Report of the Head of Planning & Enforcement

Address LAND FORMING PART OF 28B KINGSEND RUISLIP

Development: Erection of a single storey two-bedroom detached bungalow with detached garage and associated parking and amenity space.

LBH Ref Nos: 5740/APP/2009/2541

Drawing Nos: Design and Access Statement un-numbered location plan scale 1:1250 09/76/03 Rev B 09/76/04

Date Plans Received:23/11/2009Date(s) of Amendment(s):Date Application Valid:31/12/2009

1. SUMMARY

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two bedroom detached bungalow with associated parking, including the provision of a detached garage.

The principle of back land development on this site was established when planning permission was granted for a detached dwelling in 1978. However, it is considered that the development now proposed would result in a plot size which would appear cramped in relation to the more spacious plots which surround the application site. Furthermore, the site is now contained within the Ruislip Village conservation Area and it is considered that the proposal would detract from the visual amenity of the area and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by reason of its location and plot size in relation to surrounding plots would result in an obtrusive, incongruous and cramped overdevelopment of the site which would be out of keeping with the layout and open character of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would detract from the visual amenities of the area and the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, contrary to Policies BE4, BE13 and BE19 of the Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

INFORMATIVES

1

152 **Compulsory Informative (1)**

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

2 I53 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (February 2008) and national guidance.

BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas	
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.	
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.	
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.	
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.	
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.	
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.	
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy neighbours.	
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area	
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units	
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.	
AM9	Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design	
	of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities	
AM14	New development and car parking standards.	
HDAS	Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement(HDAS):Residential	
	Layouts	
	4.6 Unit Size	
	4.9 Sunlight/Daylight	
	4.12 Privacy	
	4.15 Garden Space for Houses	
	4.23 Elevation Treatment	
	4.24 Rooflines	
	4.27 Building Lines	
	4.33 Car Parking	
	4.39 Cycle Parking	
	4.40 Waste Management	
	Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement(HDAS):Accessible Hillingdon	
LPP 4A.3 LPP 4B.1	London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.	
LPP 4B.1 LPP 4B.5	London Plan Policy 4B.1 - Design principles for a compact city. London Plan Policy 4B.5 - Creating an inclusive environment.	

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the north side of Kingsend to the east of Ruislip Town Centre. The site has an area of 0.16 hectares and is currently occupied by a large detached bungalow.

The site is located to the rear of the gardens of 26, 26b Kingsend and land formerly known as 28 and 28a Kingsend, which comprised two dwelling units. This site has an extant permission to provide a three storey building to contain 7, two-bedroom and 1, one bedroom flats and is currently vacant. The land formerly known as 30 Kingsend, has recently been redeveloped to provide a two storey residential block with rooms in roofspace comprising eleven flats (known as 1-11 Elthorne Court). To the north of the site is Ruislip Methodist Church and the rear gardens of 21, 23 and 25 Ickenham Road. To the east of the site is a detached bungalow, 26a Kingsend, which has a separate means of access from Kingsend. The access to the application site is via a 53m long driveway which runs between the site formerly known as 28 and 28a Kingsend and nos.1-11 Elthorne Court.

Kingsend is designated as a Local Distributor Road in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007. The site is located approximately 400 metres from Ruislip Station and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 4 on a scale of 1 to 6 where 6 represent the highest level of accessibility.

The area immediately surrounding the application site is characterised by a mix of large detached dwellings, generally two storeys in height. However, over recent years there has been a large amount of redevelopment on Kingsend that has taken place, including an approval on this site and 43-45 Kingsend. Approved development is now in excess of the 10% Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement limit. The application site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and is also covered by TPO 658.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached two bedroom bungalow located to the south west of the existing bungalow, 26b Kingsend.

The proposed bungalow would incorporate the side extension currently attached to 26b Kingsend, involving the demolition of the link extension between the 26b Kingsend and its side extension. The proposed bungalow would be sited in front of the existing access drive and would be set 1.2m from the south western site boundary, 2.6m at front widening to 6.2m at rear from the 26b Kingsend, and a minimum of 4.7m from the rear boundary with the properties in Ickenham Road. The proposed bungalow would measure 16.5m wide, 6.3m deep and finished with a gable end ridged roof 2.3m high at eaves level and 4.7m high at ridge level. A centrally positioned gable end front projection is proposed measuring 5.5m wide, 3.8m deep and 4.3m high, set 0.3m below the roof ridge.

