

Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration

Address 4 ASHBURTON ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension, 4 x detached garages to rear and conversion of dwelling from 1 x 4-bed to 1 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed dwellings with parking and amenity space. (Resubmission)

LBH Ref Nos: 15579/APP/2018/642

Drawing Nos: Site Location Plan
Location Plan
4AshburtonRd/2018/03
4AshburtonRd/2018/01
4AshburtonRd/2018/02
Design & Access Statement
Life Time Homes Compliance Statement
SUDS

Date Plans Received: 22/01/2018 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 22/01/2018

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks planning permission for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension, 4 x detached garages to rear and conversion of dwelling from 1 x 4-bed to 1 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed dwellings with parking and amenity space.

This is a re-submission following the refusal of a similar scheme. Having examined the proposal it is considered that the proposal remains unacceptable. The proposed side and rear extension, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling. The application proposes inadequate provision for off-street car parking, resulting in additional on-street parking in an area where such parking is at a premium, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. Furthermore the proposed development by reason of the extensive use of the rear garden area for parking including extensive areas of hard-standing, and the proximity of the garages to surrounding properties and gardens, would result in a significant increase in noise and general disturbance to the proposed and adjoining residential properties.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two storey side/rear extension, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, its size, scale and bulk would represent an incongruous addition, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original end terrace dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and to the visual amenities of the street

scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The application proposes inadequate provision for off-street car parking, resulting in additional on-street parking in an area where such parking is at a premium, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. Accordingly, the scheme is contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by reason of the extensive use of the rear garden area for parking including extensive areas of hard-standing, and the proximity of the car parking spaces to surrounding properties, would result in a significant increase in noise and general disturbance to the proposed and adjoining residential properties, and as such would provide a poor residential environment and constitute an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

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.
New development and car parking standards.

AM14	
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
LPP 3.3	(2015) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.8	(2015) Housing Choice
LPP 5.3	(2015) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 7.4	(2015) Local character
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments
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. In this instance no pre-application advice was sought.

5 174 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Refusing Consent)**

This is a reminder that Under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), should an application for appeal be allowed, the proposed development would be deemed as 'chargeable development' and therefore liable to pay the London Borough of Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This would be calculated in accordance with the London Borough of Hillingdon CIL Charging Schedule 2014 and the Mayor of London's CIL Charging Schedule 2012. For more information on CIL matters please visit the planning portal page at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil

3. **CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 **Site and Locality**

The application site is located on the Western side of Ashburton Road with the principal elevation facing North East. The application site is located within a large, prominent and open corner plot. The site comprises a two storey end-of-terrace house with a single storey car port with a flat roof profile attached to its Northern side plus a further parking space between the car port and the site's Northern boundary. To the front is a mono-pitched roof running from the bay window to the end at ground floor with the first floor set under a hipped roof set down from the main ridge by 0.97 metres.

To the North of the property lies No. 2 Ashburton Road, a semi-detached two storey house arranged at an angle to Ashburton Road and Cornwall Road. This property has been substantially extended at single storey level to the rear and side. To the South of the site is No. 6 Ashburton Road, the attached house with a single storey rear extension.

The street scene is residential in character comprising primarily groups of terraced properties, many of which have previously been extended.

The application site lies within the Developed Area as designated in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension, 4 x detached garages to rear and conversion of dwelling from 1 x 4-bed to 1 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed dwellings with parking and amenity space.

The proposal involves a two storey side extension 3.75 metre wide set in 1.72 metres from the side boundary to the front reducing to 1.47 metre to the rear. At ground level this extends the full length and wraps around to the rear projecting a further 2.9 metres from the rear elevation. The first floor elevation is set in 2 metre from the side boundary to the South, closest to no.6 and has a stepped elevation.

With these proposed alterations the existing dwelling is proposed to be converted to one, 2 bed 3 person flat and three 1 bed 2 person flats. 4 car parking spaces would be provided to the rear along with an area of hard-standing, accessed via the private alleyway with the remaining garden area proposed as a single communal area of 132 m2.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

15579/APP/2017/3615 4 Ashburton Road Ruislip

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and conversion of dwelling from 1 x 4-bed to 3 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed self-contained flats with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front.

