

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration**

Address 57 NEWDIGATE ROAD HAREFIELD MIDDLESEX

Development: Retention of dormer window and single storey rear extension

LBH Ref Nos: **76008/APP/2021/2764**

Drawing Nos: Site Plans
 1st Floor Plans
 East Elevation
 West Elevation
 Rear Elevation
 2nd Floor Plan
 Ground Floor Plans
 Roof Plan
 Covering Letter dated 14.07.2021
 Block Plan

Date Plans Received: 14/07/2021

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 14/07/2021

1. **CONSIDERATIONS**

1.1 **Site and Locality**

The application site is located within the designated Harefield Village Conservation Area. It comprises a two storey mid terraced property located on the north-western side of Newdigate Road.

The surrounding area is residential in nature and is predominately defined by two storey dwellings. The properties on the north-western side of Newdigate Road are characterised by their consistent front building lines. In particular, the row of terrace properties which the application property forms a part of share a strong degree of uniformity, in terms of their architectural style, plot sizes and original ridge heights. It is considered that this uniformity between these properties makes a positive contribution to the historic merit of the Harefield Village Conservation Area.

Numbers 55 and 59 Newdigate Road are the adjoining terraced properties located to the east and west of the site, respectively. Immediately to the rear of the application site are a block of garages which are served by an access road located between numbers 47 and 53a Newdigate Road. To the south of the site, are the semi-detached properties at numbers 14 and 16 Newdigate Road.

The site is not covered by an Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights for the change of use of a house from Use Class C3 (dwellinghouse) to Use Class C4 (a small House in Multiple Occupation). The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 1b (Very Poor), and lies in Flood Zone 1 (i.e. a low probability of flooding).

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The submitted planning application form states that planning consent is being sought for the retention of a dormer window and single storey rear extension. However, Officers are of the view that the proposal description specified on the application form does not accurately reflect the developments that have recently been constructed at the site.

During the Officer site visit it was observed that a single storey rear extension and rear dormer extension had been constructed, as stated on the planning application form. However, the ridge height of the property has been increased and a roof light has been fitted in the front roof slope. A new external pipe run has been installed on the front elevation of the property. Also, the original two-storey rear outrigger has been externally rendered in white at ground floor level. These developments would be retained as part of the development, and should therefore be considered as part of the assessment of this current application.

It is noted that there is a garage to the rear of the site which is not shown on the submitted drawings. Although there does not appear to be any planning consent for this garage, Google satellite images show that the structure has been in existence for more than four years. It is therefore considered, on the balance of probabilities, that the garage is lawful through the passage of time.

The covering letter claims that the property is currently being converted into a small HMO (Use Class C4) and therefore does not require planning permission. However, based on the evidence possessed by the Council, it is questioned whether the conversion of the property would be tantamount to the creation of self-contained flats for which planning permission would be required. Please refer to the section of the report titled 'principle of development' for further details.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

There is no relevant planning history attached to this site. However, it should be noted that there is an on-going enforcement investigation for the alleged breach of planning control for the unauthorised developments that are the subject of this Planning Committee Report (ref: ENF/778/20).

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 9th September 2021

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

EXTERNAL CONSULTEES:

Four neighbouring properties were consulted by letter on 5th August 2021. A press notice was published in the local newspaper on 18th August 2021. A site notice was erected on a lamp post to the front of the site on 15th August 2021. 22 objections from separate addresses have been received, and their comments are summarised as follows:

- The development is not permitted as the site is in a Conservation Area.
- The proposal is not in-keeping with the local area and surrounding houses.

- The ridge height has been raised, where planning guidance states the roof must not exceed the height of the existing roof. This looks out of place particularly being a terraced property.
- Both the overly large dormer and raised ridge causes harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- The roof has been raised and it looks unsightly and not in keeping with the other houses on the road.
- The dormer has affected neighbouring residents' privacy.
- There are no other rear dormer extensions in the row of terrace properties and applications at neighbouring sites have been declined in the past.
- The property has gone from a 3 bedroom family home to a 6 bedroom for non-related individuals.
- The property is not suitable for occupation by six random families.
- Altogether the proposal represents over intensification of the site and will cause harm to the residential amenity of the properties by noise, nuisance and parking pressure.
- There is no reception room in the property so there is limited space for each occupant which may have an effect on the standard of living provided.
- Parking will become impossible as the road is already heavily crowded.
- The addition of up to 6 new households would potentially increase demand by 6-12 cars.
- There is no cycle parking provision being provided at the site.
- The front room on the ground floor plan has a built kitchen unit which is not shown on the plans. This indicates a self-contained unit, which would be very undersized.
- It is likely the other rooms have cooking facilities so a site visit to verify the current condition of the site is necessary.
- They have put microwaves in each room which causes a fire hazard, and noise and disturbance.
- The submitted plans are not accurate as the original property did not contain a second floor.
- There is a garage in the garden which is not shown on the submitted plans.
- They have been dumping rubbish on the public road since October last year, which has only recently been cleared.