A new 2m high timber fence is proposed between the existing and proposed bungalows and a detached garage is located adjacent to the new side boundary. It would measure 2.9m wide, 5.9m deep and finished with a gable end ridged roof 2.2m high at eaves level and 3.4m high at its highest point. Two parking spaces are also proposed; one along the side and the other in front of the new bungalow.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

5740/APP/2008/1214 28 & 28a Kingsend Ruislip

ERECTION OF A THREE STOREY BUILDING TO CONTAIN 7, TWO-BEDROOM AND 1, ONE- BEDROOM FLATS, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND AMENITY

SPACE (AMENDMENT TO PREVIOUS APPROVAL REF. 5740/APP/2007/1043 TO ALLOW FOR AN ADDITIONAL FLAT AT SECOND FLOOR LEVEL)

Decision: 25-06-2008 Approved

5740/APP/2008/2969 28b Kingsend Ruislip

ERECTION OF 5 TWO-BEDROOM TERRACE HOUSES AND GARAGE TO SIDE OF PLOT 5, TO INCLUDE THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING (OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE APPROVAL OF ACCESS, APPEARANCE, LAYOUT AND SCALE)

Decision: 09-12-2008 Refused

Comment on Relevant Planning History

Planning application ref: 5740/APP/2008/2969 was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its location, size, bulk and height, narrow plot widths and the associated subdivision of the proposed rear garden areas would result in an obtrusive, incongruous and cramped overdevelopment of the site which would be out of keeping with the layout and open character of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would detract from the visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.

2. The proposal would result in an increase in vehicle movements to and from the site and the proposed access arrangements in proximity to surrounding properties is likely to result in an unacceptable increase in noise and disturbance to the detriment of the amenities of the existing and future occupiers of surrounding residential properties, contrary to Policies H12 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.

3. The proposal results in additional parking in excess of this Council's maximum adopted parking standards. As such, the proposal represents an unsustainable form of development, which conflicts with one of the five guiding principles in the Unitary Development Plan, i.e. to reduce travel demand. By encouraging the use of the private car it contributes to increased congestion and pollution to the detriment of the area in general being contrary to Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan 'Saved Policies' September 2007.

4. The applicant has failed to provide contributions towards the improvements of services and facilities as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development in respect of education and transport improvements. The scheme therefore conflicts with Policy R17 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan.

Planning application ref 51672/A/98/1296 for the erection of three detached house at 25 Ickenham Road was refused on 18th December 1998. An appeal against the refusal of this application was dismissed on 1st July 1999.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

Part	DIICIES:	
BE4	New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas	
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.	
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.	
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new p and landscaping in development proposals.	anting
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.	
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.	
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.	
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighb	ours.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and th area	e local
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units	
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.	
AM9	Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of high improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities	way
AM14	New development and car parking standards.	
HDA	 Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement(HDAS):Residential Layouts 4.6 Unit Size 4.9 Sunlight/Daylight 4.12 Privacy 4.15 Garden Space for Houses 4.23 Elevation Treatment 4.24 Rooflines 4.27 Building Lines 4.33 Car Parking 4.39 Circle Parking 	

- 4.39 Cycle Parking
- 4.40 Waste Management

Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement(HDAS):Accessible Hillingdon

- LPP 4A.3 London Plan Policy 4A.3 Sustainable Design and Construction.
- LPP 4B.1 London Plan Policy 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city.
- LPP 4B.5 London Plan Policy 4B.5 Creating an inclusive environment.

