

## Report of the Head of Planning & Enforcement Services

**Address** 2 HILLIARD ROAD NORTHWOOD

**Development:** Conversion of existing end terrace house into 2, two-bedroom flats, involving part single storey, part two storey rear extension, first floor side extension, and partial conversion of existing attached garage to side to habitable use.

**LBH Ref Nos:** 34684/APP/2011/359

**Drawing Nos:** Location Plan to Scale 1:1250  
Design and Access Statement  
Photograph  
2099/11  
Block Plan to Scale 1:200  
2216.10A  
2099/10  
2216.11A

**Date Plans Received:** 16/02/2011                      **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**  
**Date Application Valid:** 04/03/2011

### 1. SUMMARY

This application is the third proposal that has been submitted seeking to extend and convert this end of terrace property within the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character into flats. The first application for 3 one-bedroom flats and 1 three-bedroom flat, with a part single, part two-storey side and rear extension and conversion of the roofspace to habitable use with a rear dormer and front and rear rooflights (34684/APP/2010/841) was withdrawn on the 18/06/10. The second application (34684/APP/2010/2013) was for a similar conversion of the property into 1 three-bedroom, 1 two-bedroom and 1 one-bedroom flats was refused.

This application has been amended in an attempt to overcome the reasons for refusal of the last application (34684/APP/2010/2013). However, although the first and second reasons for refusal which related to design and lack of privacy for the ground floor flat with the shared use of the rear garden area have been overcome, the third reason relating to inadequate provision of off-street parking has not been adequately addressed. Furthermore, removing the front boundary wall to open up the front garden area for parking would not be characteristic of this part of the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character. A fourth reason for refusal of the previously refused application related to the floor area of the original house and is an in principle objection to the conversion of the property. The application is recommended for refusal.

### 2. RECOMMENDATION

**REFUSAL for the following reasons:**

#### 1                      NON2                      Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposal fails to make adequate provision for off-street parking in accordance with the Council's adopted car parking standards and to demonstrate that the parking layout proposed would not give rise to vehicular and pedestrian conflict. As such, the proposal is likely to give rise to additional on-street parking on a heavily parked road and be prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the

adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

**2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed parking in the front garden, involving the removal of the front boundary wall, with little opportunity to provide any landscaping, would be detrimental to visual amenity of the street scene and the character and appearance of the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character, contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2009) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

**3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The application property is not of a sufficient size to provide a suitable scheme of residential conversion and would result in the loss of a single family dwelling to the detriment of the character of the road. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

**INFORMATIVES**

**1 I52 Compulsory Informative (1)**

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

**2 I53 Compulsory Informative (2)**

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (2011) and national guidance.

BE5	New development within areas of special local character
BE13	New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
BE15	Alterations and extensions to existing buildings
BE19	New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
BE20	Daylight and sunlight considerations.
BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE3	Buildings or uses likely to cause noise annoyance - mitigation measures
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units Use of planning obligations to supplement the provision of

R17	recreation, leisure and community facilities
AM2	Development proposals - assessment of traffic generation, impact on congestion and public transport availability and capacity
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM9	Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LDF-AH	Accessible Hillingdon, Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010
SPD-PO	Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2008

### 3

You are advised that the submitted plans contain discrepancies, particularly concerning the depth of the side/rear extension which is shown as 9.7m and 7.4m deep on the ground and first floors respectively on the floor plan (Drw. No. 2216-10A), but 10.0m and 7.9m deep respectively on the elevation plan (Drw. No. 2216.11A).

## 3. CONSIDERATIONS

### 3.1 Site and Locality

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

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

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought to convert the dwelling into 2 two-bedroom flats (one on each floor), involving the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension with integral garage, associated car parking and amenity space provision. The works involve the demolition of the side lean-to garage.

