

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: GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

Development: Erection of single-storey rear extension and front infill extension
(Retrospective Application)

LBH Ref Nos: 11841/APP/2026/493

Drawing Nos: GRE-09a Rev 1.5
GRE-09b Rev 1.5
GRE-05 Rev 1.5
GRE-06 Rev 1.5
GRE-07 Rev 1.5
GRE-10 Rev 1.5
GRE-11 Rev 1.5
GRE-12 Rev 1.5
GRE-02 Rev 1.5
GRE-03 Rev 1.5
GRE-01 Rev 1.2
Planning Statement
GRE-04 Rev 1.5
GRE-08 Rev 1.5
GRE26 REV 1.0

Date Plans received: 25-02-26

Date(s) of Amendments(s):

Date Application valid 09-03-26

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is a large, detached two storey dwelling set within a 0.809 hectare plot on the western side of Robinwood Grove. Within the curtilage of the site there are several outbuildings, two detached garages, a tennis court and an outdoor swimming pool to the rear. The rear garden of the property backs onto Brunel University sports field. To the front of the site there is a large driveway which leads from Robinwood Grove. The site is situated within the Hillingdon Village Conservation Area and the Metropolitan Green Belt

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the erection of a single-storey rear extension and front infill extension.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

11841/APP/2025/1086 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
EBA INVALID - Variation of Condition (Demolition of Outbuilding) of planning permission ref. 11841/APP/2022/166, dated 08/11/2022 for (Erection of single storey rear extension and front infill extension) to remove condition.

Decision:

11841/PRC/2024/8 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
Erection of single storey rear extension, and front infill extension and Outbuilding.

Decision: 26-03-2025 Withdrawn

11841/PRC/2022/16 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
Single storey rear extension and front infill extension

Decision: 05-04-2023 No Further Action(P)

11841/APP/2022/166 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
Erection of single storey rear extension and front infill extension

Decision: 08-11-2022 Approved

11841/PRC/2019/221 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
extension to existing annex

Decision: 28-02-2022 No Further Action(P)

11841/APP/2019/2915 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
Erection of outbuilding (involving the demolition of existing garage).

Decision: 02-12-2019 Refused

11841/PRC/2018/191 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
Conversion of existing annex into separate dwelling

Decision: 31-12-2018 Objection

11841/PRC/2016/64 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
Proposed extensions and internal alterations

Decision: 23-03-2017 Pre-App Advice Given

11841/APP/2012/2521 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
Details pursuant to conditions 6 and 7 of Planning Permission 11841/APP/2012/1606 dated 29/08/2012 (2 x single storey rear extensions, single storey side extension, single storey front extension, canopy to front, and alterations to all elevation, involving demolition of existing garage to front, existing element to rear and existing canopy to front)

Decision: 06-12-2012 Approved

11841/APP/2012/1606 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

2 x single storey rear extensions, single storey side extension, single storey front extension, canopy to front, and alterations to all elevation, involving demolition of existing garage to front, existing element to rear and existing canopy to front

Decision: 29-08-2012 Approved

11841/APP/2012/832 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

2 x single storey rear extensions, single storey side extension, single storey front extension, canopy to front and alterations to windows and doors, involving demolition of existing garage to front, existing element to rear and existing canopy to front

Decision: 12-06-2012 Refused

11841/APP/2011/1018 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON
FOUR DWELLINGS

Decision: 22-06-2011 No Further Action(P)

11841/APP/2010/261 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

Conversion of existing two storey dwelling to 4 two- bedroom dwellings, involving conversion of integral garage at front to habitable use with a first floor extension above, 2 new front porches, alterations to elevations and associated parking, provision for an eco friendly nature garden with separate access and parking.

Decision: 30-04-2010 Refused

11841/APP/2008/3505 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

CONVERSION OF DWELLING TO 1, ONE BEDROOM FLAT, 3, TWO BEDROOM FLATS AND TWO HOUSES INVOLVING A FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION AND NEW FRONT PORCH AND ASSOCIATED PARKING AND AMENITY SPACE AND MODIFICATION OF EXISTING ACCESS INCLUDING INSTALLATION OF ELECTRONICALLY CONTROLLED ACCESS SYSTEM

Decision: 13-02-2009 Refused

11841/APP/2008/2456 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

Conversion of dwelling to 1 x 1 bedroom flat, 3 x 2 bedroom flats and 2 houses involving a first floor side extension and new front porch and associated parking and amenity space.

Decision: 29-10-2008 Refused

11841/PRE/2005/81 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

T P PRE - CORRES: REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE

Decision:

11841/APP/2001/1761 GREENSLEEVES ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY CONSERVATORY (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)

Decision: 01-10-2001 Approved

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 7th May 2026

3. Comments on Public Consultations

31 neighbouring properties have been consulted by letter dated 1.4.26. A site notice was also displayed which expired on 7.5.26

1 letter of objection has been received raising concerns about the scale of the building and the significant number of traffic movements associated with the use of the property.

Conservation Officer - The additional extension would not impact on the conservation area its self however the officer should consider if the removal of the garage is necessary to protect the character of the area and prevent it appearing over developed.

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

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
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management
DMEI 4	Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land
NPPF13 -24	NPPF13 2024 - Protecting Green Belt land

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene, whether the proposal preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the impact on the Green Belt, the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden and car parking provision.

Character and Appearance:

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.

More specifically to this proposal, Policies HE1, DMHB 1 and DMHB 4 are relevant given that the site forms part of the Hillingdon Village Conservation Area. These three policies relate specifically to heritage assets and conservation areas, seeking to avoid harm to heritage assets and ensure the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Other development management policies including Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that alterations and extensions to dwellings should not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

With specific regard to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

- 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;

The constructed single storey rear infill extension measures at max approximately 15.76 metres wide, 7 metres deep and a maximum height of 2.92 metres high. It is acknowledged that the constructed single storey rear extension would not be in accordance with Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

With regards to front extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

- i) alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor, and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused;
- ii) porches should be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building; pastiche features will not be supported; and
- iii) notwithstanding the above, at least 25% of the front garden must be retained.

The constructed single storey front infill extension measures at max approximately 7.1 metres wide, 4 metres deep and a maximum height of 2.82 metres high. It is acknowledged that the constructed

single storey front infill extension would be in accordance with Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

The proposed rear extension would be a vast addition to the building and the 7m depth of the extension would be contrary to policy DMHD 1B(ii), Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (HLPP2, January 2020). Cumulatively the existing and proposed extensions would fail to remain proportionate to the original building, more than doubling its footprint.

However it is noted that the rear elevation of Greensleeves has been heavily altered and the new addition provides some continuity and improvement to the design. Further the established character of this property is a large detached dwelling which shares few key characteristics or building lines with other properties nearby, given its very nature. The extension, whilst large, would preserve the character and appearance of the building and wider conservation area for this reason, as it sets its own character in context.

The proposed infill extension to the front, between an existing garage and side extension would further develop the site to the front. The addition to the front would be acceptable and would have the added benefit of removing an unattractive outbuilding to the front which the Conservation Officer notes as "detracting".

The extensions are constructed with matching materials to the existing, the extension and this has been secured by condition. Overall, they would be proportionate to the dwelling in terms of character and appearance and preserve the conservation area.

Officers note that the extensions themselves have been previously approved under conditional application reference 11841/APP/2022/166. As such, the extensions would not be detrimental to the form, proportion and appearance of the dwelling, character and appearance of the area and the visual amenities of the streetscene, or wider Conservation Area.

Green Belt

Policy DMEI 4: Development in the Green Belt or on Metropolitan Open Land

A) Inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances.

B) Extensions and redevelopment on sites in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will be permitted only where the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, and the purposes of including land within it, than the existing development, having regard to:

- i) the height and bulk of the existing building on the site;
- ii) the proportion of the site that is already developed; iii) the footprint, distribution and character of the existing buildings on the site;
- iv) the relationship of the proposal with any development on the site that is to be retained; and
- v) the visual amenity and character of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.

Policy G2 (A) of the London Plan (2021) states 'The Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development: 1) development proposals that would harm the Green Belt should be refused except where very special circumstances exist'.

It is noted that the existing area of the dwelling is 567m², historically the original dwelling would have been approximately 461sq.m, as established in previous planning applications. It was evident that there has been much change at the property over time, but this figure is not disputed.

The site is located in the Metropolitan Green Belt. The NPPF 2024 provides the most up to date planning guidance for how development in the Green Belt should be treated. It is therefore considered to be a significant material consideration. Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states that 'A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are...c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The previously approved application reference 11841/APP/2022/166 for the same extensions included revisions to include the demolition of an existing outbuilding which totals 70m². This resulted in a change to the overall percentage increase of 268m² in area, which is 47.3% of the original, and 666m³ which is 54.2% of original. The volumetric calculation was considered, in the context of the site, siting and position of extensions to be acceptable, on balance.