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

- 5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 17th February 2010
- 5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable
- 6. Consultations

External Consultees

30 adjoining owner/occupiers and the Ruislip Residents' Association have been consulted. 4 letters of objection and 2 petitions with 22 and 32 signatories have been received. The application has been advertised as a development that affects the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Letters of Objection:

(i) The proposal would be constructed on a small and inappropriate space;

(ii) The increase in construction vehicles using the existing driveway would harm highway and pedestrian safety;

(iii) The proposed development would have a visually intrusive impact of surrounding neighbouring properties;

(iv) Out of character with the surrounding area;

(v) similar backland developments have been refused in the past notably to the rear of 25 Ickenham Road and 30 Kingsend;

(vi) The proposal would generate the need for additional waste facilities. New facilities at the site would not be accessible by the Council's refuse collectors as the width of the existing driveway is inadequate;

(vii) The additional use of the driveway would increase noise and disturbance harming residential amenity;

(viii) It is unlikely that adequate landscaping can be provided at the site and therefore the proposal would be unacceptable due to excessive hardstanding;

(ix) The width of the existing driveway is inadequate.

Petitions:

"We the undersigned, petition Hillingdon Council to take urgent steps to oppose the plans at 28B Kingsend to protect our neighbourhood, in particular;

To PRESERVE the character of this part of Kingsend in the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, that was characterised by large spaces between homes on large plots with good sized gardens. The proposed development will be squeezed on to an existing tandem development site. The original plot of 28 Kingsend has already been carved up over time to create more than 10 dwellings. This proposal will not make a positive contribution or enhancement to the character of the area contrary to the general principle of policy BE4 of the Hillingdon UDP.

To DISALLOW development which causes disruption to the layout of an established residential area contrary to Policies BE19 and BE 21 of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.

To AVOID inconvenience caused by service and delivery vehicles by the shared access drive to 2 bungalows at 28B (6 cars), and for 8 flats (8 cars) and cycle store (8 cycles) located on the west side of 28/28A Kingsend.

To DISALLOW more development on this site. The occupants of the flats at 30 and 28/28A would suffer loss oF amenity caused by traffic movements on the access drive situated close to the side elevations. The private enjoyment of the rear gardens of 23 and 25 Ickenham Road and 30 and 28/28A Kingsend would suffer intrusion from the presence of the extra dwelling and associated traffic movements on the proposed site.

To AVOID more GARDEN GRABBING."

Internal Consultees

Urban Design/Conservation:

This site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, a fact that has not been addressed in the Design and Access statement. The existing structure is modern and part of it can be seen in views from the access road off Kingsend. The main bulk of the building is currently screened from the road by tall evergreen trees that lie to the rear of the frontage site, which is currently vacant.

This part of the conservation area is characterised by mainly good sized detached houses, set in mature gardens, which date from the turn of the 20th century. The road is important in terms of the history of the area, as it was one of the first to be developed by the then owners, Kings College, in the Garden Suburb tradition.

The current bungalow appears to be backland development agreed prior to the designation of the area. Bungalows do exist within the conservation area, but they tend to be 'one offs' and are not a dominant building type.

As proposed, the new house and garage would appear very cramped, leaving little space for a garden and associated landscaping. As such, they would not reflect the 'spacious' character of the area and we would object to this proposal.

Trees/Landscape:

This site is covered by TPO 658, and is also situated in the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

The trees of merit on this site are: the Cedar (T1 on TPO 658) to the west of the existing dwelling (shown as Pine 12 m); the Leyland hedge to the north of the proposed dwelling (off-site, and shown as cypress screen 10 m); and the Leyland hedge to the south of the existing and proposed dwelling (off-site, and not shown on plans)

The Cedar is set away from the site of development and will not be affected, however the Leyland hedges screen the view of the proposed/existing dwellings from much of the surrounding area and merit retention and protection throughout the development.

The drawing (proposed dwelling plans and elevations) does not indicate which trees are to be retained, therefore the plans should be amended to include the hedge to the south of the site, and to show both hedges, and the cedar, as retained. The hard surface of the driveway will protect the Leyland hedge to the south of the site, however the drawing should show the protective fencing around the hedge to the north of the site (in accordance with BS 5837).

Subject to these amendments, and conditions TL2, and TL3 (amended to remove section asking for detailed drawings), this scheme is acceptable in terms of Saved Policy BE38 of the UDP.

Waste & Recycling:

No objections.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

This application relates to the erection of a detached bungalow adjacent 28b Kingsend located to the rear of land formerly occupied by 28 and 28a Kingsend. 28b Kingsend was approved in 1978 established the principle of backland development on this site.

