

Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration

Address 26 BROADWOOD AVENUE RUISLIP

Development: Alterations to front, flank and rear elevations to house and reduction of overall roof height

LBH Ref Nos: 16080/APP/2019/688

Drawing Nos: Design and Access Statement November 2018 Vers4
FRAM 8/18/10 Existing Frontage Comparative Study
FRAM8/18/10 MAY 2018 REV 01 1.6.19 Proposed Section through house
SCP2160301-001 Location Map
Proposed materials and finishes to No 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip LB Hillingdon Planning Application number: 16080/APP/2019/688
FRAM /18/14B JUNE 19 Proposed Flank Elevations & Roof & 2nd Floor Plans
FRAM 8/18/11A JUNE 19 Proposed Elevations & Plans
FRAM 8/18/12A JUNE 19 Existing Elevation & Plans
FRAM 8/18/13A June 2019 Existing Elevations and Plans
Fram/18/HHN, Fram/18/PA/26 Broadwood/PP-0763044 Cover Letter
2160301-2 REV A Proposed Block Plan
FRAM 7/18/01 DECEMBER 108 REV01 Original House Plans and Elevations

Date Plans Received:	26/02/2019	Date(s) of Amendment(s):	28/02/2019
Date Application Valid:	16/04/2019		03/06/2019
			01/03/2019
			05/06/2019

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located north of Broadwood Avenue. The property is a 2 storey high detached dwelling with a generous back garden space. The front elevation comprises of a hardstanding area for car parking and landscaping. The front elevation comprises of brick and paint render finish. There are four rooflight facing directly onto Broadwood Avenue.

The site is located on the southern boundary of Park Wood. The street scene is residential in character and appearance. It comprises of mainly large detached houses of a variety of designs. River Pinn runs parallel to Broadwood Avenue on the south of the property. The site is in proximity to Eastcote Hockey Club, Ruislip Cricket Club and Pinn Meadows.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

This application seeks planning permission for the alterations to front, flank and rear elevations to house and the reduction of overall roof height.

Frontage is to be entirely remodelled:

- The front elevation would be transformed to respect local styles and materials removing the observed blandness of the current 'as built' finish.
- Natural colour oak, timber-inserts would be used in the first floor elevation against a white

'stuccoed' background to provide a 'half-timbered' first floor appearance.

- A 'Capel Clockworks' style, red, un-faced, 'through' brick would be used as a finished surface to the ground floor frontage. This style is considered to be in keeping with the general tone of the frontages in Broadwood Avenue, blending with the street scene in this section of the avenue. The flank elevations would be treated with similar materials and to a similar palette, but without the timber inserts to unify the external appearance of the building. The rear elevation would remain as a rendered, white finish.
- The roof covering will comprise 'Rosemary' plain clay, non-interlocking tiles, in a terracotta colour.
- The replacement front elevation windows shall be provided from the Heritage range of 'Boulton and Paul' timber frames; painted to match the oak inserts to the front elevation.
- The front door shall have an applied oak finish to match the timber inserts to the front elevation.
- No change is proposed to the front hard-standing surface.
- No additional lighting is proposed to the front hard-standing area or to the front elevations of the house. (No bulwark lighting)
- The storm water drainage system shall consist of PVCu 'Heritage' section h/r gutters with downpipes to match, finished in black.
- There are no additional fences or walls proposed to the street frontage.

The proposed include:

- Reducing ridge height from 9.04 metres to 8.54 metres (500mm reduction) in reference to drawing FRAM 8/18/11A - the new ridge height will be inline with the rear ridge height.
- Extending the roof downwards to lower the eaves level to the front, side and partial rear elevation - ground to eaves will be reduced from 5.34 metres to 4.81 metres (540mm reduction). The rear elevation eaves will remain unchanged.

The footprint and internal ceiling height of the house will remain unchanged.

During the course of the assessment, the submitted documents were revised by the agent several times to try to address the Officer's concerns.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

16080/APP/2016/1142 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front rooflights, 6 side rooflights and alterations to elevations

Decision Date: 26-07-2016 **Approved** **Appeal:**

16080/APP/2016/3282 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

Details pursuant to condition 7 (Method Statement) of planning permission Ref: 16080/APP/2016/1142 dated 26/07/2016 (Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front rooflights, 6 side rooflights and alterations to elevations)

Decision Date: 27-10-2016 **Approved** **Appeal:**

16080/APP/2017/1893 26 Broadwood Avenue Ruislip

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front roof lights, 6 side roof lights and alterations to elevations

Decision Date: 03-10-2017 **Refused** **Appeal:**06-SEP-18 **Dismissed**

Comment on Planning History

An Appeal Decision was dismissed on 6/9/2018 for Appeal A (APP/R5510/C/18/3198540) and Appeal B (APP/R5510/D/18/3193787).

