

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	☐
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	☐
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	☐
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	☐
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	☐
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	☐
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	☐
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	☐
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	☐

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses	☐
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	☐
14.	Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use.	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	☐
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	☐
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	☐
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	☐
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	☐
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	☐
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	☐
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	☐
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	☐
25.	WORKS TO TREES	☐
26.	OTHER (please specify)	☐

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control**

Address: 493 BATH ROAD LONGFORD

Development: Erection of a boundary fence and gate, timber double garage and proposed landscaping.

LBH Ref Nos: 77891/APP/2023/577

Drawing Nos: OS MAP (1:1250)
 OS MAP (1:500)
 A 02
 A 01
 A 03
 A 04
 A 05
 A 06

Date Plans received: **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

Longford Cottage is a timber framed cottage of 16th century appearance with a heavy timber frame with brick infill. It is situated with its gable end to the Bath Road and main entrance with modern porch on the east side with a small gabled extension on its west side. The building was formerly used as a meeting house for The Quakers who began meeting in Longford in 1669. The Quakers sold the building in the late nineteenth century when it was converted to a cottage. The site is not within the Longford Conservation Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

It is proposed to install a close board fence with a hedge in front to the street and re-landscape the site which will include large areas of hard standing and a garage to the rear.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

77891/APP/2023/578

493 BATH ROAD LONGFORD

Erection of a boundary fence and gate, timber double garage and proposed landscaping.

Decision: Refused

Comment on Planning History

Relevant history attached.

This application should be read in conjunction with application with Listed Building Consent: 77891/APP/2023/578.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

109 neighbouring properties were consulted.

One comment of objection was received from Longford Conservation Area Panel:

I am writing on behalf of Longford Conservation Area Advisory Panel. We are extremely disappointed by these proposals, especially as they follow on from the removal of the hedge, trees and gates on the road frontage, and the bulldozing of the whole of the area around the house, and between it and the road, without any attempt to obtain planning permission despite the listed status of the property, and hence of its curtilage. This is all the more regrettable since we understand the building was built as a Quaker Meeting House, and there were numerous human burials and some grave markers in the area between the house and the road. The application form does not appear completely accurate as it says no parking spaces are being created, but a double garage is to be built and the very large shingle area is identified as suitable for vehicles! As the house itself is so small, one must wonder why such an extensive parking area is necessary - unless the applicants are intending to run a profitable side-line in airport parking. This all suggests there may be plans for the use of the property that are not completely above board, explaining why the applicants feel it necessary to install such a high and solid boundary so activities within cannot be seen. We consider the proposed entrance gate and 2m-high front boundary treatment to be inappropriate for a property of this date, especially in this semi-rural setting. Although the boundary is described as a hedge, the drawing of it on the elevation looks as though it is to be grown through or alongside a metal mesh fence like those used round factories to deter intruders. We note the comments from the conservation officer on the enforcement notice recommending 'a simple timber post and rail fence, estate railing or low wall and hedging'; we agree with and support the recommendation. We would also support the reinstallation of the existing gates in the front boundary or, if there is a real need to re-use them elsewhere on the property, we would recommend a traditional wooden five-bar gate, or pair of gates, as widely used in rural areas. For all these reasons we hope this application will be refused unless major revisions are made to it. These comments also apply to application 77891/APP/2023/578.

Conservation Officer:

Prior to the removal of the garden, the listed building had a clearly domestic garden setting with a driveway at the front for parking. This character needs to be reinstated and this proposal does not go far enough. This is mostly due to the proposed garage to the rear which requires an access route and further gates and hedging leaving little room for a soft green landscape setting. The garage should be removed from this proposal and the side and rear laid to a clearly domestic garden character rather than small areas of lawn with mostly planting in boxes.

The hard standing to the front has fallen into a sorry state. It is proposed to use shingle in the areas of previous hard standing which would be acceptable. There would be planting to the sides of the driveway area, some of it in boxes which would also be acceptable although the proposal could still benefit from additional soft landscaping in front of the cottage to separate it and soften views of it within the context of the driveway.

The close board fence to the front is not what was previously recommended and there is concern that this will appear too suburban in this context from the street. Comments relating to the enforcement case had suggested a simple timber post and rail fence as previously or estate railing or alternatively a low wall and hedging. This guidance should be followed in order to best preserve the setting of the listed building. It is noted that there is already some close boarded fencing around the site but a low more rustic boundary to the front would be preferred to preserve the simple cottage character of the setting and reinstate the character that it previously had.

4. Conclusion

Amendments are clearly needed to make this proposal acceptable. If the applicants are unwilling to do so the application should be refused on the grounds that the proposal would be harmful to the setting of the listed building in accordance with Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990, 66 (1) and Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020); DMHB2.

As proposed this application would be harmful to the setting of the listed building, the harm identified to the significance of the listed building is less than substantial harm requiring NPPF 202 test to be applied.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and locality the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden and car parking provision.

Character and Appearance:

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 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 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. It should also not have an adverse impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extensions of dwellings do not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and they should appear subordinate to the main dwelling. It also requires that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Policy DMHD 2: Outbuildings The Council will require residential outbuildings to meet the following criteria: i) the building must be constructed to a high standard of design without compromising the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; ii) the developed footprint of the proposed building must be proportionate to the footprint of the dwelling house and to the residential curtilage in which it stands and have regard to existing trees; iii) the use shall be for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house and not capable for use as independent residential accommodation; and iv) primary living accommodation such as a bedroom, bathroom, or kitchen will not be permitted.

The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted as part of this application, reviewing the original scheme as well as further justification of the proposal. Whilst the scheme could be altered to include more soft landscaping which would be welcome, there is a fundamental issue with the erection of the double garage to the rear.

The garage should be removed from this proposal and the side and rear laid to a clearly domestic garden character rather than small areas of lawn with mostly planting in boxes.

As proposed this application would be harmful to the setting of the listed building, the harm identified to the significance of the listed building is less than substantial harm requiring NPPF 202 test to be applied.

There would be no significant impact on neighbours arising from the proposal. Sufficient off-street parking would be retained.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Harm to the setting of the listed building

The siting and scale of the outbuilding would be harmful to the setting of the listed building, posing harm to its setting, contrary to Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990, 66 (1)

and Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020); DMHB2.

INFORMATIVES

1. In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

Part 1 Policies

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 2 Listed Buildings

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

NPPF16 NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Hardev Gill

Telephone No: 01895 250230