However, the Inspector in his decision notice which dismissed an appeal in respect of planning application ref 51672/A/98/1296 for the erection of three detached house at 25 Ickenham Road, located immediately to the north of the current application site states in paragraph 10:

'I do not share the assertion that the principle of backland development, as envisaged in this appeal, has been established in the area. Admittedly there are examples of tandem development, defined by the siting of dwellings one behind another and sharing the same access, in the locality but they date back some 15 or more years. Circumstances, including the policy background have changed in the meantime.'

The tandem development which the Inspector is referring to are the bungalows at 26a and 28b Kingsend. Following that appeal decision, two more recent applications to erect a detached bungalow on land to the rear of 30 Kingsend were refused on the grounds that the development would detract from the layout and character of the surrounding area. Taking into consideration the Inspector's appeal decision and more recent decisions at no. 30, the impact of the proposed detached bungalow now proposed adjacent to 28b Kingsend, would still need to be assessed in terms of its impact on the layout and character of the surrounding area and in light of the Council's current policies and standards.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

The proposed scheme would have a density of approximately 27 habitable rooms per hectare (hrph). This is significantly below the London Plan guidelines having regard to the site's Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL 4). However, taking into consideration the plot and garden sizes in the surrounding area an increased density of development is not considered to be appropriate.

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

This is not applicable to this application.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

This is not applicable to this application.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

This is not applicable to this application.

7.06 Environmental Impact

This is not applicable to this application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

Policies BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) seek to protect the impacts of development on the street scene, character and amenity of established residential areas. The Inspector in his appeal in respect of planning application ref:

51672/A/98/1296 for the erection of three detached houses at 25 Ickenham Road states in paragraph 12:

'The scheme under appeal would be detrimental to the character and visual amenities of the area and would disrupt the layout of the established residential area. Whilst I acknowledge that the plot and garden sizes in the general area vary considerably, the proposed ones in the appeal are significantly smaller than those existing in the immediate locality.

Consequently, the proposal would result in a cramped and unneighbourly form of development. The sense of openness which currently exists to the rear of properties fronting the southern side of Ickenham Road, which I accept is curtailed by the presence

of the Ruislip Methodist Church and by housing that has occurred to the rear of the properties fronting Kingsend, would be completely lost as a result of the proposed development.'

It is accepted that the principle of backland development has already been established on the application site by 28b Kingsend which was approved in 1978, and that the proposed development would not be that prominent in the street scene. However, the sense of openness, which exists to the rear of the properties, is considered to be an important characteristic of the surrounding area and the character of this part of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. In this respect, it is considered that the proposal would create a plot size that would be considerably less than surrounding plots and as such would result in a cramped appearance which would fail to maintain the generously proportioned amenity spaces which are characteristic of surrounding residential houses. The proposal would therefore appear incongruous in view of the surrounding context and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of this part of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, contrary to policies BE4, BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

7.08 Impact on neighbours

26a Kingsend would not be adversely affected by the proposed development as it lies on the opposite side of 28b Kingsend. The proposed development would be sited some 30-35m to the north of 26b Kingsend and from the recently approved development on land formally known as 28 and 28a Kingsend. It would be some 35m from 1-11 Elthorne Court and would be some 50m to the south of 21, 23 and 25 Ickenham Road. These distances are sufficient to ensure that the existing and proposed surrounding properties would not be affected by the proposed development through, overdominance, visual intrusion and overshadowing or overlooking.

The proposed bungalow would be located to the south west of 28b Kingsend and would not have an adverse impact on that property through overdominance, visual intrusion and overshadowing. No windows are proposed facing that property and therefore no overlooking will result.

The proposal would therefore comply with Policies BE20, BE21, BE24 and OE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and paragraphs 4.9 and 4.12 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts.