Harefield Tenants and Residents' Association: This application will change a 3 bed house to a 6 bed property. We feel this is over development of the site. Newdigate Road terraced properties have no off street parking. No parking provision in an already restricted road. This development will not enhance the conservation area.

An e-petition against the application was received by the Council. However, at least 20 signatories from residents who live in the borough are required for the petition to be counted as valid. The e-petition ran from 24th August 2021 to 7th September 2021. Nobody signed the e-petition. The grounds of opposition stated on the e-petition are as follows:

1. 57 Newdigate Road, Harefield is a very narrow busy residential road that already suffers from lack of parking availability, and often cars parked opposite each other barely leave enough room for an emergency vehicle to pass.
2. If 6 bedrooms has 2 occupants, that is potentially 12 adults with a car each. The road cannot accommodate any more cars.
3. The ridge on the plans has been raised which has not been shown on elevations. This looks unsightly on a row of Victorian terrace houses and is not in keeping with Harefields Conservation Area status.

Planning Officer Response: The following sections of this Committee Report will address the concerns raised in respect to the use of the property, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area having particular regard to the Harefield Village Conservation Area, the impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and parking and highway safety issues.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES:

The Council's Conservation Officer has provided the following consultation response:

Assessment - Background information and significance:

The existing property is a mid-terrace dwelling, dating from the early part of the 20th century. The property originally formed part of a row of 5 Edwardian cottages, typical two-up two-down dwellings with the rear projecting wing originally comprising of the kitchen and bathroom (service end of the house). Unfortunately, some cottages have been externally rendered and original characteristic features have been poorly replaced by modern alternatives, degrading their appearance.

The existing property retains its London stock external appearance to the front. It includes a projecting bay window at ground floor and retains its original recessed entrance. The roof is finished in a modern profile tile which appears to have been recently renewed. Originally it is likely the roof was finished in a slate tile, similar to the terrace at the western end of the road. The group value of the terrace contributes to the conservation area.

The unauthorised external works to No57 comprise of a side/rear ground floor extension, raising of the ridge height and large box dormer to the rear. Internally the building has been entirely gutted of characteristic features and subdivided into small individual units.

The Harefield Village Conservation Area comprises of a mix of buildings dating from the medieval period through to the 20th century. Harefield is rural in character with a small village core surrounded by open countryside. Newdigate Road is predominantly characterised by semi-detached and terraced dwellings, the road was originally known as Park Terrace and allowed for uninterrupted views from the terraces along the northern side of the road towards the village green.

Assessment- Impact and Harm:

This retrospective planning application for solely the retention of the dormer and single storey rear extension. It does not include the works carried out to raise the ridge height of the property. Therefore, it is expected the original ridge height, in line with the neighbouring properties would be reinstated.

Side/rear extension:

The ground floor side/rear extension matches the depth of the original projecting wing to the rear of the cottage, infilling a characteristic gap. Whilst the principle of an addition in this location can be considered, as constructed, the addition is poorly detailed with plastic fascia boards and externally rendered. Its appearance as constructed fails to respect the original appearance of the Edwardian terrace.

The application of render to many of the dwellings along the terrace is a later alteration. Whilst it is not clear when such works took place, the render fails to respect the original character and design of the dwellings, harming the appearance of the terrace, and is considered to be an inappropriate precedent to copy. The side/rear addition to this dwelling would need to be externally finished in a London stock brick to remain in keeping with the design and appearance of the original property.

The side/rear addition has further reduced the rear amenity space associated to the building, which is also partly occupied by an existing large outbuilding.

Roof alterations and additions:

The alterations and additions to the roof fail to respect the original design and character of the individual building and wider terrace. Whilst not part of this retrospective planning application, as existing the raised roof ridge is highly visible along the street scene and disrupts the appearance and rhythm of the terrace.