Decision: 10-01-2018 Refused

47214/PRC/2014/7 4 Ashburton Road Ruislip

Private dwelling house

Decision: 11-09-2014 Refused

Comment on Relevant Planning History

15579/APP/2017/3615 - Seeking planning permission for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and conversion of the existing dwelling (1 x 4-bed) to 3 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed self-contained flats with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front. This was refused at committee on 11th January 2018 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey side/rear extension, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, its size, scale, bulk and roof form in particular the crown roof and rear dormer design would represent an incongruous addition, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original end terrace dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2. The proposal provides an indoor living area of an unsatisfactory size for the occupiers of the proposed flat on the first floor. The proposal therefore gives rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers contrary to Policy 3.5 and Table 3.3 of the London Plan (2016), The Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016), Policies BE19 and H7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015).

3. The application proposes inadequate provision for off-street car parking, resulting in additional on-street parking in an area where such parking is at a premium, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. Accordingly, the scheme is contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4. The proposed development by reason of the extensive use of the rear garden area for parking including extensive areas of hard-standing, and the proximity of the car parking spaces to surrounding properties, would result in a significant increase in noise and general disturbance to the proposed and adjoining residential properties, and as such would provide a poor residential environment and constitute an un-neighbourly form of development, resulting in a material loss of residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

47214/PRC/2014/7 - Pre-Application for a private dwelling house. A number of objections were raised.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

The proposed development would be assessed against the Development Plan Policies contained within Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1, Saved Unitary Development Plan policies, the London Plan 2016, the NPPF and supplementary planning guidance prepared by both

LB Hillingdon and the GLA.

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.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
LPP 3.3	(2015) Increasing housing supply
LPP 3.4	(2015) Optimising housing potential
LPP 3.8	(2015) Housing Choice
LPP 5.3	(2015) Sustainable design and construction
LPP 7.4	(2015) Local character
LPP 3.5	(2015) Quality and design of housing developments
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

56 neighbouring properties not only on Hawthorne Avenue but also those to the rear of the

application site and those adjoining the access route along Hatherleigh Road and Cornwall Road, along with Ruislip Residents Association were consulted on 27.02.2018 and a site notice was posted to the front of the site on 02.03.2018.

At the time of preparing the report, 14 local objections were received and Ward Councillors' have also objected and called for the application to be heard at Committee.

Ward Cllrs:

As ward cllrs, we wish this application to be determined by the Planning Committee.

Whilst this latest application has been amended, we don't believe it removes the concerns previously expressed. The scheme remains out of character with the surrounding area, an over development of the site and significant encroachment onto the garden by means of both the actual building and the proposed four garages.

In addition, the extra vehicles coming onto the streets of either Hatherleigh Rd or Kingsway bring addition risk to pedestrians, as the exits are set back from the public highway.

The local objections can be summarised as follows:

- density of occupation and reduction of privacy to rear of my property.
- Although 4 parking spaces are provided, the occupants of 4 flats will inevitably need more than 4 parking spaces, parking for residents has become a major problem/ concern in this area.
- The shared Road providing access to the parking has been successfully gated for a number of years , unless the Access Path is gated to a similar standard this will impact considerably upon the security of all the residents with properties on the shared access road.
- concur with the reasons given for the original application to be rejected.
- proposed side and rear extensions would over dominate what is an end of terrace dwelling.
- will look out of proportion to the existing footprint which will be visually harmful to the existing residential street scene. - conversion of the flats would potentially be an over-intensification of the use, which would be harmful to our amenities.
- proposed parking and garages to the rear of the site would result in additional noise disturbance and overuse of the existing garden. This would also be a security risk as the plans are open to the rear of the property.
- With the proposed plans, the turnover of residents entering and exiting the property would be extremely high, causing added security concerns and excess noise to our party wall.
- the many mature trees that once stood in the gardens of number four have already been cut down, destroyed and left as an eyesore to look at. With Ruislip prone to flooding, this is an added drainage concern.
- With the noise, disruption and dust created by the building work would be a continuation of what we had been put through for many months with the ongoing building work at Number 10 Ashburton Road.
- would be out of keeping with the existing character of the neighbourhood.
- The location is surrounded by residential properties already burdened by traffic and associated parking.
- The proposal if allowed, would encourage further development of back gardens which is contrary to existing planning policy and will destroy the existing feel of the area.
- would possibly be 10-15 residents in the building creating noise coming through the party wall to the next door neighbours' house
- change the character of the neighbourhood which consists of mainly one family homes with the occasional 2 family flats - create a precedent
- before the introduction of security gates on the service roads behind, there were several incidents of fly tipping, break-ins and other anti-social behaviour. The extra 4 flats using the service road to drive in and out of their garages would very likely result in the gates being left open. It would also be very likely that the cars would not always be parked in their garages but rather parked on Ashburton Road where parking is already impossibly difficult.

