

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: 10 THE GREENWAY ICKENHAM

Development: Erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension and a porch, following demolition of existing garage.

LBH Ref Nos: 79332/APP/2025/1943

Drawing Nos: Site Location Plan
MP. 2230
MP. 2224
MP. 2225
MP. 2228

Date Plans received:	21-07-25	Date(s) of Amendments(s):	21-07-25
			21-07-25
Date Application valid	30-07-25		21-07-25
			21-07-25

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached property located on a prominent corner plot of The Greenway, Ickenham. The property is set back from the main road by an area of soft landscaping and off street parking. To the side of the dwelling is a detached garage structure. The property is finished in a mix of white render and brickwork.

The surrounding area is residential in character comprising mainly two storey semi-detached and detached properties, each uniquely designed.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension and a porch, following demolition of existing garage.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

79332/PRC/2025/44 10 THE GREENWAY ICKENHAM

Erection of a single storey front extension and part single, part double storey side extension (revised drawings received 28/04/25)

Decision: 13-05-2025 Objection

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

Pre-application advice was sought from the LPA whereby the scheme was objected to.

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

12 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 05-08-25. Consultation expired on 27-08-25.

2 Objections were received that stated the following:

1. Boundary & Setback Concerns

- Extension shown as being built hard up against the boundary.
- Request for at least a 1m setback from the shared boundary.
- Concern about oppressive and overbearing impact if built flush against the boundary.

2. Inconsistencies in Submitted Plans

- Two different proposed first-floor layouts:
- MP.2224 / MP.2228: narrower first floor with set-backs (preferred).
- MP.2226: full-width first floor with no set-backs (opposed).
- Contradicting roof plans (flat vs. pitched roof) create confusion.
- Request that wider / full-width version be withdrawn.

3. Structural & Construction Impacts

- Concerns about excavation and footings affecting stability of other properties.
- Lack of information on retaining works and protection of neighbouring property during and after construction.
- Request for full structural plans and assurance of safeguarding measures.

4. Daylight and Sunlight Impacts

- Daylight/Sunlight Assessment criticised as theoretical, computer-generated, and based only on external modelling without access to neighbouring property.
- underestimates the impact on living spaces

- Rear garden (loss of natural light, overshadowing, risk of damp, loss of enjoyment of planting and wildlife).

- Belief that impacts on mental health and wellbeing have not been adequately considered.
- Suggestion that applicants should commission an independent assessment from within No. 12 itself.

5. Health, Lifestyle & Wellbeing

- Loss of natural daylight and outlook would reduce quality of life and mental health.

6. Procedural Concerns

- Late awareness of application due to postal delays and communication gaps.
- Insufficient consultation time to fully assess impacts.

7. Right to Light & Property Value

Officer comments;

1. Boundary & Setback

- Noted concerns regarding proximity to boundary. These comments will be taken into account in the assessment of scale, massing, and impact.

2. Plan Inconsistencies

- Acknowledged that different plan versions have been submitted. The application was clear that with the description of plans proposed. A further set of drawings showed the pre-app drawings which are not subject to the assessment.

3. Structural & Construction Issues

- Matters relating to construction methods, excavation, and retaining walls fall outside planning control. These are covered by Building Regulations and the Party Wall Act.

4. Daylight/Sunlight Assessment

The submitted report will be reviewed against BRE guidance. While planning cannot require internal access, Officers will carefully consider potential impacts on neighbouring amenity.

5. Health, Lifestyle & Wellbeing

- Noted. - the key assessment concerns for domestic householder extension would relate to the design and impact on neighbour amenity - whilst acknowledging the health and wellbeing of nearby residents, it would not form a material consideration in the assessment.

6. Procedural Concerns

- The statutory consultation requirements have been met.

7. Right to Light & Property Value

- The Right to Light is a civil matter, not a planning consideration. Property value is also not a planning matter.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking

LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
NPPF4 -24	NPPF4 2024 - Decision making

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the proposal's design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact on the streetscene and locality, the impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties, the reduction in the size of the rear garden, highways impact, and car parking provision.

Character and Appearance:

Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) require development proposals to be high quality and enhance the local context, delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness.

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

Policy DMHB 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.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

With regard to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 requires:

- i) single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth or 3.6 metres where the plot width is 5 metres or more; ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- iii) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level;
- iv) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet;
- v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;
- vi) two storey extensions should not extend into an area provided by a 45-degree line of sight drawn from the centre of the nearest ground or first floor habitable room window of an adjacent property and should not contain windows or other openings that overlook other houses at a distance of less than 21 metres;
- vii) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the

particular character of the existing house;

viii) pitched roofs on extensions should be of a similar pitch and materials to that of the original roof and subordinate to it in design. Large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported; and
ix) full width two storey rear extensions are not considered acceptable in designated areas or as extensions to Listed Buildings or Locally Listed Buildings.

The existing property is unique in its appearance, located on a prominent corner plot position readily available from multiple public vantage points. The property is located on a triangular shaped island plot which differs to the surrounding properties which have benefited from extensions. The unique nature of the plot means that the extension along the side reads more as a rear extension.

The original property is designed with a half gable end roof and half hipped roof which integrates with the attached neighbouring property No.12. Whilst many of the surrounding properties do benefit from extensions, these properties differ in design to the application site and as such, any proposed extension should respect the architectural style and size of the existing property. Number 8 The Greenway is located south east of the application site and has benefited from multiple extensions, however it is important to note the differences between the two sites. No.8 is located on a relatively square plot which is deeper and wider than the application site and the as built extensions are adequately proportionate to the size and shape of the plot and do not appear overly cramped.

The proposed part single, part double storey extension would infill the south eastern corner which currently maintains a vital spacious gap. It is noted that the level of development has been reduced from the pre-app submission with the depth of both the ground and first floor element now approximately 4m in depth. Along the street scene, the two storey element would be set down from the main front roof and set back from the facade with the design matching the overall architectural style of the dwelling.

It would have on side box window that would face onto the The Greenway. This element would be set in 1m from the side boundary. Overall the part single, part two storey element would be acceptable from a design perspective. Whilst it is noted that it would infill a proportion of the south eastern corner, the main private amenity space service the site would be situated towards the north west. The design along the street scene would also appear sympathetic to the main dwelling.

The proposal also includes a single storey extension to the east elevation which would be 1.5m in width and 3m in depth with a height 3.4m. This element would be subordinate to the host dwelling but would not completely comply with Policy DMHD1 as there is not set back from the front building line. However, given the subordinate nature of this element would be considered appropriate on balance. This element would also be set in from the side boundary and is therefore acceptable on balance.

In design terms the proposal complies with the overarching aims of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), and Policies DMHD1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) states that developments should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy, and amenity. Policy D6 states the site layout, orientation, and design of dwellings should provide privacy and adequate daylight for residents.

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

Officers note that concerns have been raised regarding the overdevelopment of the site, loss of light and overbearing impact.

The nearest neighbour would be situated at No 12 The Greenway and Officers note the proposed first floor extension would breach the 45 degree line. It is noted that the first floor element has been amended from the pre-app submission whereby it would be located closer to the common boundary with No 12 The Greenway. A concern had been raised through the pre-app regarding potential impact on neighbours amenity. In support of the application, a daylight sunlight assessment has been undertaken by the applicant which confirms that the windows serving the adjoining neighbour would meet the VSC daylight and APSH testing as recommended within the BRE Daylight Sunlight Guidance.

Whilst Officers note these findings, there remains concerns regarding the overall depth of the first floor element, its proximity to the common boundary with No 12 The Greenway. These concerns relates to the impact on the neighbours outlook, sense of enclosure from both the habitable windows adjacent the boundary as well as their private garden area.

The projection beyond the neighbouring property would lead to a sense of enclosure and dominant form of development from this neighbour space. This would lead to a oppressive living environment for the adjoining resident due to the height and depth in close proximity to the boundary.

Furthermore, given the overall limited depth of the rear garden serving No 12 The Greenway, it further exasperates this sense of enclosure and dominance. As such, Officers consider that the proposed extension would result in an undue harm to the amenity of the occupants of this property.

Number 8 The Greenway is located south east of the application site and is separated from the host property. This neighbour has no side facing habitable room windows and there are no side facing windows proposed and as such it is not considered that the proposed development would cause any loss of privacy or overlooking. The proposed development would replace an existing detached garage and it is not considered there would be any significant loss of light or overshadowing.

Overall, concerns are raised regarding the potential impact on the amenities of No.12 The Greenway in terms of overbearing impact and potential loss of light/overshadowing. Given this, officer do not support this application as it would not comply DMHD 1.

Outdoor Amenity Space:

Policy D6 of The London Plan (2021) requires a minimum of five sq. m. of private outdoor space for one- to two-person dwellings and an extra one sq. m. for each additional occupant.

Policy DMHD 1 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that, vi) adequate garden space is retained, while Policy DMHB 18 states that developers should provide amenity space in accordance with Table 5.3 of the local plan. Table 5.3 requires developments to provide between 40 and 100 sq. m. of private outdoor amenity space, dependent on the number of bedrooms within the property. It should be well-located, well-designed, and usable for the private enjoyment of the occupier.

Following the development, the garden to the north west would remain unaffected. This appears to represent the main private amenity space and is screened from the street by mature landscaping. On this ground the loss of private amenity space along the south east corner is acceptable.

The proposed development would comply with Policy D6 of The London Plan (2021) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 18, and Table 5.3 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

Highways and Parking:

The highway and parking provision would remain unaffected by the proposal..

Conclusion

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NONSC Neighbour Amenity

The development, by reason of the cumulative size, scale, and design would result in a visually dominant form of development that would be detrimental to the neighbouring amenities of No 12 Greenway creating an overbearing impact on the main habitable rooms and private amenity space serving this property which results in loss of outlook and sense of enclosure and therefore conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of The London Plan(2021) and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

INFORMATIVES

1. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
2. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

DMHB Design of New Development

11

DMHB Private Outdoor Amenity Space
18

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF4 - NPPF4 2024 - Decision making
24

Standard Informatives

1. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
2. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance..

Part 1 Polices

Part 2 Polices:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
NPPF4 -24	NPPF4 2024 - Decision making

Contact Officer:

Sharon Singh

Telephone No: