### **Report of the Head of Planning & Enforcement Services**

Address 30B NORTHOLT AVENUE RUISLIP

**Development:** Retention of two storey, with rooms in roofspace, four-bedroom terraced dwelling with 2 rooflights to front and 2 rooflights to rear

**LBH Ref Nos:** 16490/APP/2011/245

Drawing Nos: Design & Access Statement PT/1477/1 Rev. D

Date Plans Received:	02/02/2011	Date(s) of Amendment(s):	02/02/2011
Date Application Valid:	08/02/2011		15/05/2011

### 1. SUMMARY

The proposal is for retrospective planning permission for a mid-terrace property, that has not been built in accordance with the approved plans, which were for the erection of a row of four 2-storey 2-bedroom terraced houses, two with integral garages, together with frontage parking and vehicular crossovers (16490/APP/2006/1061). This particular property was constructed with 4-bedrooms, one of which is in the roof space and due to the amended frontage layout, now only allows for one off-street parking space. However, the proposed dwelling is still considered to provide adequate amenities for future occupiers and the bulk and design is not considered materially different to that approved by the earlier grant of planning consent and as such, it is considered that the design of the dwelling has been established by that permission as acceptable. With regard to the revised frontage layout, whilst the dwelling now results in a parking shortfall, due to the parking management scheme that is in place in the street, it is not considered demonstrable harm by this deficiency results and furthermore, this revised layout is considered to result in a visual improvement to the frontage as there is now adequate space to allow for areas of soft landscaping to be provided. Approval is therefore recommended.

#### 2. **RECOMMENDATION**

See above.

That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Consumer Protection, Sport and Green Spaces to grant planning permission, subject to the following:

A. That the Council enter into a legal agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following:

(i) A contribution of £13,572 towards the provision of educational facilities.

B. That the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the Section 106 agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

C. That the officers be authorised to negotiate the terms of the proposed agreement.

D. That, if the S106 agreement is not completed by within 3 calendar months of the date of the committee meeting to which this is agreed, under the discretion of the Head of Planning Consumer Protection, Sport and Green Spaces, the application is refused under delegated powers for the following reason:

The development is estimated to give rise to a significant number of children of nursery and primary school age, and therefore additional provision would need to be made in the locality due to the shortfall of places in nurseries and schools facilities serving the area. Given a legal agreement at this stage has not been secured, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy R17 of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.

E. That if the application is approved, the following conditions be attached:

# 1 OM1 Development in accordance with Approved Plans

The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in strict accordance with the plans hereby approved unless consent to any variation is first obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

# REASON

To ensure that the external appearance of the development is satisfactory and complies with Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

# 2 H13 Installation of gates onto a highway

No gates shall be installed which open outwards over the highway/footway.

#### REASON

To ensure that pedestrian and vehicular safety is not prejudiced in accordance with Policies AM3 and AM8 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and Chapter 3C of the London Plan. (February 2008).

# 3 H7 Parking Arrangements (Residential)

Within 3 calendar months of the date of this decision, the parking arrangements, including the vehicular access point and the surfacing of the parking area, as shown on the plan hereby approved shall be implemented. If these details fail to be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority within this time period, or unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the occupation of the dwelling shall cease until these details have been implemented. Thereafter, the parking area hereby approved shall be retained and used for no other purposes.

#### REASON

To ensure that an appropriate level of car parking provision is provided on site in accordance with Policy AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and Chapter 3C of the London Plan. (February 2008).

# 4 RPD5 Restrictions on Erection of Extensions and Outbuildings

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extension to any dwellinghouse(s) nor any garage(s), shed(s) or other outbuilding(s) shall be erected without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

# REASON

So that the Local Planning Authority can ensure that any such development would not result in a significant loss of residential amenity in accordance with policy BE21 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

## 5 RPD6 Fences, Gates, Walls

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no fences, gates or walls shall be erected on the frontage of the dwelling other than those expressly authorised by this permission.

### REASON

To protect the visual amenities and character of the street scene in accordance with policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

### 6 RPD9 Enlargement to Houses - Roof Additions/Alterations

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no addition to or enlargement of the roof of any dwellinghouse shall be constructed.

### REASON

To preserve the character and appearance of the development and protect the visual amenity of the area and to ensure that any additions to the roof are in accordance with policy BE15 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

# 7 TL5 Landscaping Scheme - (full apps where details are reserved)

Within 3 calendar months of the date of this decision, a landscaping scheme providing full details of hard and soft landscaping works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. If the scheme is not agreed within a further three calendar months of the submission of these details the occupation of the dwelling shall cease, until an agreement is reached. The scheme shall include: -

· Planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100),

· Written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken,

Schedule of plants giving species, plant sizes, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate,

· Implementation programme.

The scheme shall also include details of the following: -

- · Means of enclosure,
- · Car parking layouts,
- Other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas,
- Hard surfacing materials proposed,

#### REASON

To ensure that the proposed development will preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in compliance with policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

#### 8 TL6 Landscaping Scheme - implementation

All hard and soft landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved landscaping scheme and shall be completed within the first planting and seeding seasons following the agreement of the landscaping scheme. The new planting and landscape operations should comply with the requirements specified in BS 3936 (1992) 'Nursery Stock, Part 1, Specification for Trees and Shrubs' and in BS 4428 (1989) 'Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations (Excluding Hard Surfaces)'. Thereafter, the areas of hard and soft landscaping shall be permanently retained.

Any tree, shrub or area of turfing or seeding shown on the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of 5 years from the completion of development dies, is removed or in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority becomes seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the same place or, if planting in the same place would leave the new tree, hedge or shrub susceptible to disease, then the planting should be in a position to be first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in the next planting season with another such tree, shrub or area of turfing or seeding of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority first gives written consent to any variation.

# REASON

To ensure that the landscaped areas are laid out and retained in accordance with the approved plans in order to preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in compliance with policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

### 9 SUS5 Sustainable Urban Drainage

Within 3 calendar months of the date of this decision details of the incorporation of sustainable urban drainage shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. If these details fail to be agreed within a further three calendar months of the submission of these details and subsequently implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority within this time period, or unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the occupation of the dwelling shall cease until these details have been implemented. The approved details shall thereafter permanently retained and maintained.

#### REASON

To ensure that surface water run off is handled as close to its source as possible in compliance with policy 4A.14 of the London Plan (February 2008).

#### **INFORMATIVES**

# 1 152 Compulsory Informative (1)

The decision to GRANT 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).

# 2 153 Compulsory Informative (2)

The decision to GRANT 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.	
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.
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.
R17	Use of planning obligations to supplement the provision of recreation, leisure and community facilities
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS	Residential Layouts
LPP 3A.3	London Plan Policy 3A.3 - Maximising the potential of sites
LPP 3A.5	London Plan Policy 3A.5 - Housing Choice
LPP 4A.3	London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.
LPP 4B.5	London Plan Policy 4B.5 - Creating an inclusive environment.

# 3 11 Building to Approved Drawing

You are advised this permission is based on the dimensions provided on the approved drawings as numbered above. The development hereby approved must be constructed precisely in accordance with the approved drawings. Any deviation from these drawings requires the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

# 3. CONSIDERATIONS

# 3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is on the western side of Northolt Avenue and comprises a row of four newly constructed terraced properties. This application relates to Plot B a mid-terrace unit. Originally this site comprised a detached bungalow, which has been demolished to make way for this new development. The area is characterised by a mix of detached bungalows, two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraces houses. The site lies within the developed area, as identified in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies (September 2007).

# 3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal relates to retrospective planning permission for a mid terrace property, that has not been built in accordance with the approved plans (16490/APP/2006/1061), for the erection of a row of four 2-storey 2-bedroom terraced houses, two with integral garages, together with frontage parking and vehicular crossovers.

This particular property was constructed with 4-bedrooms, one of which is in the roof space. The house has a maximum width of 5.6m and is 10m deep. The unit has been finished with a pitched roof with an eaves height of 5.1m and a ridge height of 8.6m high.

The footprint is identical to that approved by the earlier grant of planning consent, together with the eaves height, however the overall ridge height has been increased by 0.5m.

One off-street parking space is provided on the frontage.

#### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

16490/APP/2006/1061 30 Northolt Avenue Ruislip

ERECTION OF A ROW OF FOUR TWO STOREY TWO BEDROOM TERRACED HOUSES, TWO WITH INTEGRAL GARAGES, ALL WITH PARKING AT THE FRONT, TOGETHER WITH FORMATION OF THREE ADDITIONAL VEHICULAR CROSSOVERS (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW)

Decision: 16-06-2006 Approved

16490/APP/2007/1034 30 Northolt Avenue Ruislip

RETENTION OF TERRACE OF 4, TWO STOREY THREE-BEDROOM DWELLINGS (INCLUDING ROOFSPACE ACCOMMODATION), TWO WITH INTEGRAL GARAGES, ALL WITH PARKING AT THE FRONT, TOGETHER WITH FORMATION OF THREE ADDITIONAL VEHICULAR CROSSOVERS (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW)

## Decision:

16490/APP/2011/1037 30a Northolt Avenue Ruislip

Retention of two storey, three-bedroom, end terrace dwelling with integral garage and associated amenity space and parking

#### Decision:

16490/APP/2011/1039 30c Northolt Avenue Ruislip

Retention of two storey, with rooms in roofspace, four-bedroom terraced dwelling

#### **Decision:**

16490/APP/2011/1085 30d Northolt Avenue Ruislip

Retention of two storey, three-bedroom, end terrace dwelling with integral garage and associated amenity space and parking

#### Decision:

#### **Comment on Relevant Planning History**

Planning application 16490/APP/2006/1061 was granted on the 16th June 2006, for the erection of a row of four 2-storey 2-bedroom terraced houses, two with integral garages, together with frontage parking and vehicular crossovers. However, the development was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans and a subsequent enforcement investigation commenced.

During the period of the enforcement investigation, the site was subdivided and each of the four residential units are now in separate ownership. Due to the non-compliance with the originally approved plans prosecution proceedings were instigated, and these have

resulted in four individual applications being submitted to try and gain retrospective permission for the units as constructed.

Failure to receive permission would result in the prosecution proceedings recommencing.

### 4. Planning Policies and Standards

### UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Policies:

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.	
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.	
R17	Use of planning obligations to supplement the provision of recreation, leisure and community facilities	
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.	
AM14	New development and car parking standards.	
HDAS	Residential Layouts	
LPP 3A.3	London Plan Policy 3A.3 - Maximising the potential of sites	
LPP 3A.5	London Plan Policy 3A.5 - Housing Choice	
LPP 4A.3	London Plan Policy 4A.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction.	
LPP 4B.5	London Plan Policy 4B.5 - Creating an inclusive environment.	
E Advertigement and Cite Nation		

#### 5. Advertisement and Site Notice

- **5.1** Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable
- 5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

# 6. Consultations

#### **External Consultees**

13 letters were sent out to local interest groups and neighbours of the application site. Two letters of representation have been received specifically referring to this application, however, this proposal is one of four applications seeking retrospective consent for the erection of four terrace houses. As such, a further two letters have also been received which are also considered relevant to this application. The comments were as follows:

1. I object to retrospective permission being granted for this application, the properties do not conform with either the original or the revised applications submitted to the council.

2. The developer was made aware at the time that Completion Certificates for this development would not be granted, but he carried on regardless.

3. There is another house (Plot C) with roof lights for which planning permission has not been granted.

4. The Design and Access Statement comments the design of the proposal has taken cues from an adjacent development in Baring Road. Therefore this should not be considered.

5. The roof windows, if allowed, will overlook the upper bedrooms of the houses opposite and compromise privacy.

6. The developer having submitted plans, had them approved and then disregarded them and continued to build without consideration of residents. I feel if consent is now granted, there will be nothing to stop developers from building what they want, regardless of conditions or approvals given.

7. My original objections sent previously still stand.

8. Yet another perfectly good bungalow to be destroyed. This is why the area is going downhill and the feel and look of it has changed. There is not a need for big houses within that road and no room for the cars that it would bring.

9. The development was in contravention to planning law. The houses are currently let out to many people and should probably be registered as houses in multiple occupation.

10. The houses are poorly built. Garages were built with no permissions for dropped kerbs.

11. Due to the height of these properties, they overshadow our house.

12. We would not have purchased our property if we knew this development would take place.

13. We are concerned we have not been fully consulted on all applications

14. Now we are facing with a building comprising 14 bedrooms, rather than 3, this has increased parking, traffic and noise, particularly as these as rented houses.

MOD-RAF Northolt: No safeguarding objections NATS: No safeguarding objections

0 0 ,

### Internal Consultees

Highway Engineer: No objection raised.

Trees and Landscape Officer: The site is a recently constructed mid-terrace house in a residential area. The front garden is predominantly block paved with a very narrow strip for planting between the pedestrian access to the front door and a space for off-street parking. There are no significant landscape features on the site which constitute a constraint on development. There are no Tree Preservation Orders on, or close to, the site, nor does it fall within a designated Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL: The proposal is a retrospective application to regularise the situation regarding one of the four properties, which were not constructed in accordance with the approved plans. Drawing No. PT/1477/1 rev B indicates a planted strip along the southern boundary which will improve the setting and the views from the street and, if appropriately specified and maintained, help to screen the bin store against the house.

#### LANDSCAPE CONSIDERATIONS:

Saved policy BE38 seeks the retention and utilisation of topographical and landscape features of merit and the provision of new planting and landscaping wherever it is appropriate.

• The site currently features no soft landscaping, an issue which will be addressed by the current proposal. Structure planting in the form of shrubs or a hedge should be specified. It is not clear why a narrow strip of slate/mulch is indicated between the parking space and the footpath. This features could be removed as it appears to have no practical or aesthetic purpose.

 $\cdot$  HDAS (Residential extensions, chapter 11.2) recommends that, where parking space is increased in front gardens, at least 25% of front garden space is retained for soft landscaping. The proposed planting appears to be somewhat less than 25% of the site coverage.

• DCLG/EA guidance requires new driveways to be designed and installed in accordance with SUDS principles. Although the block paving has been installed recently, it is not know whether the particular blocks (or laying specification) conform to SUDS guidance.

RECOMMENDATIONS: No objection, subject to the above observations and conditions TL5 and TL6.

Officer Comment: A revised plan has been submitted which now includes landscaping strips, crossover details and bin storage areas. Whilst these details are now considered acceptable it is considered the above conditions would still be applicable to ensure implementation of the same.

Director of Education: Based on the creation of 1 x 7-room private house, the requested amount is  $\pm 13,572$ .

### 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.01 The principle of the development

Policy BE13 of the Adopted Hillingdon UDP Saved Policies (September 2007) states that development will not be permitted if the layout and appearance fail to harmonise with the existing street scene, and BE19 states the LPA will seek to ensure that new development within residential areas compliments or improves the amenity and character of the area.

The proposal is located within the `developed area' as identified in the UDP Saved Policies (September 2007) and there is no objection in principle to additional housing in this location. Furthermore, it is considered that the erection of four terraced properties on this site has been established by the previous approval for the original development (16490/APP/2006/1061).

### 7.02 Density of the proposed development

With regard to residential density, the proposed site, as constructed has a residential density of 337 habitable rooms per hectare (hrpha). Therefore, this exceeds the London Plan's recommended guidelines having regard to the sites Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) score of 2 (which thereby recommends 200-250 hrpha, 50-80 units per hectare). Whilst, the proposal exceeds these guidelines, consideration also needs to be given to the future internal and external living environments and whether a cramped situation has resulted. It is considered that whilst the proposal exceeds the recommended density requirements, adequate amenities have still been provided for future occupiers of these properties and as such the proposal is considered to comply with the Policy 4B.3 of the London Plan.

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

Not applicable to this application

# 7.04 Airport safeguarding

NATS (NERL Safeguarding) and the MOD (RAF Northolt) have been consulted and do not raise any safeguarding objections to the proposal.

# 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

Section 4.27 of the SPD: Residential Layouts, states careful consideration should be

given to building lines, and these should relate well to the existing street pattern.

The footprint of this development is identical to that approved by the earlier grant of planning consent (16490/APP/2006/1061), together with the eaves height. However it is noted that the overall ridge height has been increased by 0.5m.

The design of the building is not considered materially different to that earlier approval and whilst the resulting ridge line has been increased on that shown on the originally approved plans, the overall scale of the development and its impact on the street scene, in comparison to existing properties is considered to be acceptable and has not resulted in a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the area.

The proposed development is not considered to result in an incongruous or cramped form of development and as such, the application is considered to comply with Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies (September 2007).

#### 7.08 Impact on neighbours

With regard to the impact of the amenities on the adjoining occupiers, Sections 4.9 of the SPD: Residential Layouts, in relation to new dwellings, states all residential developments and amenity space should receive adequate daylight and sunlight. The daylight and sunlight available to adjoining properties should be adequately protected. Where a two or more storey building abuts a property or its garden, adequate distance should be maintained to overcome possible over-domination, and 15m will be the minimum acceptable distance. This proposal would comply with this advice as properties directly to the rear of this proposal have a separation distance of over 28m.

With regard to any loss of light and outlook that has arisen as a result of this proposal. It is noted the same footprint has been used to that approved by the earlier grant of planning consent (16490/APP/2006/1061) and whilst the resulting ridge line has been increased by 0.5m, the hipped roof form that has been used means that the proposal has not resulted in a material impact on adjoining properties, over and above the impact that would have been created by the originally approved scheme, which was considered to be acceptable. Therefore, the house is not considered to result is a significant increase in over dominance, visual intrusion and over shadowing and as such, the proposal would comply with the intensions of policies BE20 and BE21 of the UDP Saved Policies (September 2007).

The Council's SPD HDAS: Residential Layouts, requires a minimum distance of 21m to ensure that no overlooking to adjoining residents will occur. In this case the dwellings to the rear are situated over 28m away and therefore a material loss of residential amenity would not result. With regard to the front facing windows these would be considered to face onto public areas and therefore also would not be considered to result in a material loss of privacy. As such, the proposed house would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to existing or future occupiers and therefore would comply with Policy BE24 of the Borough's adopted UDP Saved Policies (September 2007).

of the Borough s adopted UDP Saved Policies (September 2007).

### 7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Section 4.7 of the SPD: Residential Layouts, states careful consideration should be given in the design of the internal layout, and that satisfactory indoor living space and amenities should be provided. The proposed internal floor space for the new dwelling is over 120m2. The SPD states the minimum amount of floor space required for a 4-bedroom two storey

house would be 92m2 and therefore the proposal would comply with this advice.

With regard to the size of the garden, the SDP: Residential Lavouts: Section 4.15 states that three bedroom properties should have a garden area of at least 60m and four bedroom properties should have a garden space of 100m2. The layout plans show areas of 93m2 provided for the four bedroom units (Plots B and C) over 100m2 provided for the three bedroom units (Plots A and D). Whilst there is a marginal shortfall for the four bedroom properties it is not considered enough to warrant the refusal of planning permission on these grounds alone. As such the proposal would comply with the intensions of Policy BE23 of the UDP Saved Policies (September 2007) and the SPD: Residential Layouts.

# 7.10 Traffic impact, car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

This application comprises 1 of 4 retrospective applications submitted for a row of four terraced properties. These properties were not constructed in accordance with the approved plans and during the construction period the parking layouts/integral garages were altered.

The council's adopted policy seeks to provide a maximum of 2 parking spaces per residential dwelling. The development as constructed provided integral garages to the two end terrace units, and one parking space on the front of each of the mid-terrace units. This has resulted in a shortfall of 2 spaces for the development as a whole. However, it is noted there is a parking management scheme in place in the street and it is not considered that the shortfall of 2 spaces would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Furthermore, it is considered if the proposal (with regard to the parking layout) had been implemented as per the approved drawings, this would have resulted in a large amount of hardstanding, without the ability to mitigate this impact with any soft landscaping, thereby having a greater impact visually.

Therefore, subject to compliance with appropriate conditions relating to the laying out and implementation of acceptable cross-overs the proposal is considered to comply with policies AM7 and AM14 of the UDP (Saved Policies, September 2007).

# 7.11 Urban design, access and security

These issues have been considered in Section 7.07.

# 7.12 Disabled access

The proposed floor plans show the provision of WC facilities at ground floor level and that the dwelling would exceed the minimum floor space standards required to meet Lifetime Homes Standards. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the intensions of Policy 3A.4 and 3A.5 of the London Plan and the Council's Accessible Hillingdon SPD January 2010.

### 7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

The proposal does not meet the threshold to require the provision of this type of housing.

# 7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology

The Trees and Landscape Officer considers that there are no significant landscape features on the site which constitute a constraint on development. There are no Tree Preservation Orders on, or close to, the site, nor does it fall within a designated Conservation Area. The proposal is a retrospective application to regularise the situation regarding one of the four properties, which were not constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

The revised drawings now include planted strips along the shared boundaries which will improve the setting and the views from the street and, if appropriately specified and

maintained, help to screen the bin store against the house.

Therefore, no objection is raised subject to suitable conditions being applied and as such the proposal is considered to comply with Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

### 7.15 Sustainable waste management

As the property is a residential house, refuse collection would not involve wheelie bins or an external bin storage area.

#### 7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

The SPD: Residential Layouts: Section 4.9 states, each habitable room should have an outlook and source of natural light and the proposal would comply with this advice and with Policy 4A.3 of the London Plan (2008).

### 7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

The proposal is not within a flood plain and no drainage issues have arisen.

## 7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

Not applicable to this application

#### 7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

With regard to points 1-4, 6, 9, 12, whilst these points are noted, planning applications are required to be considered on their own merits. The remaining points are addressed in the main body of the report.

#### 7.20 Planning Obligations

Presently S106 contributions for education are sought for developments when the net gain of habitable rooms exceeds six. The development would result in a net gain of 7 habitable rooms and the director of education has stated an education contribution of £13,572 for nursery, primary, secondary, and post 16 education would be required in the South Ruislip Ward.

#### 7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

The property, together with the adjoining ones, is the subject of a valid enforcement notice and if this application is refused, then enforcement action would recommence.

#### 7.22 Other Issues

#### 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 proposal is a retrospective application for the erection of a mid-terrace 4-bedroom dwelling. It is considered that the design of the proposed dwelling, the building lines, together with the size and bulk, is not materially different to that approved by the earlier grant of planning consent and therefore no undue harm would result to the street scene or the wider area if this retrospective proposal received consent. Furthermore, it is considered that adequate amenities have been provided for future occupiers of this unit and whilst there is a shortfall in off-street parking provision for the unit, when balanced against the negative visual impact that providing two off-street spaces on this frontage would have on the wider street scene and that there is a parking management scheme in place on the street, which will control off-site parking in the immediate vicinity, it is not considered that this would warrant the refusal of planning permission on these grounds alone.

Therefore subject to the completion of a legal agreement requiring a contribution towards education provision within the ward, the proposal is recommended for approval.

#### **11. Reference Documents**

Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Polices September 2007 HDAS: Residential Layouts: HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon The London Plan (2008) Consultee and Neighbour responses

Contact Officer: Catherine Hems

**Telephone No:** 01895 250230