Appeal A - Dismissed

The appeal is made by Mr K Pogwizd against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of London Borough of Hillingdon. The requirements of the notice are to:

(i) Modify the height, depth, width and design of the dwellinghouse so as to comply with Drawing No. 2160301-01 titled "EXISTING PLANS" attached to planning permission (ref. 16080/APP/2016/1142) granted on 26 July 2016; OR

(ii) Modify the height, depth, width and design of the dwellinghouse so as to comply with Drawing No. 2160301-1 REV A titled "PROPOSED PLANS" attached to planning permission (ref. 16080/APP/2016/1142) dated 26 July 2016 and ensure the resultant development complies with all conditions and limitations attached to the planning permission.

(iii) Remove from the Land all materials, debris, plant and equipment associated with requirements (i) or (ii) above.

The period for compliance with the requirements is 8 months.

Appeal B - Dismissed

The appeal is made by Mr K Pogwizd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon on application reference 16080/APP/2017/1893 dated 23/5/2017 for the retrospective erection of part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front roof lights, 6 side roof lights and alterations to elevations.

An Enforcement Notice reference ENF/68/17 was issued on 28/2/2018 for the breach of planning control alleged without planning permission, the substantial enlargement of a dwellinghouse which fails to comply with the terms of planning permission reference 16080/APP/2016/1142 granted on 26/7/2016 including its conditions.

A planning application reference 16080/APP/2017/1893 was refused on 9/11/2017 for the retrospective erection of part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front roof lights, 6 side roof lights and alterations to elevations.

A planning application reference 16080/APP/2016/1142 was granted on 31/3/16 for the erection of the part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 side dormer, 2 rear dormers, 4 front rooflights, 6 side rooflights and alterations to elevations.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- 19th May 2019

3. Comments on Public Consultations

A site notice was on public display between 18.4.19 and 19.5.19. A total of 3 objections and 1 representation commented on behalf of 28 Broadwood Avenue were received. The concerns raised from the objection includes:

- Revised application has the appearance of an attempt to delay the enforcement process
- Slight reduction in property height and cosmetic changes will not change the overall bulky property, the property remains ugly and unsuited to the street scene.
- Flood Risk - property comprises of a very large roof and surrounding area of the house are hardstanding area therefore during heavy rain, water is likely to run off to neighbouring properties 45 and 47 Broadwood Avenue and the street.
- Anomalies with the Design and Access Statement.
- No indication of the intention to reduce the eaves height, only the ridge height.
- No attempt has been made to reduce the overall bulk of the building as stated within the Planning Inspector's appeal documentation and recommendation.
- The plans submitted are incorrect - side elevations show differing heights on the reduced ridge height, the proposed floor plans showing the introduction of the crown roof cannot be built as shown, the hip rafters will need to be realigned to meet the corners of the proposed crown roof, altering the hip rafters will impact on the position of the front velux windows.
- Only two modifications are taken into account to address the Inspectors comment - reducing the ridge height by between 350mm and 500mm, and to remodel front elevation.
- No change to the footprint of the property and as such has not overcome the harm identified by the Inspector.
- No evidence that a soakaway has been constructed to standard.
- Application should be invalid as it is a non-compliant structure and based on Value Added Tax Legislation and Bank Legislation.
- The Design and Access Statement suggest the site is in Lancaster Avenue.
- Plans submitted are misleading - "as built" that was built without planning permission.
- Impact on property 24 Broadwood Avenue - detrimental impact caused by the increased volume of the property, height of the rear extension, extractor fan fitted excretes directly onto the neighbouring property, existing exterior light around the roof and garden area is creating light pollution issue.

