

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address 54 PARKFIELD ROAD ICKENHAM

Development: Two x 2-storey dwellings with habitable roofspace, outbuildings to rear, installation of vehicular crossover to front and associated landscaping works, involving demolition of existing bungalow.

LBH Ref Nos: 20899/APP/2016/2376

Drawing Nos: PP01-AM-04-16 Rev 1
PP09-AM-06-16 Rev 1
PP10-AM-06-16 Rev 2
Photographs
PP002-AM-05-16
PP003-AM-05-16
PP004-AM-06-16 Rev 1
PP005-AM-06-16 Rev 1
PP-AM-05-16
Design & Access Statement
PP001-AM-06-16 Rev 1
Energy Assessment
Regulations Compliance Report
Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Study
PP08a-AM-08-16 Rev 1
PP08b-AM-08-16 Rev 1
PP07-AM-08-16 Rev 1
PP06-AM-08-16 Rev 1
PP02-AM-08-16 Rev 1
PP03-AM-08-16 Rev 1
PP04-AM-08-16 Rev 1
PP05-AM-08-16 Rev 1
Flood Risk Assessment August 2016
Sequential Test Updated February 2017

Date Plans Received:	20/06/2016	Date(s) of Amendment(s):	30/06/2016
Date Application Valid:	01/07/2016		20/06/2016
			20/12/2016
			01/07/2016
			16/09/2016

1. SUMMARY

The property is located within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012). This proposal considers the demolition of the existing bungalow and replacement with 2 detached dwellings.

Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene, and BE19 states the LPA will seek to ensure that new development within residential areas compliments or improves the amenity and the character of the area.

The proposed dwellings are acceptable in design terms and would meet all relevant Council standards in terms of unit size, amenity space provision and car parking and as such would afford future occupiers with adequate levels of amenity. No objection is therefore raised in this regard.

However the site lies within Flood Zone 2 and the proposal fails to demonstrate that there is adequate justification for the intensification for the site for residential purposes in accordance with the requirements of Policy EM6 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, 2012, Part 2 and the NPPF.

As such it is recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The Local Planning Authority consider the development to be unacceptable in principle as insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate under a sequential test that, given the application site's status under land designated as Flood Zone 2, alternative sites with a lower probability of flooding could accommodate the proposed residential development. The Council is meeting its average annual housing target and there is evidence of a continued supply of small housing sites outside of flood zone 2. The proposal therefore is contrary to Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012); Policies 5.12, 5.13 and 5.15 of the London Plan (March 2016 and the NPPF.

INFORMATIVES

1 I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

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

2 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).

3 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.
EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management
H3	Loss and replacement of residential accommodation
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 5.12	(2016) Flood risk management
LPP 5.3	(2016) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 7.2	(2016) An inclusive environment
LPP 7.4	(2016) Local character
NPPF1	NPPF - Delivering sustainable development
NPPF6	NPPF - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF7	NPPF - Requiring good design
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
LDF-AH	Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010

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 2007, 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 a large sized plot, located on the North Eastern side of Parkfield Road. It currently comprises a large detached 4 bed bungalow with an attached garage to one side and an additional parking space in front. There is also another driveway to the other side of the property. It benefits from a good sized rear garden. To either side there are detached bungalows however the general street scene is made up from a mixture of house types and styles including bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings. It is also noted that this plot is approximately twice the width as most of the others in the area.

The application site lies within the 'Developed Area' as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of two x 2-storey dwellings with habitable roofspace, outbuildings to rear, the installation of vehicular crossover to front and associated landscaping works.

The application has been accompanied by a Flood risk assessment & Sequential Test (over 100 pages of written reports). A Sequential Test should be applied to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding that would be appropriate to the type of development or land use proposed. This report has evaluated all the Sites within the wards of Ickenham, West Ruislip, South Ruislip, Hillingdon East Ward and Uxbridge North.

Extracts from the applicants reports are copied below:

'The proposed development comprises the construction of two four bedroom detached houses with associated driveway, car parking and landscaping. According to the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning Purposes, the Site is located in fluvial Flood Zone 2 and is not protected by flood defences. Modelled flood level data was obtained from the Environment Agency and using the most up to date guidance for climate change (May, 2016), the 25% central allowance was used to inform the design flood level. As a result 0.5 m was added to the 1 in 100 year flood level to give a final design flood level of 42.67 mAOD. Surface water flood risk is Low to Very Low and groundwater flood risk is negligible....

Mitigation and Next steps following GeoSmart's assessment of flood risk to the site, it is recommended that:

- Minimum floor levels for the proposed houses are set no lower than 43.27 mAOD (600mm above the 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood level of 42.67 mAOD);
- Residents should register themselves to the Environment Agency's flood warning direct scheme; and
- A Sustainable urban Drainage Strategy (SuDS) is developed for the site, see the further information section at the end of this report.

The Sequential Test report has been updated to search for any available Sites between the threshold of 0.057 and 0.13 hectares. The Sequential Test (Appendix B) report has been updated to reference the definition of 'reasonably available Sites'. The report identifies Sites that are a range of sizes, the smallest identified in the search of the Local Plan is approximately 0.17 ha. As part of the updated report, we have undertaken our search in accordance with the minimum and maximum thresholds (0.057 ha to 0.13 ha) set out by the local planning authority and already included these thresholds within both the Local Plan Site search and the review of alternative Sites. There are no Sites which could be compared and that were identified within both Flood Zones 1 and 2 and suitable for residential development.

In the revised version of the Sequential Test report (Appendix B), the search radius has been increased to locate alternative Sites within a much larger radius than in the original report and now includes Sites within Ickenham, West Ruislip, South Ruislip, Hillingdon East and North Uxbridge....

Concluding Remarks: The Sequential Test confirms there are no Sites which are of comparable size, which are capable of providing suitable housing in either the Local Plan or review of alternative Site searches. Moreover, the recommendations for mitigation outlined within the flood risk assessment for the Site would ensure the proposals would be

safe for the lifetime of the development and would not lead to flood risk elsewhere.'

3.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Relevant Planning History

No relevant planning history exists.

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.

EM6 (2012) Flood Risk Management

H3 Loss and replacement of residential accommodation

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 5.12 (2016) Flood risk management

LPP 5.3 (2016) Sustainable design and construction

LPP 7.2 (2016) An inclusive environment

LPP 7.4 (2016) Local character

NPPF1 NPPF - Delivering sustainable development

NPPF6 NPPF - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

NPPF7 NPPF - Requiring good design

HDAS-LAY Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary

Planning Document, adopted July 2006

LDF-AH Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

8 neighbours were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 26 July 2016. A site notice was also erected on a lamp post to the front of the site.

There were no responses.

Parkfield Road/Oak Avenue Petition Group - No response.

Ickenham Residents Association - No response.

Eastcote Residents Association - No response.

Internal Consultees

Access Officer - No comments to make.

Highways - The site has a PTAL value of 1 (poor) which indicates there will be a strong reliance on the private car for trip making. My comments this time round are very similar with the exception that the on-site parking is reduced to 2 spaces per dwelling which is adequate for a 4 bed dwelling.

There will be two new vehicular access points required to be constructed at the applicant's expense. The latest plans show refuse/recycling facilities included along with a secure covered cycle storage for 1 cycle and this should be 2 cycles so could you condition this please if permission is being granted. There will be slightly more traffic generated as a result of the current proposal but capacity is not an issue at this location. On the basis of the above comments I have no significant concerns.

Trees/Landscape Officer - Initial concern was raised over the excessive parking and the dominating effect of so much hard surfacing to the detrimental to the character and appearance of the area - and is contrary to LBH design guidance. The proliferation of hard surfacing in the front garden is also contrary to SUDS guidance.

Subsequent plans have been submitted for the provision of two parking spaces and some soft landscaping. Although it is noted that as shown this is slightly less than the 25% requirement, there is sufficient space for this level of soft landscaping to be increased without compromising the parking provision. This could therefore be addressed with the condition requiring the submission of a suitable landscaping scheme.