From a heritage conservation perspective, the larger box dormer to the rear is in principle unacceptable. The dormer has resulted in the entire loss of the rear roof slope, with the substantial box structure over-dominating the appearance of the dwelling to the rear. The standard box dormer design and proposed window openings fail to relate to the original Edwardian cottage style or respect the original form of the building. The addition of the dormer has detrimentally harmed the appearance of what was an unaltered rear roof scape to the terrace along Newdigate Road.

Due to the exposed nature of the site to the rear, the dormer is visible from properties within Newdigate Green and the open garage block to the north. It is recognised that these spaces are not entirely public and are located outside the conservation area boundary. However, they form part of how the heritage asset is experienced and viewed. It is important to recognise that conservation areas are not designated as a series of street scenes and the lack of public views does not lessen the heritage value of the site or the statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Other works:

A roof light has also been installed along the front roof slope. This application submission fails to include a front elevation/ street scene drawing. The installed roof light to the front fails to appear as a subtle addition to the property. Its positioning in close proximity to the raised roof is unacceptable. In conservation areas it is expected that traditional conservation roof lights of metal construction with genuine glazing bars are used. They should also be installed completely flush, in line with the roof, avoiding any protrusion above the roof tiles, ensuring it appears as a subtle addition.

In addition to the above, the front elevation features a new external pipe run. The pipe work is a detracting, unacceptably visible element, cluttering the appearance of the front elevation. No other properties include such a poor construction detail.

Harm:

The alterations and additions to the property fail to respect the original character and

design of the building and wider terrace. Substantial harm has been caused to the building itself and appearance of the wider terrace.

The extent of harm to the conservation area is less than substantial, paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021), would need to be applied in this instance. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2021) would also be relevant, which states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset regardless of the extent of harm.

Duties under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 would need to be considered by the decision maker. From a heritage conservation perspective the works fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion: Objection

As constructed the additions and alterations are contrary to Hillingdon's Local Plan Part 2 policies, DMHB 1, DMHB 4 and DMHD 1 (January 2020).

The Council's Highways Officer has provided the following consultation response:

The application relates to matters with no Highway aspects; consequently, the Highways Authority has no comments to make.

However, the case officer has asked for highways comments for if the application was for the use of the property as self-contained flats.

The existing dwelling is a 3/4bed house with no on-site car parking and it would appear no cycle parking either. If the application was for 6 flats, then the Highways Authority would have the following comments to make:

The site achieves a very poor PTAL rating of 1b, validating the relative isolation of the site from public transport services which gives rise to a higher dependency on the ownership and use of private motor transport.

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) Policy DMT 6: requires that development proposals must comply with the relevant parking standards. For dwellings with curtilage the maximum car parking requirement is 2 spaces per dwelling.

Whilst the existing dwelling has no on-site car parking, the proposed change of use to 6 flats impact assessment would have to take into account the impact the existing dwelling already has which is an overspill of 2 cars onto the highway.

Consequently, both the London Plan and The Hillingdon Local Plan specify the same maximum standards for flat developments in outer London with 0-1 PTAL ratings with higher levels of provision of up to 1.5 space per dwelling, and Policy DMT 6 requires 1.5-1 space per dwelling.

As mentioned above given the site has a very poor PTAL rating of 1b, validating the relative isolation of the site from public transport services which gives rise to a higher

dependency on the ownership and use of private motor transport and the site is also not within a residents parking management scheme, therefore the upper range of parking for proposed development is required of 1.5 space per flat (which matches the London Plan) i.e. a total of 9 car parking spaces.

Given the existing dwelling has a requirement of 2 spaces, the net impact from the change of use to 6xflats would be a substandard provision of 7 car parking spaces.

Alternatively, on-street parking stress surveys based on the Lambeth methodology is required in order to assess the potential magnitude the displacement impact (if any) would have on the parking stress on the nearby streets, and consequently how the impact (if any) from the displacement onto the highway will be mitigated.

For the proposal to satisfy policy DMT6 secure and covered cycle parking spaces (1 per 1/2 bed unit) should be provided. The applicant will be required to provide detailed information and plans to demonstrate how the cycle parking provision and storage design are in accordance with Policy DMT6 and/or guidance contained in the London Cycling Design Standards.

Recommendation: Refuse

Reasons for Refusal: The applicant has failed to demonstrate a satisfactory policy-led approach to the provision and layout of car and cycle parking contrary to the London Plan and Policy DMT6.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 4	Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design

LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF14	NPPF 2021 - Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment
NPPF4	NPPF 2021 - Decision-Making
NPPF9	NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT:

Whether or not the property has been converted into a small House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4) or six self-contained flats?