The demolition of the outbuilding was secured by way of condition in order to offset the impact of the development on the Green Belt. It has been explained to the applicants planning agent that there was an excessive amount of built form on the site and cumulatively this would be likely to be classed as inappropriate development by definition. The removal of this outbuilding offsets this harm and has the added benefit of opening the site to the front in a more sensitive location, thereby preserving a degree of openness providing a positive contribution to the Green Belt. Condition 3 of planning permission reference 11841/APP/2022/166 was therefore imposed as follows:

Within 3 months of the date planning permission is granted, the outbuilding shown on plan GRE-02a Rev 1.5 shall be demolished and all resultant materials, debris, fixtures and fittings shall be removed from site.

REASON

To offset the cumulative impact of the extensions and to maintain the openness of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, in accordance with Policy DMEI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).

Notwithstanding this significant numerical increase, it is recognised that assessing proportionality is primarily an objective test based on size, and that floorspace is not the only possible measure of the degree of change. It is instructive to compare any changes to the original physical size and scale of a building, including the degree of bulk or mass that might be added. The proposed extensions would be set amongst and adjacent to existing built form at the property and incorporate material finishes to match. However, they would increase the overall depth and projection of the property which would increase the overall footprint. Nevertheless, given the benefit of the outbuilding being removed to the front of the site, and the existing built form, this is acceptable.

The NPPF states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence, and a fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The consideration of openness can have a spatial and visual dimension.

The current application seeks retrospective planning permission for the same extensions as previously approved, but excludes the frontage outbuilding from the application red edged site boundary. The applicant has submitted information to confirm the separate sale of the outbuilding on 25 October 2024. Land registry titles have been submitted to confirm this. Officers note that there is no council tax listing for an annexe or separate dwelling. The planning unit has therefore been subdivided and the matter referred to planning enforcement for investigation.

The proposed extensions would extend the depth of the property, and alter its footprint however, these changes with the removal of the outbuilding would not significantly add to the bulk and mass

of the dwelling. However, in combination with the retention of the outbuilding, the proposed additions result in a loss of spatial openness to a harmful degree.

The proposed extensions, in combination with the retained outbuilding, by virtue of their cumulative size, scale, bulk and spread across the site, is considered to significantly increase the built up appearance of the site and therefore represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt in terms of the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework which is harmful by definition to its open character and appearance. Furthermore, there are no very special circumstances provided or which are evident which either singularly or cumulatively justify the development which would overcome the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The development is therefore harmful to the Green Belt, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024); Policy G2 (A) of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DME1 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Development Management Policies (2020) .

Residential Amenity:

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon 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: ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Perspolis House, Robinwood Grove is located to the north-west of property and is a detached bungalow property located on the South-Western side of Robinwood Grove. To the south of the site is a privately gated estate, mainly consisting of flats. Notably 3 Robinwood Grove is the closest to the proposal.

Given the site context and plot size of the dwelling it is considered that the development would not adversely impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, in terms of daylight/sunlight, outlook and overbearing effect.

Overall, it is considered that the single storey rear extension would not adversely effect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

Light and outlook:

It is considered that all the resulting habitable room, and those altered by extension, maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

External Amenity Space Provision:

More than a sufficient amount of private amenity space will be retained to meet the minimum standards set out in Table 5.3 (Private Outdoor Amenity Space Standards) of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020). The proposal therefore, would not undermine the provision of external amenity space, in accordance with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

Parking and Highway Safety:

The parking provision would remain unaffected by the proposal, in accordance with Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion

Whilst the extensions themselves have been previously supported by the Council under planning reference 11841/APP/2022/166, the consent was justified on the grounds that the scheme involved the removal of this outbuilding to offset the harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Without the removal of this outbuilding, officers consider that the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and accordingly the application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed extensions, in combination with the retained outbuilding, by virtue of their cumulative size, scale, bulk and spread across the site, is considered to significantly increase the built up appearance of the site and therefore represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt in terms of the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework which is harmful by definition to its open character and appearance. Furthermore, there are no very special circumstances provided or which are evident which either singularly or cumulatively justify the development which would overcome the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The development is therefore harmful to the Green Belt, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024); Policy G2 (A) of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DME1 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Development Management Policies (2020) .

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.

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

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
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
EM6	(2012) Flood Risk Management
DMEI 4	Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land
NPPF13 -24	NPPF13 2024 - Protecting Green Belt land

Contact Officer:	Nicola Taplin	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	---------------	----------------------	--------------