Flood and Water Management - The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence of the additional dwelling having passed the Sequential Test. Policy EM6 clearly states that the Sequential Test should be undertaken prior to the Exception Test. I object to the proposed development as there is no justification why this development should be sited at a location which is shown to be within Flood Zone 2. The proposal adds an additional dwelling into Flood Zone 2 and therefore this is not

considered acceptable.

In accordance with the NPPF 'inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere' The developer should justify with evidence to the LPA what area of search has been used when making the application. There is no justification as to the need for additional 4 bedroom houses in Ickenham and the surrounding area.

The sequential test provided clearly shows that there is land available in Flood Zone 1 suitable for residential development. The ownership of a site of the size for two properties is not appropriate to then restrict the sequential test to that size of site to justify its development.

The Council needs to be assured that if they are placing new development in areas of flood risk then there must be an appropriate reason. This development will introduce a new dwelling into an area with a high probability of flooding. Plus additional residents at risk as people returning to their homes may be inclined to navigate flood waters or seek to retrieve flooded property placing themselves at risk and putting added burden on emergency services.

The Council has to be able to accept that the benefits of the development outweigh this risk by determining there is no available land at a lower risk of flooding. It is for the applicant to satisfy the Council as to why a new development should be located in this area. Without suitable evidence the Council should look to alternative sites at a lower risk to fulfil its housing needs. The majority of the Borough is outside of flood zones 2 & 3, including its main centres. The Council's housing land studies suggest that there are many locations across the Borough not at risk of flooding.

Only once the sequential test has been passed would the applicant then need to address the Exception test, demonstrating that flood risk can be suitably mitigated in accordance with Local and National Policy. For the Exception Test to be passed it must demonstrate that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk and a site specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The first element is not addressed and the justification that it provides an additional house towards housing supply is not considered adequate.

Planning Policy - Having looked at the latest Sequential Test and Flood Risk information, I note the following:

- 1) The Council is meeting its average annual housing target of 559 units per annum, as defined in the London Plan (March 2016). The latest information on windfalls indicates that on average, the Council delivers 174 units on sites of 0.25 hectares or less.
- 2) The latest information on housing need indicates a borough-wide need to provide larger family units over the period of the Local Plan, however no area specific needs are identified for the Ickenham area.
- 3) Taking account of its designated flood zone, borough-wide housing needs are not sufficient to justify the development of additional residential units on the site.
- 4) The proposal involves a net gain of 1 additional residential unit. Notwithstanding the presence of any additional planning constraints, many of the sites identified in Table 2 of the sequential test document are of a sufficient size to accommodate this requirement.
- 5) I am therefore of the view that there are sequentially preferable sites available.

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 land. Policy 3.4 of The London Plan (2015) promotes the optimisation of housing output within different types of location. Policy 3.8 of The London Plan also encourages the Council to provide a range of housing choices in order to take account of the various different groups who require different types of housing. Consideration will also be given to the accessibility of the site to services and amenities.

Policy H3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) advises the loss of residential accommodation will only be permitted if it is replaced within the boundary of the site. An increase in the residential accommodation will be sought, subject to other policies in the plan.

Whilst the site lies within an established residential area, due to the sites location within Flood Zone 2, there is an objection in principle to the intensification of the residential use of the site contrary to the requirements of Policy EM6 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, 2012, Part 2 and the NPPF.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan 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 the existing and adjoining sites.

The existing street scene is varied comprising one, one and a half and two storey dwellings of varying design. The proposed dwellings have been designed to reflect various features within the street scene and have a hipped roof design with front and rear projections and a catslide feature to the front including a dormer window. In order to minimise the height and bulk of the proposal the roofs are finished with a small crown. Ordinarily this would be considered unacceptable, however it is noted that no. 58 has previously been extended with the addition of a first floor. This was approved at appeal (APP/R5510/A/08/2077613) where the Inspector considered that "The design of the proposal itself seems to have been

thought through to fit into the streetscene and to minimise the bulk of the resulting building and I do not think the flat roof element would stand out". Given that the crown elements of the proposed dwelling are significantly smaller, it would seem unreasonable to refuse this proposal on that basis alone. Therefore the overall scale of the proposed new dwellings is considered acceptable. It is also considered that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and that its visual impact is acceptable, in accordance with policies BE13 and BE19 of the UDP saved policies.

To the rear of the property the proposal includes an outbuilding per dwelling, which measures 7.8 m in width, 2.7m in depth and has a flat roof of 2.4 m in height. This is proposed to form a store room and a gymnasium as well as a cycle store to one side. The size and scale of the proposed outbuildings are in compliance with HDAS requirements and are considered acceptable.

7.08 Impact on neighbours

With regard to the impact of the amenities on the adjoining occupiers, Sections 4.9 of the SPD: New Residential Layouts, in relation to new dwellings, states all residential developments and amenity space should receive adequate daylight and sunlight. The daylight and sunlight available to adjoining properties should be adequately protected and careful design can help minimise the negative impact of overbearing and overshadowing.

There is currently a large detached bungalow located centrally at the front of the plot, maintaining a front building line with the adjacent properties but has been extensively built upon to the rear, measuring 18 m in depth. To the South the existing garage sits very close to the boundary with no. 52, with the main part of the dwelling set back 2.2 m and projecting 4.2 m beyond the rear of that property. To the North the bungalow is set back 4.15 m from the boundary with no. 56 however there was previously a car port structure set back 1.25m from the boundary and projecting 7.6m beyond the rear of that property, which had been removed at the time of the site visit.

The plot has been divided into two with 54a proposed on the Northern half and 54b to the South. The dwellings measure 15 m in depth by 8.5 m in width with a height of 8.1 m. 54b is centrally positioned within its plot, set back 1m from each boundary and will project 1.6 m beyond the rear of no. 52. The proposal would not compromise a 45 degree line of sight from this property. 54a has been set back 1 m from the boundary with 54b and 2 m from the boundary with no. 56. It is noted that although the neighbouring property has been previously extended, this is not along the boundary with the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwelling will extend 7.2 m beyond the rear of the neighbouring property with the two storey element at 4 m in depth and a further single storey element at 3.2 m. Whilst the two storey element would comply with HDAS requirements, it is acknowledged that the total depth would exceed HDAS guidance. However this is a reduction in depth to the existing bungalow and although the 45 degree line of sight crosses the very corner of the single storey element this would be no deeper than the car port structure that was previously there and set back from the boundary by an additional 1 m. Therefore, the proposed dwellings are considered not to result in an unacceptable degree of over dominance, visual intrusion and over shadowing and would comply with Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

In relation to any loss of privacy arising from the proposal, the principle windows face front and rear. The side windows are either secondary windows or serve non habitable rooms

and can be conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.8 m. Therefore subject to the appropriate conditions, the proposal is not considered to result in a material loss of privacy and would comply with Policy BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

To the rear of the garden of each it is proposed to erect an outbuilding, which would measure 7.8 m in width and 2.7 m in depth not exceeding 2.4 m in height and set back from the side boundary by 1 m. Given the degree of separation and the distance from the adjacent existing residential units, it is not considered the proposed outbuilding would have a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

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

The Housing Standards (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) March 2016 sets out the minimum internal floor spaces required for developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for existing and future occupants. The standards require a 4 bedroom (8 person) property to have a minimum internal floor area of 130 sq m with an additional 3 sq m of internal storage. The proposed layouts indicate the dwellings have a floor area of approximately 250 sq m, in excess of the standard required. The proposal therefore provides a satisfactory living environment for the future occupants of property in accordance with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2015.

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, would have an adequate outlook and source of natural light, and therefore comply with the SPD: New Residential Layouts: Section 4.9.

The development provides over the 100 sq m of private amenity space required in accordance with the Council's adopted standard. The proposal therefore complies with policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)

The accompanying plans indicate designated refuse storage to the front. The Highways Officer has advised that although the plans indicate a cycle store, this should be conditioned for the provision of at least two cycles.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) requires developments to comply with the Council's Car Parking Standards.