- also unlikely that any visitors would bother using the parking area behind the house and would instead park on the street.
- security concerns given volume of traffic from future occupants
- overdevelopment of the existing property
- the space allocated for each flat indicate the maximum possible development of the property with little thought to those living there and the residents of the street.
- the proposals are not in keeping with character of the existing properties and will set a precedent for future overdevelopment of similar properties by get rich quick developers to the detriment of the surrounding areas.
- residents either park on their front drive or on the road to make life easier for themselves, therefore garages to the rear will not be used.

Internal Consultees

HIGHWAYS OFFICER:

Site Characteristics

The site is located in Ruislip within a residential catchment due West of Victoria Road. The address is currently a four bedroom semi-detached property which has off-street parking provision on the house frontage. The surrounding road network is unrestricted and devoid of parking controls. The PTAL for the location is rated as 2 which is considered as low.

Parking Provision

Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - saved UDP policy states that new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards.

It is proposed to provide 4 residential flats (1 x 2 bed & 3 x 1 bed) in lieu of the existing 4 bedroom single tenure property. To comply with the adopted parking standard the maximum on-site requirement demands up to 1.5 spaces per unit thus totalling 6 spaces. The proposed quantum of 4 spaces, situated within individual garages to the rear of the address, therefore falls below this maximum standard. Hence there is an apparent under provision of 2 spaces for the new proposal.

On this premise there is concern that undue parking displacement may result on the local public highway to the detriment of highway safety and added congestion which is considered unacceptable.

Cycling Provision

In terms of cycle parking there should be a provision of 1 secure and accessible space for each of the flatted units (totalling 4 spaces) to conform to the adopted minimum borough cycle parking standard. 2 have been indicated on plan hence this number should be increased to the required 4 spaces. The indicative position of the proposed cycle parking places on plan will be considered acceptable once the level of provision is increased.

Vehicular Access Arrangements

There is currently a single carriageway crossing on Ashburton Road which will become redundant owing to the removal of the existing parking spaces on the property frontage. New spaces related to the proposal would be provided to the rear of the property in the form of 4 new separate garages.

These garages would be accessed via a gated private rear service road which is located off neighbouring Hatherleigh and Kingswear Road. This access arrangement is considered appropriate and therefore acceptable.

It is highlighted that once the existing access point on Ashburton Road is extinguished it will be necessary to reinstate raised kerbing and the public footway in order to maintain footway/roadway continuity. The extinguishment of the old access will need to be undertaken to an appropriate council standard under a S278 (Highways Act 1980) agreement at the applicant's expense.

Trip Generation

The proposal would marginally increase traffic generation from the site as compared to the existing

single dwelling unit. However peak period traffic movement into and out of the site is expected to rise by up to 2 additional vehicle movements during the peak morning and evening hours hence this uplift is considered insignificant in generation terms and therefore can be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Refuse collection will continue to be conducted via Ashburton Road. A specific bin storage area, close to the highway boundary with the aforementioned road, is depicted on plan. This is acceptable in principle as it ensures that waste collection distances are not excessive and within accepted standards.

Construction Logistics Plan (CLP)

A full and detailed CLP will be a requirement given the constraints and sensitivities of the local residential road network in order to minimize/avoid potential detriment to the public realm. It will need to be secured under a suitable planning condition.

Conclusion

The application has been reviewed by the Highway Engineer who is concerned that the proposal would potentially exacerbate parking stress on the local highway network to the detriment of highway safety and congestion, contrary to policies AM7 and AM14 of the Development Plan (2012) and policies 6.3 and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016).

A Highway refusal on these grounds (as per original committee refusal) is recommended as follows:-

'The application proposes inadequate provision for off-street car parking, resulting in additional on-street parking in an area where such parking is at a premium, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. Accordingly, the scheme is contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012)'.

TREES/LANDSCAPE:

This site is occupied by an end of terrace house set within a spacious plot which is wider than average in this street. Much of the frontage is hard surfaced and does little to contribute to the character and appearance of this residential street. The back garden can be accessed from a narrow rear service road entered from Hatherleigh Road. There are no tree, or landscape planning, designations which affect the site. However, there are trees / shrubs along the side (north) and rear (west) boundaries that can be seen from adjacent houses.

Comment: This application follows the refusal of a previous submission, ref. 2017/3615. No trees are indicated on plan but, according to the to the D&AS, trees will be removed to facilitate the development. The car park (for four cars) is very tight and will be awkward to manoeuvre in - please check with highways specialists. Minor amendments have been made to the layout, so that bike and bin storage is indicated to the rear of the building. The front garden has also been amended to provide modest areas of soft landscape enhancement for the benefit of the occupants and the wider streetscape.

Recommendation: This remains a tight scheme. However, if the proposal is approved, conditions should include: RES9 (parts 1, 2, 4 and 5).

FLOODS:

The site lies in a Critical Drainage Area (CDA) identified in the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for Hillingdon. A CDA is the catchment area from which surface water drains and

contributes to drainage problems. The site is also identified at risk of surface water flooding on the Environment Agency Flood Maps. It is therefore important all developments in this area contribute to manage the risk from surface water, and reduce the run off from their site.

Comments: Although it is noted that SuDs are referenced it is unclear of the way in which all options have been considered to be utilised within this development other than the provision of water butts. A clear plan showing all the methods of control including maximising the permeability of all hard surfacing on the site, green roofs on flat roof garages. A management and maintenance plan should also be provided for the management company presumed that will take on the management of the site.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

The site is within the developed area as defined in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). It is currently in residential use and there is no objection in principle to the intensification of the residential use of the site, subject to all other material planning considerations being acceptable, in accordance with Policy H7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012). Policy H7 pertains to house conversions and serves to ensure that conversions achieve satisfactory environmental and amenity standards.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Density ranges set out in the London Plan are not used in the assessment of schemes of less than 10 units.

However the Council seeks to ensure that houses suitable for conversion should be over 120 m² in internal floor area, which this is at approximately 147 m².

Minimum gross internal floor and storage is a further measure of the suitability of the size of a proposed dwelling. DCLG guidance identifies that a 1 storey, 1 bed 2 person dwelling should have a total of 51.5 m² (50 + 1.5) and a 2 bed 3 person 63 m² (61 + 2).

The 2 bed flat, Flat 3 on the ground floor is shown to have 69 m² and the three remaining 1 bed flats on the ground and first floor are between 52.5 to 53.4 m². The size and GIA of the proposed flats are therefore acceptable.

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) states that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings and the public realm contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place.

Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (Saved UDP Policies) requires alterations and extensions to existing buildings to harmonise with the scale, form and architectural composition of the original building. Policy BE5 requires development to harmonise with the materials, design, architectural style of the area and retain a form of symmetry. Policy BE13 requires the layout and appearance of new developments to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area and Policy BE19

ensures any new development complements or improves the amenity and character of the area.

The NPPF (2012) notes the importance of achieving design which is appropriate to its context stating that 'Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.'

The Council's Adopted SPD the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions (December 2008) or HDAS, contains design guidance for all types of extensions which should appear subordinate in scale to the original building.

The proposal involves a two storey side extension 3.75 metre wide set in 1.72 metres from the side boundary to the front reducing to 1.47 metre to the rear. At ground level this extends the full length and wraps around to the rear projecting a further 2.9 metres from the rear elevation. The first floor elevation is set in 2 metre from the side boundary to the South, closest to no.6 and has a stepped elevation.

The application site is located within a large, prominent and open corner plot. Whilst this re-submission has been amended to include the removal of the large crown roof and dormer within the roof slope, it is still a significant development which occupies a prominent corner plot. Overall it is considered that the proposals are not sympathetic to the original dwelling and would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the both the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. This is exacerbated by the prominent position of the end terrace property and the wider views of the site from the access road to the rear.

In conclusion it is considered that the proposals are significant and would significantly alter the character and appearance of the original property and the wider area. The proposed two storey side/rear extension, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, its size, scale and bulk would represent an incongruous addition, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original end terrace dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

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 three principal ways. The effect of the siting, bulk and proximity of a new building on the general outlook and residential amenity of these adjoining occupiers are considered under Policy BE20, whilst potential impacts on daylight/sunlight (Policy BE21) and privacy (Policy BE24) are also assessed.

The neighbouring property and adjoining terrace to the immediate South, no.6 Ashburton Road benefits from a single storey rear extension. In addition the proposed first floor element has been staggered and stepped in so that there are no impingement's on any 45 degree lines. Furthermore there are no windows on either side elevation proposed.

It is considered that there would be no adverse issues raised in regard to overlooking or privacy. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development in accordance with Policies BE19, BE20, BE21 and

BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

It is noted that the previous proposed car parking spaces have now been replaced with detached garages, however as previously asserted, the proposed development by reason of the extensive use of the rear garden area for parking including extensive areas of hard-standing, and the proximity of the garages to surrounding properties, would result in a significant increase in noise and general disturbance to the proposed and adjoining residential properties, and as such would provide a poor residential environment and constitute an un-neighbourly form of development.

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 adopted the new national technical standards through The Housing Standards (Minor Alterations to the London Plan) in March 2016 and this 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.

Minimum gross internal floor and storage is a further measure of the suitability of the size of a proposed dwelling. DCLG guidance identifies that a 1 storey, 1 bed 2 person dwelling should have a total of 51.5 m² (50 + 1.5) and a 2 bed 3 person 63 m² (61 + 2).

The 2 bed flat, Flat 3 on the ground floor is shown to have 69 m² and the three remaining 1 bed flats on the ground and first floor are between 52.5 to 53.4 m². The size and GIA of the proposed flats are therefore acceptable. Furthermore it is noted that all proposed bedrooms are of an acceptable size.

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, would have an adequate outlook and source of natural light, and therefore comply with Policies BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) recognises that new residential buildings should 'provide external amenity space which is sufficient to protect the amenity of the occupants of the proposed and surrounding buildings'. The adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Layouts at Paragraph 4.15 recommends that one and two bedroom flats should provide a minimum of 20 and 25 m² of usable amenity space.

The proposal provides a total of approximately 130 m² of usable communal amenity space with a private patio area for each of the ground floor flats, enclosed with 1.8 metre high close boarded timber fence. On balance, the proposal therefore complies with policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) considers whether the traffic generated by the proposed development is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

Policy AM14 states that new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance

with the Council's adopted Car Parking Standards. These require a provision of 6 car parking spaces and not 4 as proposed. In addition these are proposed to the rear of the site with the only access from a private alleyway and not a public road. There are no parking provisions proposed to the front of the site.

In addition the Council's highway officer has also objected, stating:

Site Characteristics

The site is located in Ruislip within a residential catchment due West of Victoria Road. The address is currently a four bedroom semi-detached property which has off-street parking provision on the house frontage. The surrounding road network is unrestricted and devoid of parking controls. The PTAL for the location is rated as 2 which is considered as low.

Parking Provision

Policy AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - saved UDP policy states that new development will only be permitted where it is in accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards.

It is proposed to provide 4 residential flats (1x 2 bed & 3 x 1 bed) in lieu of the existing 4 bedroom single tenure property. To comply with the adopted parking standard the maximum on-site requirement demands up to 1.5 spaces per unit thus totalling 6 spaces. The proposed quantum of 4 spaces, situated within individual garages to the rear of the address, therefore falls below this maximum standard. Hence there is an apparent under provision of 2 spaces for the new proposal.

On this premise there is concern that undue parking displacement may result on the local public highway to the detriment of highway safety and added congestion which is considered unacceptable.

Cycling Provision

In terms of cycle parking there should be a provision of 1 secure and accessible space for each of the flatted units (totalling 4 spaces) to conform to the adopted minimum borough cycle parking standard. 2 have been indicated on plan hence this number should be increased to the required 4 spaces. The indicative position of the proposed cycle parking places on plan will be considered acceptable once the level of provision is increased.

Vehicular Access Arrangements

There is currently a single carriageway crossing on Ashburton Road which will become redundant owing to the removal of the existing parking spaces on the property frontage. New spaces related to the proposal would be provided to the rear of the property in the form of 4 new separate garages.

These garages would be accessed via a gated private rear service road which is located off neighbouring Hatherleigh and Kingswear Road. This access arrangement is considered appropriate and therefore acceptable.

It is highlighted that once the existing access point on Ashburton Road is extinguished it will be necessary to reinstate raised kerbing and the public footway in order to maintain footway/roadway continuity. The extinguishment of the old access will need to be undertaken to an appropriate council standard under a S278 (Highways Act 1980) agreement at the applicant's expense.