The change of use from a single dwelling (Use Class C3) to a small HMO for up to six residents (Use Class C4) is normally permitted development under the terms of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class L of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO).

Section 254 of the Housing Act 2004 sets out the criteria to be met if a building or a part of a building is an HMO. The criteria include that it must consist of one or more units of living accommodation not consisting of a self-contained flat or flats and that two or more of the households who occupy the living accommodation share one or more basic amenities or the living accommodation is lacking in one or more basic amenities. "Basic amenities" is defined as a toilet, personal washing facilities or cooking facilities.

The submitted plans show that each of the 6 bedrooms would have a double bed and ensuite. During the Officer site visit it was observed that each bedroom is accessed via a lockable door and contains a sink counter, fridge and a washing machine. None of the bedrooms were occupied during the time of the site visit. However, it was understood by the agent's representation who attended the site visit that the construction works were at the final stages. Subsequent to the site visit, the Council received an objection from a resident with a photograph showing that 'Bedroom 1' contains a microwave or microwave oven.

The Gravesham Court Judgement establishes that a dwelling is a building that ordinarily affords the facilities required for day to day private domestic existence. It is acknowledged

that the Gravesham test of 'facilities required for day to day private existence' is not necessarily the same as 'basis amenities' defined by Section 254 of the Housing Act. However, the bedrooms have their own exclusive shower, washing and fridge facilities and potentially cooking facilities. Whilst it is noted that there is a communal kitchen at first floor level, future occupants may not necessarily be reliant upon the communal kitchen if they are provided with their own cooking facilities within their bedroom.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate, as a matter of fact and degree, that the property has been converted into a small HMO (Use Class C3), as claimed in the submitted Covering Letter dated 14th July 2021. Given the evidence possessed by the Council, it is considered that the future occupants could potentially be afforded with all the necessary facilities required for day to day private domestic existence. Thus, resulting in a material change of use to six self-contained studio flats. It is therefore considered necessary to assess the proposal on this basis.

Material change of use to six self-contained studio flats:

Policy DMH 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that residential conversions and the redevelopment of dwellings into new blocks of flats will only be permitted where:

- i) it is on a residential street where the proposal will not result in more than 10% of properties being redeveloped into flats;
- ii) On residential streets longer than 1km the proposed redevelopment site should be taken as the midpoint of a 1km length of road for assessment purposes;
- iii) the internal floor area of the original building to be converted is at least 120 sqm; and
- iv) units are limited to one unit per floor for residential conversions.

Paragraph 4.6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council's current information on housing need indicates a substantial borough-wide requirement for larger affordable and private units, particularly three bedroom properties.

The proposal has resulted in the subdivision and loss of a former 3-bedroom dwelling with an original floor area of less than 120 sqm, and the units are not limited to one per floor. The proposal has therefore caused harm to the Borough's housing supply, where the Council's evidence demonstrates that there is a substantial need for family sized housing (i.e. three bedrooms or more). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy DMH 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the NPPF (2021).

The Council is currently able demonstrate a five-year housing supply. As such, the "tilted balance" as set out in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF (2021) should not be engaged.

QUALITY OF ACCOMMODATION FUTURE OCCUPANTS:

Internal Amenity Space Provision:

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) sets out the minimum internal floor space standards required for residential developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for future occupants. Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021) requires studio flats (with showers) to have a minimum gross internal area of 37 square metres.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment. The space standards set out in Table 5.1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) are the same as those found in Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021).

The submitted plans confirm the following:

Bedroom/Unit 1- 12.1 sqm
Bedroom/Unit 2- 13.6 sqm
Bedroom/Unit 3- 15.5 sqm
Bedroom/Unit 4- 15.7 sqm
Bedroom 5/Unit 5- 14.6sqm
Bedroom/Unit 6 - 15.9 sqm

All six flats fall significantly below the minimum internal space standards set out in Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021). The proposal would provide unduly small and cramped forms of accommodation, which would result in unsatisfactory living conditions for future occupiers. In addition, the units labelled as 'Bedroom 2' and 'Bedroom 3' would not contain any windows and instead would be served by glazed panel doors leading to the garden. The rear elevation drawing shows full height open glazing are fitted in the doors. However, this is not the case as it was confirmed during the Officer site visit that the glazing is only fitted in the upper half of the doors. Such an arrangement would create an oppressive living environment devoid of an adequate provision of outlook and natural light. The users of the rear garden space would be able to look into the units labelled as 'Bedroom 2' and 'Bedroom 3', thus compromising the level of privacy afforded to the future occupants of these respective units.

It is therefore considered that the development would fail to provide satisfactory living conditions for the future occupiers in respect of the amount of internal space, and the provision of outlook and natural light. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DMH1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

External Amenity Space Provision:

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all new residential development and conversions will be required to provide good quality and usable private outdoor amenity space. Table 5.3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) states that studio flats should have a minimum of 20 square metres of private useable amenity space.

Paragraph 5.70 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council is keen to improve the quality of housing in the Borough and therefore communal provision of private outdoor space is generally not supported unless there are strong planning reasons and the proposed scheme is of high quality with clear planning merits.

As previously stated, the submitted proposed block plan does not show the existing outbuilding. The actual amount of rear garden space remaining at the site is therefore less than what is shown on the drawing. The only residential units which would have access to

the rear garden are those labelled as 'Bedroom 2' and 'Bedroom 3'. However, given that the rear garden would serve as communal amenity space, it would not comply with the requirements of Table 5.3 which specifically refers to private amenity space. The subdivision of the rear garden into two individual spaces would be out of character with the surrounding pattern of development which is generally defined by open and unbuilt suburban rear gardens. As such, a condition requiring the erection of fencing to subdivide the rear garden is not considered to be acceptable. The remaining four flats would not be afforded with any private amenity space provision, nor would they have access to the communal rear garden.

The proposal therefore fails to provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers with regard to private external amenity space provision, contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE:

In considering development affecting a Conservation Area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) requires local authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area when considering applications relating to land or buildings within that Area.

Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) states that the Council will conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape, which includes the designated heritage assets such as statutorily Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment. Policy DMHB 1 also requires any extensions or alterations to be designed in sympathy, without detracting from or competing with the heritage asset.

Policy DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, within a Conservation Area or on its fringes, will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and

streetscape rhythm and landscaping.

With regard to single storey rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Development Management Policies (2020) states, amongst other criteria, that:

- i) Single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth or 3.6 metres where the plot width is 5 metres or more;
- ii) Flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level; and
- iii) In Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet.

With regard to roof extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states, amongst other criteria, that:

- i) The Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions;
- ii) Raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported;
- iii) All roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling; and
- iv) In Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character and on Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, roof extensions should take the form of traditional 'dormer' windows, on the rear elevation, to harmonise with the existing building. The highest point of the dormer should be kept well within the back roof slope, away from the ridge, eaves or valleys, whilst each window should match the proportions, size and glazing pattern of the first floor windows

Paragraph A1.20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Development Management Policies (2020) states that: "A dormer window should be no larger in size than those on the first floor and comprise an individual window and roof. This is preferable to a roof extension and will be required in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character."

The constructed box-style rear dormer measures 4.5 metres wide, 3.8 metres deep and 1.9 metres high. The rear dormer occupies much of the roof slope it is set in, with only a marginal 200mm gap being retained above the eaves. Due to its excessive size, scale and bulk, coupled with its siting and design, the dormer appears as an incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development which significantly detracts from the original roof form on the property. The development therefore has a detrimental impact to the overall appearance of the host building, which in turn, diminishes the contribution that the building makes to the Conservation Area.

It is important to note that public views of the dormer are readily available via the access road between Nos. 47 and 53a Newdigate Road. Whilst this area is outside of the Conservation Area boundary, it nevertheless forms part of how the heritage asset is experienced and viewed and is of material consideration. When viewed from this rearward vantage point, it is considered that the rear dormer appears bulky, cumbersome and out of keeping with the original unbroken roof forms of the other Edwardian properties within the terrace row it forms part of. The constructed dormer appears as an unsympathetic addition that erodes the traditional rear roofscape of the terrace row of properties in this section of Newdigate. No other property in this section of Newdigate

Road has been extended in such a manner, and other applications for similar rear dormer extensions have been refused by the Council in the past (most notably at No. 61 Newdigate Road).

Although not shown on the submitted drawings, the ridge height of the host dwelling has been increased to screen the height of the rear dormer extension. The ridge height of the host dwelling is visibly higher than the other properties within the terrace row of properties it forms part of. As a consequence, the ridge height appears incongruous and disrupts the appearance, rhythm and symmetry of the terrace of which it forms a part. It also has a detrimental impact on the street scene in this section of Newdigate Road which is characterised by rows of terraced properties with consistent ridge heights, and to the overall setting of the Conservation Area.

The front roof light positioned in such close proximity to the raised ridge height unacceptably detracts from the architectural composition of the property and the surrounding Conservation Area. Moreover, its protrusion above the front roof slope tiles exacerbates its intrusive appearance when viewed from the street scene on Newdigate Road. A new external pipe run has been installed on the front elevation of the property and extends up to the eaves height. The external pipe appears prominent and intrusive on the front elevation of the property and detracts from the building's architectural style. No evidence has been provided as to why the pipe could not be internally routed.

The constructed single storey rear extension effectively infills the area between the side wall of the original two storey outrigger and the mutual boundary shared with No. 59. It measures 0.8 metres wide, 4.9 metres deep and 3.5 metres high. Given its dimensions, it is considered that the single storey rear extension appears as a subservient addition when compared to the size and scale of the original host dwelling. However, this is notwithstanding the impact the single storey rear extension has upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers which is covered in the following section of this Committee Report.

It is acknowledged that the single storey rear extension and rear wall of the original two storey outrigger at ground floor level has been externally finished in white render. Whilst this external finish does not match the original brickwork on the property, the render is limited to the rear ground floor level of the building and is not visible from the public domain. It is also noted that there are other properties within the terrace row with rendered rear elevations (most notably the adjoining property at No.59). On balance, it is considered that the rendered rear walls at ground floor level have not caused such significant harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, to warrant a refusal on this basis.

The Conservation Officer has objected to the application on the grounds of the unauthorised developments failing to preserve or enhance the conservation area. Please refer to Section 3 of this report for the comments received by the Conservation Officer.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposal has caused unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the host property, the terrace row of properties it forms part of and the street scene on Newdigate Road. Furthermore, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Harefield Village Conservation Area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 4

and DMHB 11 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D1, D3, D4, D8 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021).

The harm the constructed developments have caused to the significance of the Conservation Area is less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021) states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Please refer to the last section of this report for the planning balance assessment.

IMPACT ON THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF NEIGHBOURING OCCUPIERS:

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure, amongst other matters, that: ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers. Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

No.59 Newdigate is an adjoining neighbouring property located to the east of the site. This neighbouring property contains ground and first floor windows fitted in its main rear wall. No.59 also contains ground and first floor windows in the side wall of its original two storey rear outrigger which face towards the application site. The constructed single storey rear extension has a depth of 4.9 metres, contrary to the recommended prescribed depth of 3.3 metres set out in Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). Furthermore, the single storey rear extension is positioned hard up against the common boundary shared with No.59 and has a ridge height of 3.5 metres.

Given the above relationship, coupled with the proximity to the windows at No.59, it is considered that the constructed single storey rear extension has caused harm to the living conditions of No.59, in terms of loss of outlook, sense of enclosure and overbearing impact. The eaves height of the constructed single storey rear extension at 2.3 metres, exceeds the height of the boundary treatment and therefore does not mitigate the harm to the residential amenities of No.59. Furthermore, the steeply pitched roof on the single storey rear extension is unduly overbearing and is readily visible from the ground floor windows at No.59 and their private amenity space.

The constructed single storey rear extension does not project beyond the depth of the original two storey outrigger. As such, this element of the proposal has not impacted on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No. 55 Newdigate Road. It is noted that planning permission was granted for a single storey rear extension at No.61 Newdigate Road (ref: 75825/APP/2020/3840). However, this approved extension has a shallow pitched roof made of glass which helps to mitigate its impact on the adjoining neighbouring occupiers. Also, the approved extension at No.61 has a lower eaves height at 2.1 with a maximum ridge height of 2.4 metres. It is therefore considered that this approved extension is materially different and should therefore not be used to justify the single storey rear extension constructed at the application site.

Due to the position of the constructed rear dormer, it is considered that this element of the

proposal has not caused undue harm to the residential amenities enjoyed by the neighbouring occupiers at Nos. 55 and 59 Newdigate Road, in terms of daylight/sunlight, outlook and overbearing impact. The outlook from the dormer windows is not dissimilar to the views from the first floor rear windows. As such, it is considered that the dormer windows have not resulted in a material loss of privacy or overlooking for neighbouring occupiers. However, this is notwithstanding the significant harm that has been caused to the character and appearance of the area and the surrounding Conservation Area.

The increased number of future occupants from separate households being capable of being accommodated in the six flats would result in a greater number of comings and goings to the property, when compared to its former use as a single dwelling house. It is considered that the potential intensification of the use of the property to this extent would result in a significant increase in disturbance to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, due to the impact of the increased noise and disturbance arising from the intensification of use of the site. Also, the constructed single storey rear extension has caused harm to the living conditions of No.59, in terms of loss of outlook, sense of enclosure and overbearing impact. The proposal therefore fails to accord with the requirements of Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the NPPF (2021).

PARKING AND HIGHWAY SAFETY:

Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) require the Council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway, junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the Council's adopted parking standards unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

The Council's Highways Officer has provided the following comments:

"The site achieves a very poor PTAL rating of 1b, validating the relative isolation of the site from public transport services which gives rise to a higher dependency on the ownership and use of private motor transport.

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) Policy DMT 6: requires that development proposals must comply with the relevant parking standards. For dwellings with curtilage the maximum car parking requirement is 2 spaces per dwelling.

Whilst the existing dwelling has no on-site car parking, the proposed change of use to 6 flats impact assessment would have to take into account the impact the existing dwelling already has which is an overspill of 2 cars onto the highway.

Consequently, both the London Plan and The Hillingdon Local Plan specify the same maximum standards for flat developments in outer London with 0-1 PTAL ratings with higher levels of provision of up to 1.5 space per dwelling, and Policy DMT 6 requires 1.5-1 space per dwelling.

As mentioned above, given the site has a very poor PTAL rating of 1b, validating the relative isolation of the site from public transport services which gives rise to a higher dependency on the ownership and use of private motor transport and the site is also not within a residents parking management scheme, therefore the upper range of parking for proposed development is required of 1.5 space per flat (which matches the London Plan) i.e. a total of 9 car parking spaces.

Given the existing dwelling has a requirement of 2 spaces, the net impact from the change of use to 6xflats would be a substandard provision of 7 car parking space.

Alternatively, on-street parking stress surveys based on the Lambeth methodology is required in order to assess the potential magnitude the displacement impact (if any) would have on the parking stress on the nearby streets, and consequently how the impact (if any) from the displacement onto the highway will be mitigated."

No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the street parking spaces on Newdigate Road or on nearby surrounding roads have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional car parking demand generated by the development. Given the PTAL rating of the site, it is likely that future occupants would be reliant on private vehicles as a means of transport, which would exacerbate the pressure for street parking, thus leading to increased instances of dangerous and illegal parking (such as parking in front of driveways and on yellow lines). This in turn would result in congestion and prejudice highway safety. A parking impact assessment has not been submitted to demonstrate otherwise.

Subsequently, it is considered that the proposal would lead to parking stress which would have a harmful effect on highway safety in the area. The proposed scheme would therefore conflict with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies T6 and T6.1 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 111 of the NPPF (2021).

CYCLE PARKING PROVISION:

Policy DMT 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals must ensure that safe, direct and inclusive access for pedestrians and cyclists is provided on the site. Appendix C, Table 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires 1 cycle space per studio flat.

No details of on-site cycle provision has been accompanied with this application. There is no independent access to the rear garden, which means a cycle store in this location would not be practical. A cycle store with the capacity to hold six cycles would be a sizeable structure. It is therefore considered that the siting of the cycle store to the front of the property, when combined with the refuse/recycling store, would result in unacceptable visual clutter to the detriment of the street scene on Newdigate Road and the surrounding Conservation Area.

Whilst a condition could be secured requiring the submission of cycle parking details (in the event of an approval), the details would have to overcome the above issues and be compliant with Policy DMT 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

SUSTAINABLE WASTE MANAGEMENT:

Policy DMHB 11 part d) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should make sufficient provision for well designed internal and external storage space for general, recycling and organic waste, with suitable access for collection. External bins should be located and screened to avoid nuisance and adverse visual impacts to occupiers and neighbours.

A refuse/recycling storage and management plan detailing how the needs of the development would be accommodated and served would have been secured by condition, if planning permission was to be granted. However, as stated above, the details would have to demonstrate that the refuse/recycling store would not cause harm to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding Conservation Area.

PLANNING BALANCE/ CONCLUSION:

It is considered that the proposal has caused unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the host property, the terrace row of properties it forms part of and the street scene on Newdigate Road. Furthermore, the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Harefield Village Conservation Area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 4 and DMHB 11 of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D1, D3, D4, D8 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021).

The harm to the significance of the conservation area would be less than substantial and therefore it is necessary, in accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021), to consider any public benefits from the proposal.

Whilst the proposal would have resulted in some negligible economic benefits in terms of job creation during construction, these benefits are considered to be very limited given the scale of the development. As previously stated, the Council is currently able to demonstrate a five year housing supply. It cannot, therefore, be argued that the development would help the Council meet its housing need. It is not considered that there are any public benefits that would outweigh the harm that the proposal has caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposal would provide substandard accommodation to future occupants, in terms of internal and external amenity space provision. The proposal causes undue harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. Also, insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would not lead to parking stress which would have a harmful effect on highway safety in the area.

It is therefore recommended that the application be refused for the reasons set out in this Committee Report.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The applicant has failed to demonstrate, as a matter of fact and degree, that the property has been converted into a small House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4). Given the evidence possessed by the Council, it is considered that the future occupants could be afforded with all the necessary facilities required for day to day private domestic existence. As a result, the proposal would result in a material change of use to six self-contained studio flats in a location and form that would be unacceptable, due to the requirements for amenity space, parking and and the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and on neighbouring residential properties. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMH 4, DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 16, DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D1, D3, D4, D6, T6, T6.1 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The constructed rear dormer, by reason of its excessive size, scale and bulk, coupled with its siting and design, appears as an incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development which significantly detracts from the original form of the property and the symmetry of the terrace which it forms a part and fails to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Harefield Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The increase to the ridge height of the host property, by virtue of it being higher than the adjoining terrace properties, disrupts the appearance, rhythm and symmetry of the terrace which it forms a part. Consequently, the proposal has caused significant harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the host property, the street scene and the setting of the Harefield Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

4 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The installed front roof light and external pipe run, by virtue of their siting on the front elevation of the property, protrusion and design, appear visually intrusive and significantly detracts from the architectural composition of the host property, and causes harm to the street scene and setting of the Harefield Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Framework (2021).

5 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The development has led to the unacceptable subdivision and loss of a family-sized dwelling with an original floor area of less than 120 square metres and more than one unit per floor. The proposal has therefore caused harm to the Borough's housing supply, where the Council's evidence demonstrates that there is a substantial need for family sized housing (i.e. three bedrooms or more). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy DMH 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

6 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The development, by virtue of its substandard and cramped internal floor areas, compromised outlook, privacy and natural light, and substandard provision of private outdoor amenity space, would result in poor quality living conditions for future occupants. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 16 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

7 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The constructed single storey rear infill extension, by virtue of its proximity, depth, height and roof profile causes harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residential occupiers at number 59 Newdigate Road, in terms of outlook, sense of enclosure and overbearing impact. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

8 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

Insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not severely exacerbate the demand for street parking in the area leading to increased instances of dangerous and illegal parking, which in turn, would result in congestion and harmful highway safety implications. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies T6 and T6.1 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Framework (2021).

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 Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan 2021 and national guidance.

- DMH 4 Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
- DMHB 1 Design of New Development
- DMHB 1 Streets and Public Realm
- DMHB 1 Trees and Landscaping
- DMHB 1 Housing Standards
- DMHB 1 Residential Density
- DMHB 1 Private Outdoor Amenity Space
- DMHB 4 Conservation Areas
- DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
- DMT 1 Managing Transport Impacts
- DMT 2 Highways Impacts
- DMT 6 Vehicle Parking
- LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design
- LPP D5 (2021) Inclusive design
- LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards
- LPP D7 (2021) Accessible housing
- LPP D8 (2021) Public realm
- LPP H1 (2021) Increasing housing supply
- LPP HC (2021) Heritage conservation and growth
- LPP T5 (2021) Cycling
- LPP T6 (2021) Car parking
- LPP T6. (2021) Residential parking
- NPPF11 NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
- NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
- NPPF14 NPPF 2021 - Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding
- NPPF16 NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment
- NPPF4 NPPF 2021 - Decision-Making
- NPPF9 NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport

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

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 - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 4	Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP D8	(2021) Public realm
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking

NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF14	NPPF 2021 - Meeting the challenge of climate change flooding
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment
NPPF4	NPPF 2021 - Decision-Making
NPPF9	NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport

Contact Officer: Nesha Burnham

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 2020 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address:

**57 Newdigate Road
 Harefield**

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

Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
 Telephone No.: Uxbridge 01895 250111

Planning Application Ref:

76008/APP/2021/2764

Scale:

1:1,250

Planning Committee:

Borough

Date:

December 2021



HILLINGDON
 LONDON