

Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration

Address 60 LONG LANE ICKENHAM MIDDLESEX

Development: Two storey detached building with habitable roof space for use as 7 x 2-bed flats with associated amenity space and parking, involving demolition of existing dwelling and installation of vehicular crossover.

LBH Ref Nos: 70282/APP/2018/612

Drawing Nos: 18/3124/110A
18/3124/102B
17/3124/101
17/3124/11
17/3124/13
17/3124/12
Design & Access Statement
Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment
TREE SURVEY, ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
17/3124/106 Rev A
17/3124/105
17/3124/104
17/3124/103

Date Plans Received: 16/02/2018 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 02/11/2018
Date Application Valid: 23/02/2018 16/02/2018

1. SUMMARY

The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a two storey detached building with habitable roof space to create 8 x 2 bed self contained flats with associated amenity space and parking.

The proposed development by virtue of the design, scale and bulk is considered unacceptable and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene and the neighbouring area. Given the inadequate separation distances of the building to the properties at the rear it is also considered the proposal would result in a loss of amenity to the adjoining occupiers by virtue of loss of privacy. The proposal also fails to provide adequate living accommodation for future occupiers contrary to the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) and the London Plan 2015 and is recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its size, scale, bulk, design and proximity to the boundaries would result in a cramped, unduly intrusive, visually prominent and undesirable form of development, that would fail to harmonise with the existing character of the Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and of Ickenham Conservation Area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), and policies BE4, BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part

Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2015) and the council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions and HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2 R16 Conservation Area

The site is in a conservation area and the existing property is considered to make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. The proposed heritage assessment has failed to justify demolition of the existing property and the submitted replacement building is considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The demolition of the existing dwellinghouse is therefore considered to be contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), and policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2015).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed building by virtue of its height and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers by reason of loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal would provide a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers, contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan, the Mayor of London's adopted Housing SPG (March 2016), The Mayor of London's Housing Standards (MALP 2016) and the Technical Housing Standards-Nationally described space standard adopted 2015.

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 I71 LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Refusing)

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.

We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is large rectangular plot comprising a large detached dwelling, situated on the eastern side of Long Lane. The existing property has been extended to the side in the past, which has resulted in it spanning the entire width of the site at ground floor. It also benefits from a large porch addition to the front. It is characterised by a projecting gable to the front finished with waney edge timber cladding to the gable end. The gable feature runs through the house to allow for a projecting rear gable element. The entire property has a painted render external finish with mock Tudor timber detailing at first floor and is set beneath a clay tiled hipped roof.

The existing dwelling is set well back from the main road, which maintains the existing building line within the street scene and has an existing carriage driveway with two access points. The existing front boundary treatment comprises a brick wall, in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene.

The area is characterised primarily by two detached storey houses on good sized plots of land which are set back from the road frontage, although some redevelopment and infill building works have taken place.

The site is located within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area and the developed area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012). The site is also covered by TPO 5.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing detached dwelling and the erection of a two storey building, with habitable roofspace to create 7 x 2-bed self contained flats. The proposal also includes bin and cycle stores to the side and car parking to the front with the relocation of the vehicular crossover and private amenity space to the rear.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

70282/APP/2017/3656 60 Long Lane Ickenham Middlesex

Two storey detached building with habitable roof space to create 8 x 2-bed flats with associated amenity space, parking and installation of vehicular crossover, involving demolition of existing dwelling house.

Decision: 11-12-2017 Refused

Comment on Relevant Planning History

The previous submission was refused on the basis that it failed to justify the demolition of the existing property. The replacement building was also considered inappropriate due to its size, scale, bulk and design resulting in a cramped and unduly intrusive visually prominent form of development which would be out of keeping with the character of the wider Conservation Area. The proposal was also considered to detrimentally impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers; failed to provide adequate private usable amenity space for future occupiers and failed to demonstrate that the development would safeguard existing valuable on site trees.