Policy H12 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) states that proposals for backland development in residential areas will only be permitted provided no undue noise and disturbance is likely to be caused to adjoining occupiers. In this case the proposed development would be surrounded on all sides by residential properties. However, it is considered that the vehicle movements associated with a two bedroom detached bungalow would be far less than that for 5 dwellings, which formed part of the previously refused scheme (ref: 5740/APP/2008/2969). In addition, the use of the existing access driveway would not result in a significant increase in service delivery vehicles. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not result in a significant increase in noise and disturbance to surrounding properties over and above the current situation. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies H12 and OE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

The internal size of the proposed bungalow would be some 109sq.m which would exceed the requirements of paragraph 4.6 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts for 2 bedroom houses, which advises 63sq.m. The habitable rooms would have adequate outlook and would receive sufficient natural light. With regards to the Lifetime Home Standards the proposed bungalow appears to comply with these standards, in particular, the width of doors, halls and corridors are over 900mm wide. The living room areas are of a sufficient size for wheelchair turning and there is a large hall entrance area and living space at entrance level. A wheelchair accessible WC is proposed at ground level.

Over 100m² of private amenity space would be provided which would meet the requirements of paragraph 4.15 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layout. Therefore the proposal would comply with policies BE19, BE23 and H7 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), policies 4A.3, 4B.1 and 4B.5 of the London Plan, and paragraph 4.6 and 4.15 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts, and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

The existing access way is sufficient to cater for the proposed development. Although the width of the driveway is not sufficient for two-way traffic, it is not considered that the proposed use would generate a significant increase in traffic movement to require two way traffic along the driveway.

The proposal would provide two off-street parking spaces for the proposed development. As such, the proposal would not result in an increase in demand for on-street parking and would comply with policies AM7(ii), AM9 and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the Council's Parking Standards (Annex 1, adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, Saved Policies, September 2007) and paragraphs 4.33 and 4.39 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

This is addressed at section 07.07.

7.12 Disabled access

This is addressed at section 07.09.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

This is not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

The application site is of a sufficient size to provide additional landscaping, which could be secured by way of a planning condition should planning permission be granted.

There are protected trees and hedges that surround the proposed site which contribute to the appearance of this part of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. Although the proposal would be some distance from these trees, the submitted plans do not indicate which trees and the Leyland hedge to the south of the proposed dwelling (off-site, and not shown on plans), would be retained and protected in accordance with BS 5837), from construction works. However again, this could be secured by way of planning conditions should planning permission be granted.

7.15 Sustainable waste management

This is not applicable to this application.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

This is not applicable to this application.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

This is not applicable to this application.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

This is not applicable to this application.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

With regards to the letter of objection, points (i), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix) have been addressed in the report. On point (ii), the increase in the use of the existing driveway by construction vehicles would be incidental to the grant of planning permission. On point (vi), refuse storage facilities are proposed on the driveway some 10m from the Kingsend. This would allow refuse collectors to access the waste from Kingsend.

On the comments of the petitioner, the comments raised have been addressed in the report.

7.20 Planning Obligations

This is not applicable to this application.

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

This is not applicable to this application.

7.22 Other Issues

There are no other relevant issues.

8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

When making their decision, Members must have regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies. This will enable them to make an informed decision in respect of an application.

In addition Members should note that the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA 1998) makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights. Decisions by the Committee must take account of the HRA 1998. Therefore, Members need to be aware of the fact that the HRA 1998 makes the European Convention on Human Rights (the Convention) directly applicable to the actions of public bodies in England and Wales. The specific parts of the Convention relevant to planning matters are 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).

Article 6 deals with procedural fairness. If normal committee procedures are followed, it is unlikely that this article will be breached.

Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 are not absolute rights and infringements of these rights protected under these are allowed in certain defined circumstances, for example where required by law. However any infringement must be proportionate, which means it must achieve a fair balance between the public interest and the private interest infringed and must not go beyond what is needed to achieve its objective.

Article 14 states that the rights under the Convention shall be secured without discrimination on grounds of 'sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status'.

9. Observations of the Director of Finance

10. CONCLUSION

The principle of back land development on this site was established when planning permission was granted for a detached dwelling in 1978. However, it is considered that the development now proposed would result in a plot size which would appear cramped in relation to the more spacious plots which surround the application site. Furthermore, the site is now contained within the Ruislip Village conservation Area and it is considered that the proposal would detract from the visual amenity of the area and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would result in an obtrusive and cramped overdevelopment of the site which would detract from the open character and layout of the surrounding area.

11. Reference Documents

London Plan 2008

Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007)

Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Layouts

Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Accessible Hillingdon

Contact Officer: Sonia Bowen

Telephone No: 01895 250230