Trip Generation

The proposal would marginally increase traffic generation from the site as compared to the existing single dwelling unit. However peak period traffic movement into and out of the site is expected to rise by up to 2 additional vehicle movements during the peak morning and evening hours hence this uplift is considered insignificant in generation terms and therefore

can be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

Operational Refuse Requirements

Refuse collection will continue to be conducted via Ashburton Road. A specific bin storage area, close to the highway boundary with the aforementioned road, is depicted on plan. This is acceptable in principle as it ensures that waste collection distances are not excessive and within accepted standards.

Construction Logistics Plan (CLP)

A full and detailed CLP will be a requirement given the constraints and sensitivities of the local residential road network in order to minimize/avoid potential detriment to the public realm. It will need to be secured under a suitable planning condition.

Conclusion

The application has been reviewed by the Highway Engineer who is concerned that the proposal would potentially exacerbate parking stress on the local highway network to the detriment of highway safety and congestion, contrary to policies AM7 and AM14 of the Development Plan (2012) and policies 6.3 and 6.13 of the London Plan (2016).

A Highway refusal on these grounds (as per original committee refusal) is recommended as follows:-

'The application proposes inadequate provision for off-street car parking, resulting in additional on-street parking in an area where such parking is at a premium, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. Accordingly, the scheme is contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012)'.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

Urban design issues have been covered elsewhere in the report and with regard to access and security, had the application not been recommended for refusal, conditions could have been included to ensure compliance with these requirements.

Secured by Design is now covered by Part Q of the Building Regulations which the development would be required to accord with, if the application had been recommended for approval.

7.12 Disabled access

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

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

An appropriate scheme of landscaping and landscape protection could have been secured by condition if the application was recommended for approval.

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Policy 5.17 of the London Plan requires that all new development provide adequate facilities for the storage of waste and recycling.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Not applicable to this application.

Given the potential scale and nature of the proposed development, it is not considered likely to raise significant sustainability concerns.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

The site is not within a flood zone.

The site lies in a Critical Drainage Area (CDA) identified in the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for Hillingdon. A CDA is the catchment area from which surface water drains and contributes to drainage problems. The site is also identified at risk of surface water flooding on the Environment Agency Flood Maps. It is therefore important all developments in this area contribute to manage the risk from surface water, and reduce the run off from their site.

An appropriate condition would therefore have been included if the application was recommended for approval.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

No issues raised.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The comments raised through the consultation process and the potential concerns relating to the impact of the development on adjoining occupiers have been considered in the main body of the report.

7.20 Planning Obligations

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

The scheme would also be liable for payments under the Community Infrastructure Levy. 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.

Community Infrastructure Levy:

The Council adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on August 1st 2014 and the Hillingdon CIL charge for residential developments is £95 per square metre of additional floorspace. This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £35 per sq metre.

Therefore the Hillingdon & Mayoral CIL Charges for the proposed development of 245 sq metres of additional floorspace is currently calculated as follows:

Hillingdon CIL = £24,089.11

Mayoral CIL = £19,432.11

Total = £ 43,521.22

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

There are no enforcement issues raised by 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

None.

10. CONCLUSION

The application seeks planning permission for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension, 4 x detached garages to rear and conversion of dwelling from 1 x 4-bed to 1 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed dwellings with parking and amenity space.

This is a re-submission following the refusal of a similar scheme. Having examined the proposal it is considered that the proposal remains unacceptable. The proposed side and rear extension, by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling. The application proposes inadequate provision for off-street car parking, resulting in additional on-street parking in an area where such parking is at a premium, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. Furthermore the proposed development by reason of the extensive use of the rear garden area for parking including extensive areas of hard-standing, and the proximity of the garages to surrounding properties and gardens, would result in a significant increase in noise and general disturbance to the proposed and adjoining residential properties.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012)
The London Plan (2016)
The Housing Standards Minor Alterations to The London Plan (March 2016)
Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016)
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions
Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon
Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)
National Planning Policy Framework

Contact Officer: Hardeep Ryatt

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 2013 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address

4 Ashburton Road

Planning Application Ref:

15579/APP/2018/642

Planning Committee

North Application

Scale

1:1,250

Date

June 2018

**LONDON BOROUGH
OF HILLINGDON
Residents Services**

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON