

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:	4 ALMOND AVENUE ICKENHAM MIDDLESEX	
Development:	Erection of a single storey side & part single, part double storey rear extension and Enlargement of loft space to form habitable accommodation including 2 side dormers.	
LBH Ref Nos:	61421/APP/2025/2697	
Drawing Nos:	Pottle_4AlmondAve L.01 4463/01 L.02 L.03	
Date Plans received:	21-10-25	Date(s) of Amendments(s):
Date Application valid	28-10-25	

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the northern side of Almond Avenue and comprises a mid-20th-century detached property within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. The existing property is simply characterised, it includes a double-height, projecting bay window to the front with hung tiles between the ground and first-floor window. The front elevation is finished in an exposed red brick, and the rest of the property is finished in a pebble dash render. A hipped, clay tile roof contributes to the roofscape alongside a projecting chimney stack. The property is set back from the main road with a dwarf brick boundary wall to the front in keeping with other properties along Almond Avenue.

The site does not contain any Listed Buildings. There are no trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order within the site or on adjoining land. The site falls within Flood Zone 1.

Detached and semi-detached family-sized dwellings characterise the immediate setting of the site. The neighbouring properties at numbers 3 and 5 Almond Avenue are east and west of the site, respectively.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Erection of a single storey side & part single, part double storey rear extension and Enlargement of loft space to form habitable accommodation including 2 side dormers.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

61421/APP/2024/2854 4 ALMOND AVENUE ICKENHAM MIDDLESEX

Construction of a single-storey side extension and two-storey rear extension

Decision: 06-02-2025 Approved

61421/APP/2020/3858 4 ALMOND AVENUE ICKENHAM MIDDLESEX

Single storey side and part two storey, part single storey rear extension

Decision: 10-02-2021 Refused

61421/PRC/2020/141 4 ALMOND AVENUE ICKENHAM MIDDLESEX

Two storey side extension; rear extension ; raising ridge; new roof and dormer.

Decision: 04-09-2020 Objection

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 26th November 2025

3. Comments on Public Consultations

10 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter dated 29-10-25. Consultation expired on 19-11-25.

2 External objections were received which stated:

- Impact on neighbouring privacy - side windows

The proposed first-floor and ground-floor side windows facing No. 3 Almond Avenue raise concerns regarding loss of privacy. To mitigate this, these windows should be fitted with obscured glazing and restricted to top-hung openings only.

- Impact on neighbouring privacy - rear rooflight

The rooflight positioned at the rear apex of the roof could result in overlooking of No. 3 Almond Avenue's garden and private amenity space. Obscured glazing is required to prevent loss of privacy.

- Impact on character and appearance of the Conservation Area

The proposed enlargement of the loft would materially alter the overall appearance of the dwelling. The development would be visible from the front elevation and would appear as a dominant and incongruous addition, failing to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original building and surrounding properties within the Conservation Area.

- Scale and massing of the revised rear extension

The change from the previously approved scheme (single-storey side and part two-storey/part single-storey rear extension) to a full two-storey rear extension is considered unacceptably imposing. The proposal would result in a loss of outlook and have an overbearing effect on the occupiers of neighbouring properties and their private amenity space .

An objection from the Ickenham Residents Society was also received which said:

- This property lies within the village conservation area and this application will change the Street

View.

- The previous application 2024/2854 was the source of the of the side extension which is now to be demolished, but this is not clear from the submitted Design & Access Statement, which indicates that the development of this extension is incomplete.
- The submitted Plan states that the rear and side extensions mentioned in the description are those covered by 2024/2854, but that does not cover the enlargement of the roof space for habitable accommodation which is all that is covered by the current Application. This development of the roof space will result in a significant change to the Street View, beyond that already approved under 2854.

Internal Comments:

Conservation and Design:

- We object to the proposals. The two dormers to both flank elevations are out of keeping and potential creating privacy issues for the neighbours. The surrounding group of matching buildings are unaltered. The proposed dormers would be detrimental to the overall group of similarly designed buildings.
- Provided the rear extension does not create any amenity issues, the rear extension would be accepted provided it follows the same flank building line as the host building and is subordinate in height and massing. There are concerns the porch fails to respect the character of the host building. It should be a lighter weight design.