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
- PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

- AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
- AM14 New development and car parking standards.
- 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.
- 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.
- H3 Loss and replacement of residential accommodation
- OE1 Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
- OE3 Buildings or uses likely to cause noise annoyance - mitigation measures
- 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
- NPPF- 11 NPPF-11 2018 - Making effective use of land
- NPPF- 12 NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
- NPPF- 16 NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment
- 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:- **28th March 2018**
- 5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

33 neighbours were consulted for a period of 21 days expiring on the 27 March 2018. A site notice was also erected on the telegraph pole to the front of the property. 31 responses were received raising the following issues:

- Out of keeping with the Conservation Area
- Overbearing
- Architectural style not in keeping with the established pattern of development
- Scale not in keeping with the surroundings
- Inadequate parking
- The area requires more family housing not flats
- Loss of privacy
- Loss and amenity and light
- Overdevelopment
- Too many flatted developments altering the character and appearance of the street scene
- Additional vehicles crossing the pavement to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety
- Any grant of permission should include 50% social housing or earmarked for first time buyers
- Garden grabbing
- The heritage report fails to justify the loss of the existing property which could be refurbished
- Additional traffic on the road, the traffic jams in the morning, at school time and the evening are bad enough
- The loss of the trees
- Increased hardstanding leading to localised flooding
- Noise and disturbance due to intensification of use
- Loss of natural habitats and impact on wildlife
- The bin store does not look to be of adequate size. If overflowing would attract vermin
- Impact on service
- Proximity of bin store to neighbouring properties
- Impact on the amenity of future occupiers
- The ingress point is not sufficient to allow emergency vehicles
- Lack of consultation

A petition against the proposal has also been submitted and a Ward Councillor commented on the proposal endorsing the comments raised by the Local Residents as identified above.

Ickenham Residents Association - (response 14/3/18 summarised). The proposal fails to address the previous reasons for refusal. The massive frontage would be out of keeping with the neighbouring properties and the Conservation Area. Loss of the significant front garden to accommodate the infrastructure further highlights the disparity between the proposal and existing garden and frontages of the houses in the immediate vicinity. Inadequate amenity space provision for the future occupants. Size and bulk out of character with the surroundings and would have a negative effect on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. Insufficient car parking provision. Increased traffic movements to the detriment of highway safety. We regret there were no Officer Comments in her refusal on wither local flooding nor the safety aspects, both of which are a concern. The existing crossovers should be removed and the footpath and verges made good, should the proposal be acceptable.

Additional comments on the revised plans 1st June (summarised). We uphold our previous comments.

Firstly with reference to the removal of the 2nd floor roof accommodation and the improvement of design, which we acknowledge, however should you be minded to approve this application then a

Condition be placed on the development such that 2nd floor roof accommodation and dormer windows etc., should not be allowed retrospectively.

Secondly, despite the improvement in the roof design, the developer has instead made the already huge proposed footprint even larger. He is bringing the building out at the sides, particularly next to No.62 where it will be only 80cm or so away from the boundary. The other very disappointing thing is that he has not reduced the depth of the block at all. The proposed block will still have a depth of 15m which would be 250% deeper than the existing property and is greater than the depth of the rear amenity area which would be 12.5m.

Other properties close by in the Conservation Area have house footprints that occupy approximately 30% of the rear garden depth. The proposed development would equate to a footprint of more than 120% of the remaining rear garden, a significant increase in density. The depth of the block also raises concerns to us of overlooking as it will be only 19m from the patio of 1, Neela Close and 1, Milton Road which will then be overlooked from the first floor windows.

We would query the amended existing site plans in which the neighbouring houses appear to have a much larger footprint than in the last two applications. The accuracy of these is in question as for example the footprint of No.62 is more than half made up of ground floor garages which are not overbearing to any neighbours. There also seems to be a plan to remove at least two (if not more) trees to squeeze in the bigger footprint but there is no updated tree report.

Whilst the improvements to the design are noted the changes have resulted in the amended building being crammed into the site with the rear element of the side elevation of the building adjacent to No.62 being less than 0.5m to the boundary. This would be out of keeping with the more spacious layout of the area and contrary to policies BE13 and BE19 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

- The bin stores have been indicated as being placed into a gap of less than 1m and would not enable practical access for the occupiers of the 7 proposed flats. The tandem layout of the bins as shown would not allow ease of access and be likely to result in issues of bins being visible from the site frontage which would appear unsightly. The cycle store would also not be conveniently located particularly given the limited access on the left side of the building. In our opinion a greater gap to the boundary of No.62 of at least 1.5m would address both the cramped layout and the impractical bin storage and access to the cycle storage.

- 1 Neela Close has a private rear patio which is not currently overlooked. Whilst there is currently a fragmented tree screen between the properties this would not represent permanent protection and as such cannot be taken into account in considering separation distances. The proposal would still result in the windows serving the living room and 2 bedrooms of Flat 1 all overlooking the private amenity area of 1 Neela Close at a distance of 19m. This is having regard to the requirement for a distance of 21m (taking account of a 3m private amenity area to the rear of the property) as set out in the Council's own Design Guidance SPD (fig 4.2). Similarly the distance to the private rear patio of 1 Milton Road would also be 19m and therefore undue loss of privacy to that property would also result.

Ickenham Conservation Area Panel - No response

Historic England - Responded to advise there is no need to consult them on this proposal.

Internal Consultees

Access Officer - Any planning permission should have a condition for compliance with standards for a Category 2 M4(2) dwelling as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015.

Highways - Satisfied that the proposal would not exacerbate congestion or parking stress and would not raise any highway safety concerns in accordance with adopted policy.

Tree/Landscaping - This site is occupied by a two-storey detached house on the west side of Long Lane, to the south of the Milton Road junction. The plot is a generous size and there is a small swimming pool in the rear garden. The site lies within the area covered by TPO 5 and there are several protected trees within this plot: T39, T40, T41, T42, T43 and T44. However, only one of these trees remains on the site, a purple-leafed plum (T13 on the submitted tree survey). The property is also within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area - a designation which protects trees. A previous application, ref. 2017/3656, was refused. According to the D&AS some of the reasons for refusal have been addressed in the current application. A tree report, by Elizabeth Greenwood, has been prepared. This includes a survey, arboricultural impact assessment and method statement. 19 No. individual trees and two groups have been identified. There are no 'A' grade trees on the site. Six individual trees and one group have been graded 'B'. Of these, two hollies will be removed (T17 and T18). The other 'B' grade trees: T1 birch, T8 Robinia, T14 Holly, T16 Cherry, and G1 Lawson cypress will be retained - with some management / maintenance required. The remaining trees are all 'C' grade - not normally considered to be a constraint on development. 10 No. will be retained and four removed to facilitate the development. Among those to be retained is the cherry (T16) on the front boundary - one of the more conspicuous trees when viewed from the public realm. There is no objection to the detailed recommendations in the tree report. In appendix G an indicative arboricultural supervision chart is provided. Arboricultural supervision should be conditioned to ensure that good practice and tree recommendations are adhered to. In terms of the proposed site layout, the new building is uncomfortably close to the side boundaries which will narrow the gap between neighbouring buildings uncomfortably. The front garden is dominated by parking albeit a reasonable area of soft landscape has been retained around the retained cherry tree on the front boundary. The layout should be amended to provide a front boundary hedge to screen the car park. - If necessary the planted strip in front of the flats could be sacrificed? No bin or bike stores are shown. These should be integral to the building or sited to the rear of the flats. Locating them in the front will involve sacrificing trees, or other soft landscape - and will be unacceptable. RECOMMENDATION No objection subject to the above comments and conditions BE8 (to include arboricultural supervision), BE9 (parts 1,2,4,5 and 6) and BE10.

Conservation Officer - The site is located in Ickenham Village conservation area, in a suburb of small dwellings of Arts and Crafts design in a spacious green setting developed from the 1930s. The houses are characteristically vernacular, with a single-pile plan and discrete modelling, hipped roofs with chimney stacks, cat slide roofs with hipped dormers, mock timber framing, overhanging eaves and jettied out first floors, and many have a gabled wing on a cross-axis. Long Lane is a wide road with grass verges and many small trees.

Although some dwellings in the conservation area have two wings on cross axes, they are usually pairs of semi detached houses, on particularly long and narrow plans. Examples include a group on Almond Avenue, opposite the Milton Court turning, and further north on Long Lane.

Comments: The Conservation Area is made up of various character areas. The site is located on land which formed part of the Swakeleys House Estate. Properties along this stretch of Long Lane were developed within the principles of plot based construction, comprising detached single family dwellings within individual plots, set well back from the main road, allowing verdant frontages. Many of the buildings make reference to Arts and Crafts styles.

The new development would need to make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, bulk and scale. The proposal would insert a single, significantly large building onto the site and within the rear garden. It would be considerably larger than the existing and neighbouring dwellings, projecting deeper into the site and spanning the width, with some gap views between neighbouring properties. The footprint should take into account the size of the plot and be proportionate to the

space available and fit within the wider grain of the area. The proposal would result in an overly deep building. It is noted a similar development has taken place at no. 66, however the site area in that instance is substantially larger and also situated adjacent to a previous flatted development. Wide gaps between adjacent sites are important particularly at first floor level. The general bulk, scale and built form would detrimentally increase the buildings presence along Long Lane.

The austere appearance and symmetrical nature of the principal built form elevation would be considered detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area. The design fails to harmonise with the area's established local distinctiveness. The current house is a good example of the type of early 20th century 'Metroland' development, which contribute to the character of the area. As proposed the building is neither innovative or in keeping. Crown roofs are not an established roof form in the Conservation Area and would not be appropriate. The loss of the front boundary treatment would be detrimental to the street scene.

The proposal would result in an out of scale, overly bulky, dominant building an incongruous addition to the Conservation Area.

Officer response: In view of the above comments a revised scheme was submitted, reducing the scale and design of the building.

Conservation Comments on the revised proposal - The proposed street front does bear a relation to the architecture of the area, although the twin wings on the cross axis are not characteristic of single dwellings elsewhere. The width of the two-storey element is greater than the existing house, which is unwelcome, since it reduces the gaps between the site and the flanking buildings, and diminishes the spaciousness of the surroundings.

However, the proposed plan is a double-pile of roughly square form, and its depth is much greater than the existing single-pile plan. This is uncharacteristic of the area and entirely inimical to vernacular design. The monolithic massing is equally antithetical to the surrounding buildings, and the roof plan is quite without historical precedents. The side elevations are deep and almost blank, and also detrimental. An indication of the existing ground plan on the proposed plan should be provided.

The size of the proposed dwelling is out of keeping with the area, and on a different scale from even the larger houses of the conservation area in Milton Court.

The conflict between the proposed design and the predominantly vernacular character of the architecture of the conservation area is significantly amplified by the intention to introduce windows and doors of upvc. In an area of vernacular architecture, traditional and natural materials are important.

The proposed site plan includes eight parking spaces before the building, of which four are new, and extensive hard standing stretching almost the full width of the plot. The proportion of the site devoted to garden and greenery would be much reduced to less than a third, whereas it now covers most of the site. If hard surfacing is proposed for the parking spaces, some of the trees are unlikely to survive. This would greatly exacerbate the ill effects of the development, by eroding the verdant, suburban character of the area, and fostering a densely developed, urban quality.

The proposal is a revision of a previous application which was refused. Seven flats are proposed instead of eight, and the roof is redesigned and no longer contains two flats accommodation. An east-side projection is removed and smaller projections on each side are proposed instead.

Despite these revisions, the proposal is similar to the earlier version, and almost all of the more detailed objections raised in the previous conservation comments of March 2018 still apply.

CONCLUSION:

The proposal would detract from the appearance and character of the conservation area, through its size, plan and massing, and through loss of space and greenery. Accordingly refusal is recommended.

Applicant response: The Conservation Officer advises 'The conflict between the proposed design and the predominantly vernacular character of the architecture of the conservation area...' from the street scene there are few people who would argue that the proposed building has a conflict in character in terms of street scene. This is taken from Court Road to Milton Road and so represents a full sweep of this section of Long Lane and I would respectfully suggest this is reconsidered. Another point made is the closing down of the gap between our proposal and the adjoining building, again we believe this is erroneous. The Street Scene marks the extent of the additional bulk which you will see is minimal. We feel these inconsistencies need to be addressed. Our assertions are supported within an additional Townscape Report.

Conservation Officer response: (summarised):

Townscape is correct in stating the architectural style in the conservation area is mixed, however the CA is large and has different character zones. It is rare for CA's to have one architectural style and it is key to analyse the immediate character of the proposal site. I would maintain my previous comments.

Townscape state the existing building has no architectural value. Whilst no CA appraisal existing for Ickenham Village this does not in any way mean that the existing building holds no value. The Council has clearly stated its view that the existing property makes a positive impact on the CA. The existing house is a good example of an early 20th Century Metroland development of individually designed detached houses, in large gardens, with mature planting, which contribute positively to the character of the CA. The Council strongly disagree with Townscape's assessment and the current condition of the building is not a reason to justify demolition.

Townscape quotes the NPPF "not all elements of a conservation area contribute to its significance". While this is certainly true, given the Council's view that the existing building makes a positive impact, this is not relevant. However given the positive impact of the existing building, within para. 200 of the NPPF LPA's should look for opportunities for new development within CA's to enhance or better reveal their significance.

The redesign reflects Arts and Crafts elements, such as the cat slide roof and dormer windows but the cumulative composition is rather odd, with its symmetrical facade and the uncharacteristic pair of cross wings. Arts and Crafts is generally more organic and asymmetrical in character. The gaps between the proposed building and its neighbours has been preserved at first floor level in the amended plans but the consequence is that there is even less of a gap at ground floor level than in the initial plans. The consequence of creating a gap at first floor level with the symmetrical cat slides to either side has also created very unusual and uncharacteristic side elevations.

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. This is an existing residential unit set in a spacious plot. The site lies within an established residential area where there would be 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 the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Layouts, at paragraph

3.3 states that in relation to the redevelopment of large plots and infill sites currently used for individual dwellings into flats, the redevelopment of more than 10% of properties on a residential street is unlikely to be acceptable, including the houses which have been converted into flats or other forms of housing.

The above document underpins and supports Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012), which seeks to protect the impacts of flatted development on the character and amenity of established residential areas. It is acknowledged that historically there have been a number of properties and sites redeveloped along Long Lane. This includes flats, in-fill and a separate cul de sac development. However this would represent less than 10% of the original properties within 1 km of the application site.

Given the residential character of the area adjacent to the plot, there is no policy objection to the development of the site to provide additional residential accommodation, subject to an appropriate density and design, and the proposal being in accordance with all of the relevant planning policies and supplementary guidance.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan (2015) 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 site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2 (poor). The London Plan (2015) range for sites with a PTAL of 2 - 3 in a suburban area is 35-65 units per hectare. Based on a total site area of 0.1058 ha the site would have a residential density of 75 units per hectare, which is slightly above this range.

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

With specific reference to the site location within a Conservation Area, Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies (November 2012) states that new development should harmonise with the materials, design features, architectural style and building heights predominant in such areas. This is supported by Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016) which requires developments to have regard to local character. Policy BE4 reflects the relevant legal duties.

The site lies within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area and currently comprises an attractive, detached property dating for the 1930's and as existing relates to the urban grain of area, maintaining a substantial plot. The area is characterised by individually designed properties set within spacious, with, mature planting which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer has advised that in order to make a full assessment of the proposal, a Heritage Statement should be provided including an adequate justification for the demolition of the existing property would need to be provided.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that the statutory duty of a Local Planning Authorities in regard to development affecting Conservation Areas and that 'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving

or enhancing the character and appearance of that area'. Whilst the level of harm to the individual site would result in less than substantial harm, the incremental and cumulative harm that could arise from similar development could adversely affect the significance, character and appearance of the conservation area, resulting in substantial harm. Heritage assets are irreplaceable; any harm requires clear and convincing justification. It would continue and further establish an unwelcome precedent within the Conservation Area, resulting in the loss of single family dwellings, which were originally built as plot - based development, dramatically altering the character of the Conservation Area. The demolition of the property would lead to serious harm which would not be outweighed by any public benefit.

As such it is considered that the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 & BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Saved Policies (November 2012).

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 BE13 ensures development harmonises with the existing street scene or other features of the area which are considered desirable to retain or enhance. BE19 ensures new development complements or improves the amenity and character of the area. The NPPF (2011) also 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 proposed building spans most of the plot width set back 0.65 m from the boundary with no 62 and 1.3m from the boundary with no. 58. The building measures 21.15m in width, 14.5m in depth and a maximum height of 8.7m. The submitted street scene indicates the existing dwelling stands at approximately 8.4 m in height therefore in terms of the overall height there is no significant increase.

The scale of the building has been slightly reduced from the previous submission. The design has also been significantly altered and now has a central ridge line parallel with the road and cat slide roof features to either side and centrally to the front and rear between two storey cross wings. Although the design has improved on the previous submission having greater regard to the Arts and Crafts style of the immediate vicinity, this is still a substantial addition to the street scene, which fails to maintain an adequate set back from the sites side boundaries. It is acknowledged that the existing property spans the full width; however this includes two single storey additions to either side property, with the main bulk of the building set back 4.2m and 4.7m from the boundaries with no. 58 and 62 respectively, maintaining open gap features either side at first floor level.