A re-consultation was issued due to the additional information submitted. A total of 3 comments from previous objectors and 1 representation comment received. The additional issues raised include:

- There has not been an attempt to comply with the enforcement notice
- The drawing showing the street scene in the last recent submission is totally incorrect in how the eaves levels are shown - the drawing tries to indicate that the eaves level for No. 26 and 28 are very close where in fact there is a 710mm difference.
- No. 28's pitched roof over the extended section of the garage is approximately 2575mm above the eaves level, whereas the pitched roof to No. 26 is between 2900 and 3100mm, dominating the roof line of No. 28, Broadwood Avenue that has a decline in the road from Sherwood Ave, this was reflected in the stepping down of the ridge line in the original street scene which is now interrupted by the increased height of the ridge to No. 26.
- The drawing do not contain sufficient information in terms of dimensions to consider the impact the existing development has created in the overall street scene.
- No clear indication as how the applicant intends to reduce the overall bulk of the roof extension and the figure of 300mm increase in the ridge height as put forward in the second application to retain the as built development is misleading.
- Referring to the original building eaves/soffit, the difference in level between No. 26 and 28 is approximately 300mm at the lowest point, as the original roof structure contained a dormer projection over the front window, whilst there is some replication of this detail in the

current proposal, the height of the soffit has significantly increased from the original building distorting the overall appearance of the street scene.

- Significant enlargement of the property that has been built following the demolition of the original house.
- Should be considered as invalid under planning law and other associated legislation as a non-compliant structure.
- No attempt of the applicant to make the driveway/front garden permeable, thereby increasing the risk of flooding for neighbouring residents, living further down Broadwood Avenue.

Flood and Water Management Officer:

The site lies in a Critical Drainage Area (CDA) as identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for Hillingdon. A CDA is the catchment area from which surface water drains and contributes to drainage problems. All developments in this area must contribute to managing the risk of flooding from surface water by reducing surface water runoff from their site. Therefore the applicant should minimise the water from the site entering the sewers. No drainage to support the extension should be connected to any existing surface water sewer, other than as an overflow. Water run off from any roof or hard paving associated with the development should be directed to a soakaway, or tank or made permeable. This includes any work to front gardens not part of the planning application, which must be permeable or be collected and directed to a permeable area, otherwise it would need an additional permission. A water butt should be incorporated.

Flood and Water Management Officer:

In addition to the previous response, there have been local concerns raised over the scale of the development and its potential impact on the risk of flooding in Broadwood Avenue. To provide some context, properties in Broadwood Avenue and Park Avenue flooded on 23rd June 2016 as a result of intense rainfall leading to surface water flooding. While the primary mechanism was from runoff originating in Park Wood, rain falling on impermeable surfaces in the surrounding residential areas contributed to flooding. Approval was given in July 2016 for the approved scheme, which requested no additional details regarding the management of surface water. Broadwood Avenue was designated as being in a Critical Drainage Area in the 2018 West London Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). As this is a retrospective application, the applicant should be able to provide details of the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) implemented on the site to reduce runoff to greenfield rates. Observations from the road indicate that the front drive has a drainage channel prior to discharging onto the road, while this is a welcomed addition, details of the remaining surface water network should be provided to ensure the development complies with local planning policy and the London Plan.

Trees and Landscape Officer:

This site is occupied by a two-storey detached house on the north side of Broadwood Avenue, which has recently been converted with windows in the roof. The site lies within the area covered by TPO 277 and there are trees on, or close to, the site. There is a protected oak tree on the rear boundary, T13 on the TPO schedule. This application appears to be a minor amendment to a previous submission ref. 2016/1142 which was approved subject to conditions. (A subsequent application, ref. 2017/1893 was refused at Appeal). The proposed alterations appear to be within the existing footprint of the building and should involve no direct loss of trees or external space. - Tree protection may be required to prevent indirect /accidental damage associated with the building work. RECOMMENDATION No objection subject to pre-application condition RES8 and condition RES10.

4. 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:

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.

BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

HDAS-EXT Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 7.6 (2016) Architecture

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The Local Plan Part 2 Draft Proposed Submission Version (2015) was submitted to the Secretary of State on 18th May 2018. This comprises of a Development Management Policies document, a Site Allocations and Designations document and associated policies maps. This will replace the current Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (2012) once adopted.

The document was submitted alongside Statements of Proposed Main and Minor Modifications (SOPM) which outline the proposed changes to submission version (2015) that are being considered as part of the examination process.

Submission to the Secretary of State on 18th May 2018 represented the start of the Examination in Public (EiP). The public examination hearings concluded on the 9th August 2018. The Inspector submitted a Post Hearing Advice Note outlining the need to undertake a final consultation on the updated SOPM (2019) only. The Council undertook this consultation between 27th March 2019 and 8th May 2019. All consultation responses have been provided to the Inspector for review, before the Inspector's Final Report is published to conclude the EiP process.

Paragraph 48 of the NPPF (2019) outlines that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- b) The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- c) The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

On the basis that the public hearings have concluded and the Council is awaiting the final

Inspector's Report on the emerging Local Plan: Part 2, the document is considered to be in the latter stages of the preparation process. The degree to which weight may be attached to each policy is therefore based on the extent to which there is an unresolved objection being determined through the EiP process and the degree of consistency to the relevant policies in the NPPF (2019).