OVERALL OFFICER comments:

- The neighbourhood amenity will be assessed below.
- The impact and the character on the conservation area will also be assessed below in line the planning policies and assessed accordingly.
- Under s72 the conservation and design teams special regard to preserving the conservation area is considered below.
- It is paramount that extensions and alterations align with policy DMHD 1 and that they are designed to a good calibre and therefore will be assessed below.

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 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth

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:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) states:

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users⁵¹; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

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

Policy 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.

With regard to side extensions Policy DMHD1 requires:

- i) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property;
- ii) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded;
- iii) garages should reflect the size guidelines set out in Appendix C Parking standards; iv) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary or in the case of properties in the Copse Wood and Gatehill Estates, at least 1.5 metres, but more if on a wider than average plot, in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses;
- v) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation;
- vi) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported; and
- vii) in Conservation Areas, single storey side extensions may be required to be set back.

With regard to roof extensions Policy DMHD1 requires:

- i) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line;
- ii) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;
- iii) raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported;
- iv) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling; and v) in Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character and on Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, roof extensions should take the form of traditional 'dormer' windows, on the rear elevation, to harmonise with the existing building. The highest point of the

dormer should be kept well within the back roof slope, away from the ridge, eaves or valleys, whilst each window should match the proportions, size and glazing pattern of the first floor windows.

Side extension:

The scheme proposed a side extension which would be located on the west on the property measuring approximately, 1.8m in width, 12m in depth (joining the rear to form a wrap around on the ground floor) and 3.34m in height. This element would sit approx 0.2m from the shared boundary with 5 Almond Avenue. The roof would include 5 conservation style rooflights. Number 5 Almond Avenue was previously given planning permission for a similar development in 2017 (36448/APP/2017/3829) which was renewed recently under planning permission (61421/APP/2024/2854). Given this, alongside the established principle of such extension on the street, this element is acceptable and compliant with DMHD 1.

Rear extension:

A part single storey and part double storey rear extension is proposed to the rear of the property.

The single storey element measures approximately 8.19m in width, 4m in depth and 3.84m in height. This element is compliant with Policy DMHD1 whereby rear extensions on detached dwellings allow a depth of 4m. As this overall design is in line with the recently approved scheme, there is no objection from the Conservation Officer. This overall design follows on from the Inspector's finding under Appeal decision APP/R5510/D/21/3270366 whereby the Inspectorate concluded that the rear extension would complement the features of the existing house in regard to its roof design.

Internally this will join the side element to form a wrap around feature which is acceptable.

The two storey rear element would measure approximately, 3m in depth on the boundary to the E3E2SWX/8*/89°ast, 4.16m on the West and 6.44m in width, 6.95m in height with a pitched roof and sit below the original height of the roof profile. The double storey side element would be set in by approx. 2m from the side boundary to the West (No 5 Almond Av.). There is no information regarding the 45 degree line and how this would impact the neighbouring property on the East that has been submitted the application. However, given the modest increase in depth of 3m on the building line combined with the lack of visibility from the street profile, this element is acceptable.

The overall design of both single and two storey elements is also in line with the allowed appeal decision (APP/R5510/D/21/3270366) where the Inspector found the rear extension to be complementary to the features of the existing house with regard to roof design.

Roof Dormers

The scheme proposes two large side dormers which would measure approximately, 2.75m in width when seen from the front elevation, 2.5m in height and 1.93m in depth. Whilst the principle of additional accommodation within the roofspace may be acceptable in some circumstances, the Council's design approach within conservation areas seeks to ensure that additions do not erode the simplicity and integrity of the original roof form. In this instance, the side dormers would disrupt the continuity of roof slopes and introduce visually intrusive roof alterations.

The application property forms part of a coherent group of mid-20th century dwellings which share common architectural characteristics, including a consistent hipped roof form and generally uninterrupted side roof slopes. This consistency creates a uniform roofscape and contributes

positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area, where the simplistic roof forms are an important element of the area's townscape quality.