The Conservation Officer has raised significant concerns over the scale and design of the proposed building. In principle they are concerned that no justification has been provided for the loss of the existing dwelling, which is considered to make a positive impact on the street scene and within the Conservation Area. The design as proposed does bear a relation to the architecture of the area, although the twin wings on the cross axis are not characteristic of single dwellings elsewhere. However, the proposed plan is a double-pile of roughly square form, and its depth is much greater than the existing single-pile plan. This

is uncharacteristic of the area and entirely inimical to vernacular design. The monolithic massing is equally antithetical to the surrounding buildings, and the roof plan is quite without historical precedents. The side elevations are deep and almost blank, and also detrimental. The size of the proposed building is out of keeping with the area, and on a different scale from even the larger houses of the conservation area in Milton Court. The conflict between the proposed design and the predominantly vernacular character of the architecture of the conservation area is significantly amplified by the intention to introduce windows and doors of upvc. In an area of vernacular architecture, traditional and natural materials are important.

Therefore given the scale, overall bulk and design of the building, it is considered that the proposal is unacceptable and would harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and the wider Conservation Area. As such the proposal fail to comply with Part 1 Policy BE1 and HE1, and Part 2 Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) and guidance in HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.08 Impact on neighbours

Policy OE1, OE3 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) require the design of new developments to protect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring dwellings. Also the proposed development should not breach the 45 degree guideline when taken from the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling, ensuring no significant loss of light, loss of outlook or sense of dominance in accordance with Policy BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

The Council's HDAS 'Residential Layouts' advises at paragraph 4.9 that buildings should avoid being over dominant from neighbouring properties and normally a minimum 15m separation distance should be maintained between habitable room windows and elevations of two or more storeys (taken from a 45 degree splay from the centre of habitable room windows). Paragraph 4.12 of the guidance also advises that where habitable room windows face each other, a minimum 21m distance is required to safeguard privacy. This also applies to an area of private amenity space or patio, normally taken to be the 3m depth of rear garden immediately adjoining the rear elevation of a residential property. HDAS 'Residential Extensions' also advises that in order to protect daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties, proposals should not protrude too far and as a guide for a detached property 4m would be acceptable.

The proposed building has a staggered frontage not projecting beyond the line of the existing dwelling and maintains a front building line with both the adjacent properties at the nearest point. To the rear the proposed building line is also staggered and would project approximately 2.5 m beyond the rear of no. 58, where it is adjacent to the boundary, set back by approximately 2.9m. This increases to 5m in depth set back 4.6m from the shared boundary. Although the proposed building would be significantly larger and closer than the existing dwelling it would not compromise a 45 degree line of sight and is not considered this would have a significant impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers by virtue of loss of light, overbearing or loss of outlook. To the other side the proposed building would project approximately 4.8 m beyond the rear of no. 62. The main body of that dwelling is situated further away from the boundary set back approximately 7.65 m, but it also benefits from an adjoining large double garage to the side, with a home office to the rear, which extends up to the shared boundary. It is noted that concern had been raised over the loss of outlook to the two side bedroom windows facing the proposal; however these are secondary windows serving the bedrooms which have principle windows facing front and rear. The proposal would extend beyond the rear of the home office by approximately 0.9m, set back by 4m. It is therefore considered that this would not significantly impact on the

amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would include 3 rooflights within each side elevation servicing in turn a bedroom, bathroom and kitchen lounge area for the first floor flats 2 and 3. No sections have been provided, however taking an indicative floor level provided by the rear balconettes, the proposed roof lights would be approximately 0.9m above floor level, with the potential for a loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupiers.

To the rear the proposed building would be set back 12.5m from the rear boundary with 1 Neela Close and the side boundary of 19 Milton Road. Although it is noted that a separation of 22.75 m would be maintained between the windows of the habitable rooms, the proposal would have direct views over the rear garden and private patio areas to the rear of both 1 Neela Close and 19 Milton Road in close proximity at less than 21 m. Therefore in view of the potential loss of privacy of the adjacent properties the proposal is considered unacceptable. In view of the potential impact on the adjacent properties the proposal is considered unacceptable and fails to comply with Policies BE20, BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) and guidance in HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

On 25 March 2015, the Government introduced new technical housing standards in England, which comprise of new additional 'optional' Building Regulations on water and access, and a nationally described space standard (referred to as "the new national technical standards"). These new standards came into effect on 1 October 2015. 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. For a 2 bed, 3 person flat there is a requirement of 61sqm and for a 2 bed, 4 person flat the requirement is 70sqm. The proposed ground floor flats are 3 person flats with a minimum floor area of 61sqm, However the first floor flats are 4 person units with floor areas of 65sqm, 68sqm and 73sqm. Two units do not meet minimum housing standards and it is not considered that conditions could be used to overcome the deficiency/ As such, the proposal would provide a poor standard of residential accommodation, contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (March 2015) and Policies BE19, BE21, BE24 and OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (2015) and the Council's HDAS 'Residential Layouts'.

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.

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, although this policy predates the National Planning Policy Framework. This requires the establishment of criteria to be considered when setting local parking standards including the accessibility of the development and the availability of and opportunities for public transport. The site has a poor PTAL rating and would require the provision of 1.5 car parking spaces plus 1 cycle space per unit. The supporting plans identify a car parking area to the front of the dwelling providing 8 car spaces and a separate cycle store for 8 bicycles. Although it is noted that the car parking provision would be less than the adopted standards it is also noted that in a previous appeal decision (APP/R5510/W/15/31409) the Inspector viewed that as Policy AM14 requires 1.5 spaces as a maximum standard, there is no conflict with the policy by

not providing any parking at all. Although the PTAL rating is poor the site is situated on a main road with easy access to both rail and bus routes. It is situated within easy walking distance local shops, schools and other facilities and as such it would be unreasonable to refuse the proposal on this basis. Therefore, the proposals are considered to be compliant to the Council's policies AM7 and AM14 of the Council's Local Plan Part 2.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

The Council's HDAS guidelines require a minimum of 25 sqm for a two bedroom flat. This would give an overall requirement of 200 sqm. The proposal is set in a large plot and would provide approximately 300 sqm, which is in excess of this requirement. The proposal does identify 2 small private patio areas with a section of open ended hedge screen to the rear of building, however this does not relate to all of the rear facing habitable windows pertaining to each of the ground floor flats. Nevertheless it is considered that through the use of conditions this issue could be addressed given the overall quantum of external amenity space.

7.12 Disabled access

Not applicable to this application.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

Adopted Local Plan, Policy BE1 seeks high quality design of the built and external environment. Saved policy BE38 seeks the retention and utilisation of topographical and landscape features of merit and the provision of new planting and landscaping wherever it is appropriate. The site lies within the area covered by Tree Preservation Order No. 5 and the Ickenham Village Conservation which is characterised by its garden suburb nature. The submitted tree report identifies that 10 trees will be retained and four removed to facilitate the development. Among those to be retained is the cherry (T16) on the front boundary - one of the more conspicuous trees when viewed from the public realm. In terms of the proposed site layout, the new building is uncomfortably close to the side boundaries which will narrow the gap between neighbouring buildings. The front garden is dominated by parking albeit a reasonable area of soft landscape has been retained around the retained cherry tree on the front boundary. Landscape Officer has advised that the layout should be amended to provide a front boundary hedge to screen the car park. Therefore subject to conditions for landscaping and tree protection the proposal would comply with the aim of Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012).

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 is not located within a flood zone or identified as at risk of surface water flooding. It noted that the road to the front is shown as being at risk however in the context of this proposal, were a scheme to be deemed acceptable, conditions could be imposed to ensure suitable sustainable drainage methods and materials were included to help prevent additional surface water run off during high rain fall events.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to this application.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

The consultation was carried out in accordance with Hillingdon practice, over and above statutory requirements. All comments received have been considered and all other issues

raised are addressed within the main report.

7.20 Planning Obligations

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

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not relevant 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

Not applicable

10. CONCLUSION

The existing dwellinghouse is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The current house is a good example of the type of early 20th century 'Metroland' development, of individually designed detached houses set in large gardens with mature planting, which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area. No justification has been established for the loss of the original dwelling.

The proposed development is to erect a building of significant size and scale when compared with surrounding residential units. It is considered that the proposed building would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. The development has also failed to provide adequate internal living accommodation for the occupants of all of the new flats. The development is therefore considered contrary to a suite of Hillingdon Local Plan policies (2012) and policies in the London Plan 2015 and is recommended for refusal.

11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012).
Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2.
The London Plan (2015).
Supplementary Planning Document 'Accessible Hillingdon'.
National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer: Liz Arnold

Telephone No: 01895 250230