There are two existing vehicular crossovers one to either side of the site. 54a would utilise the existing Northern crossover, whilst 54b would have a repositioned crossover. The proposal includes 2 parking spaces for each dwelling and the Highways Officer has advised that this would be acceptable. Therefore, it is considered that the development would comply with Policy AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, 2012, Part 2.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

A Secured by Design condition could be added to any approval to ensure the development complies with such principles should the application be acceptable in all other respects.

7.12 Disabled access

The Access Officer has not raised any concerns relating to Lifetime Home Standards and to achieving level access.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

The Council's Landscaping Officer initially raised concerns over the excessive parking provision to the front and lack of soft landscaping. A revised plan has been submitted to show two parking spaces and some soft landscaping. A condition for the submission of a landscape scheme would be required to identify details of the surface materials and the soft landscaping provision to ensure this exceeds the required 25%.

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Not applicable to this application.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable to this application.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

The site lies within Flood Zone 2, where development for the provision of additional residential properties is strictly controlled. The Flood and Water Management Officer has raised concerns that the proposal has failed to justify why this development should be sited at this location. The full consultation comments state:

"The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence of the additional dwelling having passed the Sequential Test. Policy EM6 clearly states that the Sequential Test should be undertaken prior to the Exception Test. I object to the proposed development as there is no justification why this development should be sited at a location which is shown to be within Flood Zone 2. The proposal adds an additional dwelling into Flood Zone 2 and therefore this is not considered acceptable.

In accordance with the NPPF 'inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere' The developer should justify with evidence to the LPA what area of search has been used when making the application. There is no justification as to the need for additional 4 bedroom houses in Ickenham and the surrounding area.

The sequential test provided clearly shows that there is land available in Flood Zone 1 suitable for residential development. The ownership of a site of the size for two properties is not appropriate to then restrict the sequential test to that size of site to justify its development.

The Council needs to be assured that if they are placing new development in areas of flood risk then there must be an appropriate reason. This development will introduce a new dwelling into an area with a high probability of flooding. Plus additional residents at risk as people returning to their homes may be inclined to navigate flood waters or seek to retrieve flooded property placing themselves at risk and putting added burden on emergency services.

The Council has to be able to accept that the benefits of the development outweigh this risk by determining there is no available land at a lower risk of flooding. It is for the applicant to satisfy the Council as to why a new development should be located in this area. Without suitable evidence the Council should look to alternative sites at a lower risk to fulfil its

housing needs. The majority of the Borough is outside of flood zones 2 & 3, including its main centres. The Council's housing land studies suggest that there are many locations across the Borough not at risk of flooding.

Only once the sequential test has been passed would the applicant then need to address the Exception test, demonstrating that flood risk can be suitably mitigated in accordance with Local and National Policy. For the Exception Test to be passed it must demonstrate that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk and a site specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The first element is not addressed and the justification that it provides an additional house towards housing supply is not considered adequate."

It is further noted that Hillingdon is currently delivering housing requirements defined within the London Plan and has a clear 5 year housing supply. Since 1 April 2016, 52 additional windfall housing units have been approved in Ickenham Ward alone in 1-10 unit development proposals, further diminishing the need to build on this and other flood Zone sites.

It is therefore considered that the proposal fails demonstrate that there is adequate justification for the intensification for the site for residential purposes in accordance with the requirements of Policy EM6 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, 2012, Part 2 and the NPPF.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to this application.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The issues raised have been addressed appropriately in 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.

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application.

7.22 Other Issues

None.

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

10. CONCLUSION

The proposed dwellings are acceptable in design terms and would meet all relevant Council standards in terms of unit size, amenity space provision and car parking and as such would afford future occupiers with adequate levels of amenity. No objection is

therefore raised in this regard. However the site lies within Flood Zone 2 and the proposal fails demonstrate that there is adequate justification for the intensification for the site for residential purposes in accordance with the requirements of Policy EM6 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan, 2012, Part 2 and the NPPF.

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: Liz Arnold

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:

54 Parkfield Road

Planning Application Ref:

20899/APP/2016/2376

Planning Committee:

North

Scale:

1:1,250

Date:

June 2017

LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON

Residents Services Planning Section
 Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
 Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111



HILLINGDON
 LONDON