Whilst the side dormers, would be set lower than that of the existing roof profile, the size, density and visibility, given the formation of the roof profile of the host dwelling; the dormers add significant visual impact and bulk of the development.

The two side dormers would result in an unacceptable cumulative impact on the roof form. The dormers would interrupt the previously unbroken side roof planes and would appear as discordant additions when viewed within the street scene, including oblique views along the road.

The resultant form would appear overly complex and would detract from the restrained character of the host property and the wider group of properties that the dwelling forms apart of. These properties, maintain their unique characteristic retaining a consistent roofscape.

Taken as a whole, the development would fail to respect the architectural integrity of the dwelling, and cumulatively, the dormer roof extensions would dominate the original dwelling resulting in incongruous additions to the street scene. It is noted that there are no similar side dormers on within this group of dwellings, especially since the current adopted local plan and the proposal of side dormers is contrary to Hillingdon Local Plan Planning Policies. The proposal would adversely affect the character, pattern of development and appearance of the surrounding environment

It is also recognised that the roof element would appear prominent and this harm has also been identified by the Conservation officer. The overall prominence of the roof within the street scene, the proposal would erode the building's architectural integrity and failing to preserve its overall contribution to the Conservation Area. The loss of the original hipped roof form, combined with the introduction of an oversized and unsympathetic roof addition, would materially harm the character and appearance of the designated asset. This harm carries significant weight, and no public benefits have been identified that would outweigh it. The dormer overspill to the sides causes overbearing issues as the gap is a paramount feature of the properties in the area. The visual harm is considered sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission.

Therefore, the proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, scale, bulk, height, and design of the dormer, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance, and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Furthermore, it would result in an incongruous and cramped appearance, which would erode the prevailing gap between dwellinghouses and harm the character and appearance of the original dwellinghouse and street scene and the conservation area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and DMHB 4.

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.

The occupants of the adjoining property have requested that the levels of light and privacy should not be reduced. Officers are mindful that the ground floor extension has been previously approved by the Council. The submitted plans do not show a 45 degree line would not be breached from the centre point of the nearest first floor rear facing window. It is noted that the Inspectorate previously found the scheme acceptable in terms of neighbours amenity. The Inspectorate found that the proposed extensions provide reasonable setbacks from neighbouring properties, and the proposed first floor element would comply with the 45 degree line of sight rule under DMHD1.

Number 5 Almond Avenue is located to the west and has previously been extended to the side and rear. The side and rear elements as proposed in this application would be located closest to this neighbour. However, given the 0.2m approximate set off from the boundary, combined with the acceptable height of the side and rear element, the neighbourhood amenity concern is limited.

Number 3 Almond Avenue is located to the east of the host dwelling and the rear single and two storey element would sit closest to this neighbour. This neighbour has previously been extended through various applications including, 2005, 2004 and 2012 to the sides and the rear. The scheme proposes a side window on the ground floor rear element which may result in privacy concerns. In an event of an approval this window would be conditioned to be obscure glazed. The double storey rear element however, seems to align with the current footprint of the dwelling given the extended building line and therefore there are no concerns in that element.

The dormers; would not cause significant harm to neighbours amenity. Were they acceptable in design form, obscure glazing non-opening condition would be required to ensure they protect adjoining neighbours amenity.

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 redevelopment, the rear garden would retain adequate amount of private amenity space.

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 for the reasons as outlined above.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the introduction of two side dormer extensions, would result in an unacceptable and visually intrusive alteration to the original roof form of the host dwelling. The dormers would interrupt the previously unbroken side roof slopes through their cumulative impact which would erode the simple and coherent roofscape of this group of mid-20th century properties, thereby appearing as discordant additions within the street scene. Overall, the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of Ickenham Village Conservation Area causing less than substantial harm to the conservation area without any notable public benefit. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policies DMHB 4, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020).

INFORMATIVES

1. 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) (2024) and national guidance.

DMHB Design of New Development
11

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB Streets and Public Realm
12

DMHB Private Outdoor Amenity Space
18

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

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 Policies

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

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

Contact Officer:

Sharon Singh

Telephone No: