars only, together with re-introduced soft landscape strips / boundary hedges addresses previous landscape criticisms. RECOMMENDATION If the application is recommended for approval, there is no objection subject to conditions RES9 (parts 1,2,4,5 and 6).

Highways and Traffic - The cross over as shown would result in a vehicle driving over the footway to manoeuvre into the parking space. An even wider cross over cannot be supported. The Council's parking standards require 2 car parking spaces for a three bedroom flat, as such the development ought to provide 3 car parking spaces. The application as currently presented cannot be supported on highway grounds.

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.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not applicable.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable.

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.

Section 7 of the HDAS Residential Extensions places significant weight on the need for dormer extensions to be subordinate to the main dwelling. The existing dwelling has small side dormers. These will be replaced by two large dormer windows on both sides. These will be almost full height and will very little set in from the eaves. The hip to gable conversion to the front elevation adds considerably to the bulk of development. The result, when viewed from the street is a substantial area of flat roof and a significant alteration to the scale and appearance of the dwelling. This is considered to be harmful to the street scheme. The close proximity of 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.

Overall, 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, 15 m will be the minimum acceptable distance between buildings. Furthermore a minimum of 21 m 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 21 m distance between facing habitable room windows in new and adjacent properties to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy.

Paragraph 3.4 of the HDAS Residential extensions states that for detached houses an

extension up to 4 m deep is acceptable. Paragraph 3.6 states that in many areas, a flat roof single storey extension will be acceptable. These should not exceed 3 m in height. The proposal involves a flat roof extension of 3.5 metres deep and 3 metres high. It replaces a conservatory. This conforms to the guidance and will produce a subordinate extension.

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, no 17 and 21 Glenalla Road. There are side facing windows in No. 17 along the common boundary with the application site both at ground floor and a dormer window within the roof. The proposed development includes 2 upper floor bedroom windows facing towards No. 17. These are not shown as obscure glazed. This is in addition to the substantial re-profiling of the roof which includes both front and rear alterations. There are upper floor windows facing towards No. 21, which has a dormer window facing towards the site. This appears to serve a bedroom. One of the proposed windows serves a bathroom and could be obscure glazed. Consideration has been given to whether it is practical to obscure glaze bedroom windows. However, this is likely to result in an unsatisfactory internal living environment. Overall, the development is likely to produce an unsatisfactory living environment for neighbours.

The rear extension has no side windows. Given that in terms of depth and height it meets HDAS guidance, it is considered that no adverse issues arise in this regard.

As such, it is considered that the proposed building would result in an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity in terms of 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. For a 3 - bed flat the maximum standard is 95 square metres. The proposed 2 bed flat is 82 square metres and the 3 bed flat is 121 square metres. In both cases the standard is exceeded.

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 sq m per flat of amenity space. The proposal provides shared amenity space of sufficient size commensurate to the size of the units.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

The cross over as shown would result in a vehicle driving over the footway to manoeuvre into the parking space. An even wider cross over cannot be supported. The Council's

parking standards require 2 car parking spaces for a three bedroom flat, as such the development ought to provide 3 car parking spaces. The application as currently presented cannot be supported on highway grounds

With this in mind, the current proposals would be contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, 2012, (Part 2).

7.11 Urban design, access and security

It is considered that the design is harmful to the character of the area. The issues are discussed in the relevant areas 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.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

This site is occupied by a bungalow which is characteristic of this residential street. The whole of the front garden has been paved over to provide off-street parking, which is detrimental to the character and appearance of the street - and contrary to Hillingdon's design guidance for front gardens. This application follows the withdrawal of a previous application ref. 2016/2760, the scope of which was far more ambitious. Further to previous comments which were critical, the extent of this proposal is more modest, with most of the development extending upwards within the footprint of the building. The parking arrangement in the front, for two cars only, together with re-introduced soft landscape strips / boundary hedges addresses previous landscape criticisms. If the application is recommended for approval, there is no objection subject to conditions RES9 (parts 1,2,4,5 and 6).

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Not applicable as recommended for refusal.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable as recommended for refusal.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

Not applicable.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The issues raised are dealt with throughout the report.

7.20 Planning Obligations

The application is recommended for refusal. The application is subject to CIL but no additional Planning Obligations issues arise.

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable.

7.22 Other Issues

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 51.5 metres of development which would generate a Hillingdon CIL charge of £4892.5 and a Mayoral charge of £1802.5, a total of £6695

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

None.

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 extensions significantly increase 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 overlooking and loss of privacy.

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.

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



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:

**Thurga,
 19 Glengalla Road**

**LONDON BOROUGH
 OF HILLINGDON**
 Residents Services
 Planning Section
 Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
 Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111

Planning Application Ref:
43884/APP/2017/401

Scale:
1:1,250

Planning Committee:
North

Date:
May 2017



HILLINGDON
 LONDON