The main issues for consideration in determining this application are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the residential area, the impact on residential amenity and whether the proposed works satisfies the issues raised by the Inspector from the Appeal Decision dated 6/9/2019.

Concerns raised by the Inspector:

- Increased in height in the region of 0.3m over and above the approved and alterations to the detailing and finishes to the front elevation.
- The increased height of the eaves and ridge of the appeal property has added considerably to its mass and bulk resulting in an overly strident building in comparison with neighbouring properties to either side.
- When viewed from the street the house has a bulky, box-like form topped with the extensive slopes of its pitched roof.
- The building appears excessively dominant and out of proportion with the adjoining properties to either side
- Starkness of materials use and lack of detailing on front elevation.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) requires all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods, where people enjoy living and working and that serve the long-term needs of all resident.

Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP (November 2012) states that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene or other features of the area which the Local Planning Authority considers it desirable to retain or enhance.

Policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) then goes on to say that proposal for alterations and extensions to existing building will be permitted where they harmonise with the scale, form, architecture composition and proportions of the original building.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) states A) All development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings, will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding: i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding: scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot size and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns; building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure; architecture composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views from both from and to the site; and impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment. ii) ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes; iii) ensuring that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities.

The applicant proposes to remodel the front elevation of the property and incorporate timber-inserts in natural colour oak finish against a white background on the first floor elevation while the ground floor will have a red un-faced 'through' brick finish. The side elevations are treated with similar material without the timber inserts and the rear elevation would remain as a rendered white finish. The front elevation windows are to be replaced with timber frames with oak finish and will set close beneath the eaves of the roof. Additional changes includes, the roof covering are to be 'Rosemary' plain clay, non-interlocking tiles in terracotta finish and the front door will be applied with oak finish. The proposed external re-modification is considered to be sympathetic to the surrounding street scene and will add character to the existing elevations. During the appeal, a similar proposal was put forward, however the Inspector's report highlighted that "whilst those suggested changes would add detail to the front of the building, it would not reduce the apparent bulk or mass which makes the building stand out when seen in context with its neighbours. The changes proposed would not overcome the harm identified".

The existing plans indicate the ridge height is approximately 9.1 metres towards the front of the house and reduces to 8.5 metres on the rear. The applicant proposes to only reduce the front ridge height by 500mm. The overall height from the front elevation appears to be reduced, however as the new front ridge line matches the rear ridge line, this exacerbates the bulky box-like form of the building. As noted in the Inspector's report, "when looking along the street the building appears excessively dominant and out of proportion with the adjoining properties to either side, the impact is exacerbated when looking from the east in a westerly direction as the closest part of the adjoining property No. 28 is set back behind the front building line of the appeal property".

To address the concerns of the height of the eaves, the applicant has extended the roof downwards so the proposed eaves would be similar of the neighbouring properties. The new eaves height is 4.8 metres as opposed to the original height of 5.34 metres. The proposed roof extension would result in overhanging eaves particularly to the front, side and partial rear elevations and it would further emphasise the extensive slopes of its pitched roof as it was noted in the Inspector's report during the Appeal. The extension of the roof to lower the eaves would again add considerable mass to the roof and bulk to the property. The building overall would appear out of keeping with the street scene.

Therefore, by reason of size, scale, bulk and design it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street. As such, it is considered that the proposed fails to comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13 and BE15 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019). As a result, the proposed is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by virtue of its design, size, scale, bulk and overdominance, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and 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), Policies DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies With Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

INFORMATIVES

- 1** The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
- 2** 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.

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE15 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings

BE20 Daylight and sunlight considerations.

BE21 Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.

DMHB 1 Design of New Development

HDAS-E> Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008

LPP 3.5 (2016) Quality and design of housing developments

LPP 7.6 (2016) Architecture

- 3** 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.

Standard Informatives

- 1** The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council

policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

- 2 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 (July 2011) and national guidance.

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LPP 3.5	(2016) Quality and design of housing developments
LPP 7.6	(2016) Architecture

Contact Officer: Rebecca Lo

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 2018 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

**26 Broadwood Avenue
Ruislip**

Planning Application Ref:

16080/APP/2019/688

Planning Committee:

North

Scale:

1:1,250

Date:

August 2019

**LONDON BOROUGH
OF HILLINGDON**
**Residents Services
Planning Section**

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON