

Report of the Head of Planning & Enforcement

Address 2 HILLIARD ROAD NORTHWOOD

Development: Conversion of dwelling to 3 one-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats to include conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 rear and 1 front rooflights and new gable end window to side and part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension.

LBH Ref Nos: 34684/APP/2010/841

Drawing Nos: 1:1250 Location Plan
2152-56
2099/10
2152.57 (Photograph)
2099/11
2152.54
2152.51
2152.53
2152.52
2152.58 (Proposed Sketch)
2152-55
Design and Access Statement

Date Plans Received: 15/04/2010 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**
Date Application Valid: 30/04/2010

1. SUMMARY

This proposal is to convert an end of terrace property into 3 one-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats, involving a part single storey, part two storey side and rear extension and conversion of the existing and extended roof space to provide habitable accommodation with the installation of a rear dormer window and rooflights. The site is within the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character.

The existing dwelling falls below the size of property normally considered appropriate for subdivision. Even with the two storey side and rear extension, the property fails to meet internal floor space standards for all the units. Lifetime homes standards also cannot be met. Car parking and cycle storage provision have also not been provided. As such the proposed conversion of this property is not acceptable.

Furthermore, the proposed two storey side and rear extension is not considered to be sufficiently subordinate to the original property and the two storey side extension, although it would replicate the existing design of the house, would accentuate its unwieldy and awkward appearance. The use of the shared amenity space would also result in the loss of privacy from the ground floor units. It is recommended that the application be refused.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 **Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed two storey side and rear extension, by reason of its siting, bulk, matching ridge height with the original roof and design, would fail to appear subordinate to the original dwelling and the side extension would accentuate the unwieldy and awkward design of the two storey set back at the side of the house. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original property and the surrounding Old Northwood Area of Special Character, contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2009) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its siting, bulk and size, would fail to appear subordinate within the rear roof slope, and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original property and the surrounding Old Northwood Area of Special Character. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2009) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The application property is not of a sufficient size to provide a suitable scheme of residential conversion and one of the proposed ground floor one-bedroom flats and the three-bedroom first floor flat would fail to provide an adequate internal floor area to afford an adequate standard of residential amenity to future occupiers. As such, the proposal would result in sub-standard residential accommodation, contrary to Policy BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed shared use of the rear garden area would not afford an appropriate level of privacy to the rear habitable rooms of the ground floor flats. As such, the occupiers of these units would be overlooked to an unacceptable degree. The proposal would therefore not provide a suitable level of residential amenity for these occupiers, contrary to policy BE23 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

5 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal involves the loss of off-street car parking spaces and fails to make provision for off-street car parking to serve the proposed flats. The proposal would therefore be likely to give rise to additional on-street car parking, detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

6 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal fails to make provision for covered and secure cycle storage, in accordance with the Council's adopted cycle parking standards. The proposal would therefore be likely to encourage reliance upon the private car, contrary to energy efficiency and sustainability objectives, Chapter 3C of the London Plan (February 2008) and Policy AM9 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

7 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal fails to satisfy Lifetime Homes standards, contrary to Policies 3A.5 and 4B.5 of the London Plan (February 2008) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon January 2010.

INFORMATIVES

1 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).

2 I53 **Compulsory Informative (2)**

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

BE5	New development within areas of special local character
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.
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
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
R17	Use of planning obligations to supplement the provision of recreation, leisure and community facilities
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM9	Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
LPP	London Plan (February 2008)
HDAS	Residential Extensions Residential Layouts Accessible Hillingdon
SPG	SPD Planning Obligations 2007

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the eastern side of Hilliards Road, some 36m to the north of its junction with Pinner Road. It forms the first property fronting the road, and is a good quality, late Victorian/Edwardian end of terrace house. The terrace of 4 has a degree of uniformity in that the houses have double height canted bays below timbered gables, sited adjacent to recessed front doors set behind arched openings. The two central properties have paired front doors positioned side by side. No.2 does differ somewhat in that it has a two storey set back to one side with a cut away eaves detail which appears to be original. The house also has an original projecting two storey rear wing and a later attached side garage. There is also a large outbuilding at the end of the rear garden.

Adjoining the site along the southern side boundary is a footpath to the rear of the adjoining retail parade fronting Pinner Road, which mainly provides access to the first floor flats. The rear yard areas are mainly used in connection with the commercial units. The application site forms part of the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

3.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought to convert the dwelling to 3 one-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats, involving the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension and conversion of the roofspace to habitable use, with the installation of a rear dormer window and one front and two rear rooflights. The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing side garage.

The side extension would be 2.8m wide and extend to the side boundary. On the ground floor, it would have an overall depth of 10.8m and align with the existing porch, projecting by 3m at the rear from the main rear elevation of the property. On the first floor, the side extension would have an overall depth of 9.0m, aligning with the recessed part of the front elevation, with a similar 3m deep projection at the rear. The ground floor of the rear extension would have an overall width of 9.5m, extending across the full width of the original house and proposed side extension. At first floor level, the rear extension would be set in by 3.2m from the side boundary with No.4 Hilliard Road, and have a width of 6.3m. The side and rear elements of the extension would be finished with gable ends, with a matching ridge height to that of the main roof. The rear dormer would be 2m wide, 1.95m high, set up from the eaves by 300mm.

The ground floor would provide 2 one-bedroom flats, the first floor a three bedroom flat and the converted extended roof space a one-bedroom flat. No off-street parking is proposed.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Relevant Planning History

None

4. Planning Policies and Standards

UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

- PT1.10 To seek to ensure that development does not adversely affect the amenity and the character of the area.
- PT1.15 To enable the conversion of residential properties to create more units, provided the additional units are suitable to live in and the character of the area and amenities of the adjoining occupiers are not harmed.
- PT1.16 To seek to ensure enough of new residential units are designed to wheelchair and mobility standards.
- PT1.39 To seek where appropriate planning obligations to achieve benefits to the community related to the scale and type of development proposed.

Part 2 Policies:

- BE5 New development within areas of special local character
- 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.
- 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
- H7 Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
- R17 Use of planning obligations to supplement the provision of recreation, leisure and community facilities
- AM7 Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
- AM9 Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities
- AM14 New development and car parking standards.
- LPP London Plan (February 2008)
- HDAS Residential Extensions
Residential Layouts
Accessible Hillingdon
- SPG SPD Planning Obligations 2007

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 10th June 2010

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

25 neighbouring properties have been consulted and a notice has been displayed on site. 5 individual responses have been received, together with a petition with 35 signatories. The petition did not raise any particular concerns, although the covering letter does state that in addition to the concerns already raised by one of the individual objectors (summarised in points (i) to (v) below), this terrace is prone to internal flooding during periods of heavy rain.

The individual responses raise the following concerns:-

- (i) Property forms part of an attractive terrace of 5 properties and proposal is out of character and out of scale with Victorian terraces, not in keeping with an Area of Special Local interest;
- (ii) Proposal represents overdevelopment of the site that adversely affects neighbouring properties;
- (iii) Proposal makes no provision for off-street parking and will exacerbate existing lack of parking in the street, which is particularly acute at this end of Hilliard Road due to adjoining shops;
- (iv) This is a modest sized family house, designed as such, and should remain such when there is a need for this type of family housing;
- (v) Additional properties would exacerbate existing sewerage problems.

Northwood Residents' Association: No response received.

Northwood Hills Residents' Association: No response received.

Internal Consultees

Conservation Officer:

PROPOSAL: Conversion to 4 flats, addition of a rear dormer and side and rear additions

BACKGROUND: This is a late Victorian/Edwardian two storey end of terrace property located in the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character. This is an area of very traditional, good quality housing from the late Victorian period onwards.

The terrace comprises 4 properties of similar design i.e. with double height canted bays below timbered gables, positioned adjacent to recessed front doors set behind arched openings. The two central properties have paired front doors positioned side by side. No.2 has a slightly different design, as the building has a two storey set back to the side. This design nuance, however, which appears to be an original detail, gives the building a slightly unwieldy appearance with a large area of render above the later first floor window. There is also a modern, part glazed porch addition to the front of the property.

CONSIDERATION: The Council's design guidance advises that two storey side extensions will be considered in terms of their setting and with particular reference to the character and overall quality of the street scene.

It is important that additions read as secondary elements to the original building. They should allow the history of the development of the building to be easily read, whilst reflecting the character and architectural style of the property.

Whilst the proposed two storey side addition replicates the features of the existing set back to the front of the house, when seen together, they would create the appearance of an overly wide two storey side addition, wider than the principal part of the frontage. The addition would not, therefore, appear as visually subordinate to the original house. The extension of the projecting porch feature across the width of the addition would create a highly visible and incongruous feature, that would detract from the appearance of the terrace as a whole. The large amount of brick work over the proposed first floor window to the front would replicate and amplify an existing unwieldy feature, detracting from the street elevation of the building.

To the rear, the Council's design guidance advises that additions should ideally have a ridge line that is 0.5m below the ridge line of the main building, this has not been achieved in this case. The windows to the addition have a horizontal emphasis rather than vertical, which would be characteristic of properties of this period. The proposed dormer window is also over wide, although it is noted that other properties in the terrace have been extended with large roof additions.

No provision has been made for parking, although the applicants have noted that one space could be created on site. It is difficult to see how this could be achieved without detriment to the street scene by the loss of what little space exists to the front of the property.

With regard to the proposal, ideally the side addition should be set back off the boundary by 1m for the full height of the new extension.

CONCLUSION: Whilst there would be no objection in principle to an extension of the property, the design approach and detailing of the proposed additions are poorly considered and of a quality that is not consistent with that required in such a sensitive location.

Highway Engineer:

The proposals will result in loss of a garage and a parking space in front and would increase the parking demand associated with the site.

On-street parking has been observed to be congested. The applicant has failed to demonstrate the availability of car parking for the site. In the absence of information and considering the existing congested parking situation, the proposals are only going to worsen the situation, leading to conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

The Council has minimum cycle parking standards of 1 space for 1-2 bedroom flats and 2 spaces for 2+ bedroom flats. The applicant has failed to provide any cycle parking for the development.

Consequently, the application is recommended to be refused, as it is considered to be contrary to policies AM7, AM9 & AM14.

Trees and Landscape Officer:

I refer to the above application, a Design & Access Statement, drawing Nos. 2152-51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 2099.10,11 and a recent site visit:

THE SITE - The site is not affected by TPO or Conservation Area designation. There are no trees visible from the front of the property.

THE PROPOSAL - The proposal to convert the house into flats includes the demolition of the garage and the construction of a two-storey side extension. This will result in the loss of a parking space and the remaining driveway is less than the standard 4.8 metres length required for a parking space. The existing garden space to the left of the front door will not be affected by the

proposal.

LANDSCAPE ISSUES - Saved policy BE38 seeks the landscape enhancement as in association with new development. DCLG/EA guidance seeks the provision of SUDS compliant hard-standing in front gardens.

The proposal is to convert the building into flats. Therefore it will be necessary to secure landscape maintenance for the communal external spaces.

RECOMMENDATION - No objection subject to conditions TL5, TL6 and TL7.

Education Services:

No education contribution would be required.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

This is an established residential area where there would be no objection in principle to creating more residential units on site, subject to relevant planning considerations and policies in the Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007).

In terms of the conversion of this property, the traditional residential character of a street can be adversely affected by the cumulative impact of too many properties being converted to more intensive residential uses. Paragraph 3.5 of the Council's SPD: 'Residential Layouts' advises that the redevelopment of more than 10% of properties in any one street to flats is unlikely to be acceptable. In Hilliard Road, no properties appear to have been converted, with only two small purpose built flatted blocks in the road (Nos. 36/36A and 37/73A Hilliard Road).

The paragraph also advises that in order to provide a suitable standard of residential accommodation, houses will only be considered suitable for conversion if they have a floor area of 120m² or more. The existing property is reasonably modest in size with a floor area of 102m². Even with the proposed extensions, a number of the proposed units do not meet minimum internal floor spaces standards (See Section 7.09). Furthermore, the loss of the existing garage results in no parking being provided on a site which would now comprise three additional residential units. The property is not considered to be suitable to achieve a satisfactory residential conversion.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

This scheme involves the residential conversion of an existing house so that density criteria are not relevant.

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

The proposed two storey side extension would maintain the prevalent front and rear building lines on Hilliards Road so that it would not appear unduly dominant. The extension would immediately abut the side boundary, where normally a 1m set in would be required, but design guidance does state that where side boundaries adjoin a road or open space, there may be some scope for flexibility. In this instance, the site adjoins a footpath, beyond which are the rear yard areas of the units in the retail parade fronting Pinner Road. As such, it is considered that there would be no specific requirement for a 1m set in to accord with Policy BE22 of the UDP (Saved Policies). However, the size and bulk of any side extension would have implications for the suitability of its design as discussed below.

The two storey set back with a cut away eaves detail does give the building a somewhat unwieldy and awkward appearance with a large area of render above a latter first floor window. This proposal would extend this set back to the side boundary, with a gable roof with a ridge height matching that of the original roof. It is considered that the design would not appear sufficiently subordinate to the original property whilst greatly accentuating the awkward and unwieldy appearance of the set back.

The rear gable roof on the two storey rear extension also matches the height of the main ridge and this should be reduced to ensure that the two storey rear extension appears more subordinate and better reflects the height and proportion of adjoining original gables, by reducing the width of the rear extension.

The rear dormer is also considered to be too large and sited too close to the eaves of the roof to appear sufficiently subordinate. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2009) and Paragraphs 5.0, 6.4 and 7.7 of the Council's SPD HDAS: Residential Extensions.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not applicable to this application.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not applicable to this application.

7.06 Environmental Impact

Not applicable to this application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

This is considered in Section 7.03 above.

7.08 Impact on neighbours

The proposed two storey side extension would be sited some 16m from the projecting wings of the rear elevations of the first floor flats in the adjoining retail parade on Pinner Road. The yard areas at the rear of the parade tend to be used in connection with the commercial units and little if any amenity use is made of them. The two storey rear extension would be sited 3.2m from the side boundary with No.4 and would not project any further to the rear than its projecting wing. An infill conservatory has been added between the shared boundary and No.4's projecting wing which the proposed single storey rear extension would not project beyond. As such, there would be no breach of the 45° line of sight from neighbouring habitable room windows. Although the conservatory at No. 4 contains side windows, they are high level, with the conservatory mainly being lit by its glazed rear elevation and roof. It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions would not be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining residents by reason of dominance and loss of light, in accordance with Policies BE20 and BE21 of the saved UDP.

The majority of the proposed windows would overlook the road or the rear garden so that there would be no additional loss of privacy. The only exception to this are two side windows. One would serve a bathroom and has been shown to be obscure glazed, whereas the gable window would serve the kitchen. However, it is considered that the potential for any loss of privacy from this window would be minimal, given that it would be sited over 21m away from their habitable rooms windows and the rear areas do not provide amenity space (there are windows in the projecting wings of at the rear of the parade but these serve kitchens). As such, there would be no loss of privacy to neighbouring properties resulting from the proposed development, in accordance with Policy BE24 of the saved UDP.

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

As discussed at Section 7.01, the floor area of the house is not considered to be adequate to be considered suitable for conversion. Furthermore, HDAS: Residential Layouts requires a minimum internal floor area of 50m² for one-bedroom and 77m² for three-bedroom flats. As measured from the plans, the ground floor one-bedroom flats would have internal floor areas of 38.4m² and 52.1m² and the loft flat 54.2m² (although the plans state floor areas of 37.8m², 40.8m² and 55.0m²). The second floor three-bedroom flat would have a floor area of 60.4m² (the plan gives a figure of 66.2m²). As such, the internal floor area of one of the one-bedroom ground floor flats and the three-bedroom flat would not comply with the Council's minimum internal floor areas and the accommodation would not afford a sufficient amount of residential amenity for its future occupiers. The proposed conversion would therefore be contrary to Policy BE19 of the adopted UDP (Saved Policies September 2007) and Paragraphs 3.5 and 4.6 to 4.8 of the SPD HDAS: Residential Layouts.

In terms of the rear garden area, at least 20m² of amenity space should be provided for one-bedroom and 30m² for three-bedroom flats. With a retained rear garden area of 114m², the proposal would satisfy the quantity of space required to satisfy standards. However, the space would be shared with access for the first and second floor flats gained by use of a side gate and the adjoining footpath. Although not ideal, it is considered that access would not be so inconvenient and circuitous to these occupiers as to justify refusal on the grounds that the space would not be usable. Of more concern is the lack of any defensible space to the rear of the ground floor flats. As such, the shared use of the rear garden would result in a lack of privacy to their rear habitable rooms. As such, the scheme would be contrary to Policy BE23 of the saved UDP and Paragraph 4.18 of the HDAS: Residential Layouts.

7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

The proposal would result in the loss of two off-street car parking spaces, one within the garage, the other in front of it. The Council's car parking standards state that 1.5 spaces per unit would be required. No car parking provision has been provided (the Design and Access Statement states that one space could be provided, but this is doubtful, given the restricted size of the front garden and the need to provide pedestrian access to the front door). The Council's Highway Engineer advises that given the lack of any parking provision, the proposal would be likely to give rise to demand for additional on-street parking in a road which is heavily parked. This would prejudice highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the saved UDP. Also, no provision has been made for cycle parking, contrary to Policy AM9 of the saved UDP.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

These issues have been considered in Section 7.03 above.

7.12 Disabled access

The proposal fails to satisfy Lifetime Homes standards and this issue could not be dealt with by condition if the application were to be recommended differently, given the small size of a number of the units. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 3A.5 and 4B.5 of the London Plan (February 2008) and the Council's HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon January 2010.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not applicable to this application.

7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

The Council's Tree Officer advises that there are no objections to the scheme on tree or landscape grounds.

7.15 Sustainable waste management

This could have been dealt with by condition if the application had been recommended favourably.

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

It is considered that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the proposals, would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 4A.3 of the London Plan (February 2008).

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

A sustainable urban drainage scheme could have been secured by condition to mitigate against any additional risk of flooding posed by the proposal had the application been recommended differently.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

A sound insulation scheme to protect the flat occupiers and their neighbours from noise could have been dealt with by condition if the application were to have been recommended favourably.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

As regards the separate point made in the covering letter submitted with the petition and points (i) to (iii) of the individual responses are dealt with in the main report. Point (iv) is noted and point (v) regarding sewerage is not a material planning consideration.

7.20 Planning Obligations

Education Services advise that no contribution would be sought from this development towards additional education space. The scale and nature of the development would not attract a requirement for a contribution towards any other type of community facility. The proposal accords with Policy R17 of the saved UDP.

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not applicable to this application.

7.22 Other Issues

There are no other relevant planning issues raised by this application.

8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

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

In addition Members should note that the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA 1998) makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights. Decisions by the Committee must take account of the HRA 1998. Therefore, Members need to be aware of the fact that the HRA 1998 makes the European Convention on Human Rights (the Convention) directly applicable to the actions of public bodies in England and Wales. The specific parts of the Convention relevant to planning matters are Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

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

Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 are not absolute rights and infringements of these rights protected under these are allowed in certain defined circumstances, for example where required by law. However any infringement must be proportionate, which

means it must achieve a fair balance between the public interest and the private interest infringed and must not go beyond what is needed to achieve its objective.

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

9. Observations of the Director of Finance

Not applicable to this application.

10. CONCLUSION

The existing dwelling falls below the size of property normally considered appropriate for subdivision. Even with the two storey side and rear extension, the property fails to meet internal floor space standards for all the units. Lifetime homes standards also cannot be met. Car parking and cycle storage provision have also not been provided. As such, the proposed conversion of this property is not acceptable.

Furthermore, the proposed two storey side and rear extension is not considered to be sufficiently subordinate to the original property and two storey side extension, although it would replicate the existing design of the house would accentuate its unwieldy and awkward appearance. The use of the shared amenity space would also result in the loss of privacy from the ground floor units. It is recommended accordingly.


11. Reference Documents

- (a) London Plan (February 2008)
- (b) Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007)
- (c) Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions
- (d) Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Layouts
- (e) Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon
- (f) Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document, July 2007: Planning Obligations
- (g) Letters making representations

Contact Officer: Richard Phillips

Telephone No: 01895 250230



<p>Notes</p> <p> Site boundary</p> <p>For identification purposes only.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved. London Borough of Hillingdon 100019283 2009</p>	<p>Site Address</p> <p align="center">2 Hilliard Road Northwood</p>		<p align="center">LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON</p> <p align="center">Planning & Community Services</p> <p align="center">Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111</p>
	<p>Planning Application Ref:</p> <p align="center">34684/APP/2010/841</p>	<p>Scale</p> <p align="center">1:1,250</p>	
	<p>Planning Committee</p> <p align="center">North</p>	<p>Date</p> <p align="center">June 2010</p>	



HILLINGDON
LONDON