The side extension would be 2.8m wide and extend to the side boundary, aligning with the recessed part of the front elevation of the house on the ground floor, set back by 1m from the recessed element on the first floor. The side/rear extension would have an overall depth of 7.5m on the first floor (as measured from the floor plan), with a gable roof set down by 600mm from the main ridge of the terrace. The extension would project 2.5m from the main rear elevation of the house to align with the rear elevation of the existing rear wing on the first floor, with its gable roof widened and heightened to cover the additional width provided by the side extension. On the ground floor, the side/rear extension would have an overall depth of 9.7m (as measured from the floor plan), projecting by 1.2m beyond the rear elevation of the existing projecting rear wing. The extension would comprise a garage at the front and the single storey elements would be covered by lean-to roofs. A single storey rear extension is also proposed between the projecting rear wing and the boundary with No. 4 Hilliard Road. This would measure 2.5m deep to align with the depth of the original rear wing, 3.2m wide and have a lean-to roof, 2.7m to 3.4m high.

In addition to the integral garage, a car parking space is shown in the front garden at the front of the main bay of the house with no front boundary wall and separate amenity space and a refuse and cycle store is shown in the rear garden.

This scheme principally differs from the previous scheme (34684/APP/2010/2013) in that one of the flats has been omitted, and it is no longer proposed to use and extend with a rear dormer the existing and proposed roof for habitable purposes. Each of the flats would now have two bedrooms. It was also previously proposed to set the side extension back 150mm from the recessed element at the front of the house (as opposed to the current proposal which aligns on the ground floor and set back 1m on the first floor). It was also previously proposed to extend the proposed part single, part two storey extension 0.5m beyond the rear elevation of the existing rear wing, as now it would align, with the exception of the ground floor at the back of the extended rear wing which would project by 1.2m. The ground floor of the side extension now comprises an integral garage at the front and elevational alterations have been made to the extension, mainly involving revising window positions and reducing their size. Front garden parking has also been revised and the amenity space at the rear has been sub-divided.

### **3.3 Relevant Planning History**

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

There have been two previous applications submitted to convert and extend this property to provide flats. The first application (34684/APP/2010/841) was for 3 one-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats with a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension and conversion of the roofspace to habitable use, including a rear dormer and front and rear rooflights. The application was withdrawn before the officer's recommendation for refusal could be considered by Members at the North Committee meeting on the 22/07/10.

The second application to extend and convert this property into 3 flats (34684/APP/2010/2013) was refused at the North Planning committee meeting on the 18/11/10 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey side and rear extension, by reason of its siting, bulk, design and fenestration, would fail to appear subordinate to the original dwelling and would fail to harmonise with the design and proportions of the original house. As such, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original property and the surrounding Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character, contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved

Policies (September 2007) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2. The proposed shared use of the rear garden area would not afford an appropriate level of privacy to the rear habitable rooms of the ground floor flat. As such, the occupiers of this unit would be overlooked to an unacceptable degree. The proposal would therefore not provide a suitable level of residential amenity for these occupiers, contrary to policy BE21, BE23 and BE24 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3. The proposal involves the loss of an off-street car parking space and fails to make adequate off-street parking provision to serve the proposed flats in accordance with the Council's adopted Car Parking standards. The proposal would therefore be likely to give rise to additional on-street car parking, to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

4. The application property is not of a sufficient size to provide a suitable scheme of residential conversion and would result in the loss of a single family dwelling to the detriment of the character of the road. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

#### **4. Planning Policies and Standards**

London Plan, July 2011

##### **UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan**

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

Part 1 Policies:

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

Part 2 Policies:

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| BE5  | New development within areas of special local character               |
| BE13 | New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.        |
| BE15 | Alterations and extensions to existing buildings                      |
| BE19 | New development must improve or complement the character of the area. |
| BE20 | Daylight and sunlight considerations.                                 |

BE21	Siting, bulk and proximity of new buildings/extensions.
BE22	Residential extensions/buildings of two or more storeys.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
BE38	Retention of topographical and landscape features and provision of new planting and landscaping in development proposals.
OE1	Protection of the character and amenities of surrounding properties and the local area
OE3	Buildings or uses likely to cause noise annoyance - mitigation measures
H7	Conversion of residential properties into a number of units
R17	Use of planning obligations to supplement the provision of recreation, leisure and community facilities
AM2	Development proposals - assessment of traffic generation, impact on congestion and public transport availability and capacity
AM7	Consideration of traffic generated by proposed developments.
AM9	Provision of cycle routes, consideration of cyclists' needs in design of highway improvement schemes, provision of cycle parking facilities
AM14	New development and car parking standards.
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006
HDAS-EXT	Residential Extensions, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted December 2008
LDF-AH	Accessible Hillingdon , Local Development Framework, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted January 2010
SPD-PO	Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2008

## **5. Advertisement and Site Notice**

**5.1** Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

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

## **6. Consultations**

### **External Consultees**

27 neighbouring properties have been consulted. 4 individual responses have been received, together with a petition with 42 signatories. The petition states:

'We the following, call on the London Borough of Hillingdon to refuse planning permission for the conversion of 2 Hilliard Road, Northwood into 2 flats.

\* The existing property, a 3 bedroom modest sized family dwelling is below the size of properties in the Borough considered appropriate for subdivision. SPD Policy No. 3.5.

\* Lack of parking for the 2 flats - a total of 3 spaces is required by the Borough's parking standards. Unitary Development Plan AM14.

\* Parking in Hilliard Road is already a severe problem and this proposal without adequate parking

will add to the traffic congestion and safety issues already prevalent in the road.

\* The proposed parking space in the front garden will adversely affect the residential amenity currently enjoyed by No. 4 Hilliard Road.

\* Approval of this application will set an unfortunate precedent in Hilliard Road that will lead to the conversion of other family sized properties in the road.

\* To approve this application would be clearly contrary to a number of policies of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, including Policies BE19 and AM7.'

The individual responses raise the following points:

(i) Conversion is inappropriate and would change whole aspect of the road, which is an Area of Special Local Character, particularly if others did the same;

(ii) Council guidelines say that the house is too small to be converted;

(iii) Conversion would require 3 parking spaces to comply with the Council's car parking standards and proposal could attract many more cars. Parking is already at saturation point on Hilliard Road;

(iv) Use of front garden as a car parking space will block light to living room at No. 4 Hilliard Road and be detrimental to its residential amenities;

(v) There is an issue with drainage and flooding during heavy rain at this end of Hilliard Road and this development will make it worse;

(vi) Turning a small family end of terrace property into flats will establish precedent for others to do the same;

(vii) This is the third application to convert No. 2 Hilliard Road. I suppose they think people will not bother to object again, but they do;

(viii) Scheme is just for profit;

(ix) Building at bottom of No. 2's garden could be converted to a habitable dwelling;

(x) Conversion work would result in disturbance to neighbouring property;

(xi) Applicant made no attempt to consult with neighbours or the local community on the proposal which is surprising given amount of previous opposition and contrary to Government advice and emerging Localism Act.

Ward Councillor:

(i) There is insufficient parking in Hilliard Road to accommodate any further development or conversion of existing properties;

(ii) I believe the proposed conversion will be an over development of a very tight site.

Northwood Residents Association:

HDAS 9.8: There is insufficient street parking for the garage to be used for any other purpose, especially as the intention is to convert the house into two dwellings. UDP Annex 1 C3 requires 1.5 car parking spaces per dwelling. The plans show only 2 spaces but one can only be accessed when the other has been vacated. All of Hilliard Road lacks sufficient on and off street parking and number 2 adjoins a minor shopping area where there is an increased need for parking spaces.

Northwood Hills Residents Association:

No. 2 Hilliard Road was and still remains a property which is not suitable for converting into more than one dwelling on the basis that Hilliard Road is quite a narrow road with mostly terraced houses. Any one visiting that road can quite clearly see that there never are any available parking spaces on the road.

If the house is converted to more than one dwelling it would increase the number of cars on the road, most likely to two cars per household and the road simply doesn't have the capacity to accommodate the extra cars. Although the plans show space for a small car in front of the house

that is not really possible even for a small car and looking at the space, it couldn't fit more than a Smart car at best. How can there be a specification to any one living there that they must only have a small car. Garages usually are not used for parking cars as they get used as storage.

We, at Northwood Hills Residents' Association, strongly object to this house given planning to be converted into more than one dwelling, now and at any point in future.

### **Internal Consultees**

#### **CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN OFFICER:**

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

The terrace comprises 4 properties of similar design i.e. with double height canted bays below timbered gables, positioned adjacent to recessed front doors set behind arched openings.

Comments: A previous application regarding a similar scheme was refused due to policy matters and the appearance of the proposed extension.

The side addition is considered to be an improvement for the previous schemes. The extension has been further set back at first floor level and has been reduced in height and depth. This would also reduce the sheer elevation visible from the street and would be considered better in terms of its visual impact.

To the front elevation, the proposed first floor window, sits under the eaves of the roof. This has been revised in accordance with the comments given previously and would be acceptable in design terms.

Whilst this is an extension over the existing garage, ideally, the addition should be set-in from the side boundary by 1m. Given that the side boundary faces the rear of the properties along Pinner Road, it would be acceptable in this instance.

There are still concerns over existing parking and the general intensification use as a result of conversion of flats. These should be assessed from a policy and development control point of view.

Conclusion: Acceptable from a design point of view. All materials to match existing.

#### **TREE OFFICER:**

This application is an amended scheme, similar to that submitted under planning ref. 2010/841. My previous comments still apply.

#### **Previous Comments:**

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

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

Landscape Issues: Saved policy BE38 seeks the landscape enhancement as in association with



new development. DCLG/EA guidance seeks the provision of SUDS compliant hard-standing in front gardens.

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

Recommendation: No objection subject to conditions TL5, TL6 and TL7.

HIGHWAY OFFICER:

Hilliard Road is a residential area accessed from Pinner Road which is an unclassified road benefiting from 2.5m wide footways on both sides and a 7.0m wide carriageway, with no parking restrictions.

The existing dwelling is an end of terrace abutting a private footpath leading to the rear of properties that face Pinner Road.

The proposal is to convert the existing dwelling into 2 x 2 bedroom flats involving a side/rear extension and providing two parking spaces.

The proposal is to accommodate a single garage parking space with its maximum internal dimension of 2.4 x 5.0m. and a second parking space in the hard standing area of the front garden, which has a maximum depth of 2.0m from the boundary wall fronting the public footway to bedroom 1 bay window.

The second vehicle parking space in the front garden is also proposed to be parallel to the bedroom 1 bay window measuring 4.8 x 2.0m, which clearly has inadequate space for standard vehicle parking. Furthermore, the applicant has failed to provide tracking illustrating that a standard vehicle is able to conveniently enter/exit and park in the front garden space as indicated in the submitted plan. The Council's minimum requirement for a standard parking bay is 4.8 x 2.4m.

Allowing this application could set a precedent resulting in other similar unacceptable proposals, affecting the Council's position in resisting the same.

It can therefore be concluded that the proposal fails to make adequate off-street parking provision to serve proposed flats in accordance with the Council's adopted car parking standards. The proposal would therefore be likely to give rise to additional on-street car parking, to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the adopted unitary Development saved policies (September 2007), and is therefore recommended to be refused.

ACCESS OFFICER:

The proposed design is not conducive to the Council's policy which requires all new homes to be built to Lifetime Home Standards. However, as the existing dwellinghouse is not a Lifetime Home, no objection is raised.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION OFFICER (LAND CONTAMINATION):

Not aware of any specific contamination issues at the site.

## **7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES**

### **7.01 The principle of the development**

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

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

The paragraph also advises that in order to provide a suitable standard of residential accommodation, houses will only be considered suitable for conversion if they have a floor area of 120m<sup>2</sup> or more. Whilst the guidance does not specify if this is the existing floor space of the house or after any proposed extension, the existing property is reasonably modest in size with a floor area of 102m<sup>2</sup> and whilst with the proposed extensions it would exceed the 120m<sup>2</sup>, it is considered that the basis of the restriction is to ensure that the stock of small family dwellings is maintained within the borough and the proposed conversion will result in the loss of a small family dwelling. As such, the principle of conversion is considered unacceptable.

#### **7.02 Density of the proposed development**

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan (July 2011) advises that Boroughs should ensure that development proposals maximise housing output having regard to local context, design principles, density guidance in Table 3.2 and public transport accessibility. Table 3.2 establishes a density matrix to establish a strategic framework for appropriate densities at different locations.

The site is located within a suburban area and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2. Taking these parameters into account, the matrix recommends a density of 50-95 u/ha and 150-250 hr/ha, assuming units have an indicative size of 2.7 to 3.0 hr/unit. Although this guidance is primarily concerned with new build schemes, this proposal equates to a density of 69 u/ha and 207 hr/ha, which accords with these density guidelines.

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

The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) HDAS: Residential Extensions advises at paragraph 5.0 that two storey side extensions can have a significant impact on the character of the street and that they need to be considered in terms of their setting and with particular reference to the character and quality of the overall street scene. The proposed two storey side extension would maintain the prevalent front and rear building lines on Hilliards Road so that it would not appear unduly dominant. The extension would immediately abut the side boundary, where normally a 1m set in would be required in order to avoid properties visually coalescing. However, at paragraph 5.3, the design guide does go on to state that where side boundaries adjoin a road or open space, there may be some scope for flexibility. In this instance, the site adjoins a footpath, beyond which are the rear yard areas of the units in the adjoining retail parade fronting Pinner Road. At first floor level, it would not be possible to develop these areas at depth. As such, it is considered that there is no likelihood of a terracing affect being created and therefore no specific requirement for a 1m set in from the side boundary to accord with Policy BE22 of the UDP (Saved Policies).

On the previous application, it was considered that the 150mm set back on the full height of the side extension was not sufficient to give the extension a subordinate appearance. The extension has now been set back 1m from the recessed part of the house at first floor level, with no set back on the ground floor. The first floor and roof of the proposed side

extension would now be sufficiently set back from the recessed part of the front elevation of the original house with its ridge stepping down 600mm from the main ridge of the house. Even aligning with the recessed part of the original house, the ground floor would still be set back 1.7m from the main elevation and porch of the house so that this element would appear subordinate. It is considered that the extension would now present a satisfactory appearance.

The previous side extension, following the design of the original property, would have had a large amount of brick work above the first floor window. The window has been raised so that it would now sit underneath the eaves of the side extension. Although the window would be higher than other windows, given its recessed position it would not appear incongruous with the rest of the front elevation. The window design has also been amended to give a more vertical, rather than a horizontal emphasis which is more characteristic of properties of this period.

Car parking is now shown to the front of the bay window which has involved the removal of the front boundary wall. Front garden parking with open front boundaries is not characteristic within this part of Hilliards Road as front gardens have limited depth as so are not used for off-street parking. It is considered that front boundary walls form an important feature along Hilliards Road and the introduction of front garden parking and removal of the front boundary wall would be harmful to the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character.

The proposal therefore fails to harmonise with the character and appearance of the original property, the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character and the visual amenities of the street scene, contrary to Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2009).

An informative has also been added to highlight the inconsistency of the plans in that the side elevation shows the side extension to be marginally deeper than on the floor plans.

#### **7.04 Airport safeguarding**

Not applicable to this application.

#### **7.05 Impact on the green belt**

Not applicable to this application.

#### **7.06 Environmental Impact**

Not applicable to this application.

#### **7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area**

This is considered in Section 7.03 above.

#### **7.08 Impact on neighbours**

The proposed two storey side/rear extension would be sited some 16m from the projecting wings of the rear elevations of the first floor flats in the adjoining retail parade on Pinner Road. The yard areas at the rear of the parade tend to be used in connection with the commercial units and little, if any, amenity use is made of them. The two storey rear extension would be sited 3.2m from the side boundary with No.4 Hilliard Road and would not project any further to the rear than its projecting wing on the first floor, although it would project a further 1.2m on the ground floor. An infill conservatory has been added at the rear to No. 4, sited between the shared boundary and No.4's projecting wing which the proposed single storey rear extension would not project beyond. As such, the only element of the proposal that would project beyond the conservatory at No. 4 would be the ground floor of the side/rear extension would project by approximately 1m but this would be set back from the boundary by 3.2m. On the first floor, the 2.5m projection would be

set back 3.2m from the side boundary so that there would be no breach of the 45° line of sight from neighbouring habitable room windows. Although the conservatory at No. 4 contains side windows, they are high level, with the conservatory mainly being lit by its glazed rear elevation and roof. It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions would not be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining residents by reason of dominance and loss of light, in accordance with Policies BE20 and BE21 of the saved UDP.

No side windows are proposed with all the proposed windows either overlooking the road or the rear garden so that there would be no additional loss of privacy as compared to the existing house. As such, there would be no loss of privacy to neighbouring properties resulting from the proposed development, in accordance with Policy BE24 of the saved UDP.

#### **7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers**

Given the submission date of the application, it is appropriate to consider the application under the Council's SPD HDAS: Residential Layouts. This requires a minimum internal floor area of 63m<sup>2</sup> for two-bedroom flats (as opposed to 61m<sup>2</sup> for a two-bedroom, three person flat and 70m<sup>2</sup> for a two-bedroom, four person flat with the recently adopted London Plan, July 2011). As measured from the floor plans, the ground floor flat would have an internal floor area of 69m<sup>2</sup> and the first floor flat 67m<sup>2</sup>. The internal floor areas of the flats therefore satisfies the Council's minimum internal floor area standards, in compliance with Policy BE19 of the adopted UDP Saved Policies (September 2007) and Paragraphs 4.6 to 4.8 of the SPD HDAS: Residential Layouts. Furthermore, all habitable room windows would have an adequate outlook and natural lighting. To overcome a previous design concern, the first floor window in the front elevation of the side extension has been raised (see Section 7.03). As there is no change in the internal floor levels, the window would be at a high level within the room, but as it would serve an en-suite shower room, no objections are raised to the restricted outlook from this room.

In terms of amenity area, design guidance requires a minimum 25m<sup>2</sup> area of amenity space to be provided for each two-bedroom flat. With the subdivision of the rear garden into two amenity areas, a 53m<sup>2</sup> area nearest the property and a 26m<sup>2</sup> area further to the rear, the scheme satisfies this guidance. Although not ideal, it was previously considered that access to the rear garden area from the first floor and roof space flats by means of the front door, via the adjoining side footpath and garden gate, was not so inconvenient and circuitous as to justify a refusal reason. The ground floor flat would now have defensible amenity space adjoining its rear elevation so that it would maintain an adequate level of privacy. The second reason for refusal of the previous application has therefore been overcome.

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

This scheme proposes two off-street car parking spaces to serve the 2, two-bedroom flats. The Council's Highway Engineer advises that two spaces would be acceptable to serve the development in accordance with the Council's adopted car parking standards which provide maximum standards, but the proposed spaces proposed are undersized.

Car parking standards advise that garages should have a minimum internal width of 3.0m as opposed to the normal 2.4m width for a parking space. This is to allow garages to serve other purposes such as workspace and storage, particularly of bulky items such as ladders to which they are commonly put. In this instance, the proposed garage would be 2.4m wide so that any other use made of the garage would be likely to prevent its use for the parking of cars. The other space in front of the bay window of the ground floor flat is also undersized, being 2.0m by 4.8m. It is also parallel to the road, and no vehicle tracking has been provided to demonstrate that a car could park in such a restricted space. The

plans also show the removal of the front boundary wall, so that vehicles would be encouraged to access the space by crossing the adjoining public footpath at an acute angle and the public footpath would also be likely to be used for the loading/unloading of vehicles.

Use of the access arrangements would be prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety and be likely to result in additional on-street parking in an already heavily parked road.

The Highway Engineer concludes that the proposal fails to make adequate off-street parking provision to serve proposed flats in accordance with the Council's adopted car parking standards. The proposal would therefore be likely to give rise to additional on-street car parking, to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to policies AM7(ii) and AM14 of the adopted unitary Development saved policies (September 2007), and is therefore recommended to be refused.

#### **7.11 Urban design, access and security**

See Section 7.07.

#### **7.12 Disabled access**

The Council's Access Officer advises that although the proposed layout is not particularly conducive to Lifetime homes standards, as this is a conversion scheme and the existing house does not accord with these standards, no objections is raised.

#### **7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing**

Not applicable to this scheme.

#### **7.14 Trees, Landscaping and Ecology**

The Tree Officer advises that the site is not affected by Tree Preservation Orders or Conservation Area designation. Furthermore, there are no trees visible from the front of the property. A landscaping scheme would need to be provided at the front of the property and proposed use of this area for parking would compromise any landscaping scheme. The lack of landscaping has been included as part of the second reason for refusal as it is contrary to Policy BE38 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and paragraph 11.2 of the Council's SPD HDAS: Residential Extensions.

#### **7.15 Sustainable waste management**

Adequate provision for sustainable waste storage has been made in the rear garden of the site.

#### **7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability**

Not applicable to this application.

#### **7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues**

The application site does not lie within a flood zone. The requirement for sustainable urban drainage could have been dealt with by condition had the application not been recommended for refusal.

#### **7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues**

Had this application not been recommended for refusal, it is considered that any impact upon the amenities of future residential occupiers and/or neighbouring properties from noise could be mitigated by an appropriate noise insulation condition in order to comply with Policies BE19 and OE1 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

#### **7.19 Comments on Public Consultations**

With the exception of points (iii) and (v) to (x) raised by individuals and the two similar points raised by the petitioners, the consultation responses have been dealt with in the

main report.

As regards point (iii) of individual responses and fourth bullet point of the petition, it is not considered that the parking of a car on the front garden would be prejudicial to the amenities of the neighbouring property as this is a normal relationship and often something that does not require permission. As regards precedent (point (vi) of individual responses and fifth bullet point of the petition), all applications have to be considered on their individual merits. The other points raised by individuals are noted, but they do not raise any material planning objections to the proposal.

#### **7.20 Planning Obligations**

Due to the scale and nature of this proposal, no S106 contributions are sought.

#### **7.21 Expediency of enforcement action**

There are no enforcement issues on site.

#### **7.22 Other Issues**

No other material planning issues are raised by this application.

### **8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor**

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

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

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

Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 are not absolute rights and infringements of these rights protected under these are allowed in certain defined circumstances, for example where required by law. However any infringement must be proportionate, which means it must achieve a fair balance between the public interest and the private interest infringed and must not go beyond what is needed to achieve its objective.

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

### **9. Observations of the Director of Finance**

### **10. CONCLUSION**

This application is considered to have overcome reasons 1 and 2 of the previous application for a similar flatted conversion of this property (34684/APP/2010/2013 refers).

However, the third and fourth reasons for refusal have not been overcome on this application. Furthermore, in an attempt to provide additional off-street parking on site, this proposal involves use of the front garden area which would involve removal of the front boundary wall. Open front gardens in use as parking space with little landscaping is not considered to be in keeping with character and appearance of this part of the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

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

London Plan (July 2011)  
Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007)  
HDAS: Residential Extensions  
HDAS: Residential Layouts  
HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon  
Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations  
Letters making representations

**Contact Officer:** Richard Phillips

**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 2011 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address

**2 Hilliard Road  
 Northwood**

Planning Application Ref:

**34684/APP/2011/359**

Planning Committee

**North**

Scale

**1:1,250**

Date

**July  
 2011**

**LONDON BOROUGH  
 OF HILLINGDON**  
 Planning,  
 Environment, Education  
 & Community Services

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



**HILLINGDON**  
 LONDON