

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: 100 LONG LANE ICKENHAM

Development: Erection of outbuilding to front garden, following demolition of existing outbuilding.

LBH Ref Nos: 54716/APP/2026/479

Drawing Nos: Proposed ground floor and roof plans
Proposed Elevations and Sections
Proposed site layout plan

Date Plans received: 24-02-26 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 03-03-26

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the west side of Long Lane in Ickenham, occupying a triangular-shaped corner plot on the junction of Swakeleys Drive and Long Lane. The site comprises a two-storey detached dwellinghouse with a hipped roof and paved driveway access off Long Lane. The dwelling is set towards the rear of the plot, such that the front garden is larger than the rear garden.

There is an existing single storey detached outbuilding with a dual-pitched roof in the front garden, in the northern corner of the plot, which is screened from the adjacent highway by a 1.8m high close-boarded fence. The existing outbuilding measures 3.4m wide and 6m long (footprint of 20.4sqm) with its long axis orientated along the eastern boundary, i.e. along Long Lane. It has a ridge height of 2.65m and an eaves height of 1.8m.

The site is located in the Ickenham Village Conservation Area, the Hillingdon Air Quality Management Area and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2. The area is mainly residential in character, predominantly comprising detached and semi-detached two-storey dwellings.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks full planning permission for a new outbuilding situated to the front and side of the dwelling, to replace the existing outbuilding.

The new outbuilding would measure 5m x 8.5m (footprint / GEA of 42.5sqm with an internal floor area of 34sqm) with a dual pitched roof with ridge height of 3.4m and an eaves height of 2.55m. The proposed development involves excavation of 0.5m, thus the new outbuilding would be set slightly below the existing ground level.

The new outbuilding would be in the same location as the existing outbuilding, i.e. in a corner position to the front of the plot, however it would be orientated at right angles to the existing building, with its long axis along the northern common boundary with 1 Swakeleys Drive.

The new outbuilding would comprise a sedum grass roof and the external walls would be finished in facing brickwork to match the parent property. The outbuilding would have a main entrance door and patio doors on the south elevation, facing into the site. Internally it would comprise a games room and a storeroom.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

54716/APP/2025/2494 100 LONG LANE ICKENHAM

Erection of outbuilding to front and side, following demolition of existing outbuilding.

Decision: 26-11-2025 Approved

54716/APP/2000/2279 100 LONG LANE ICKENHAM

ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SIDE CONSERVATORY
(INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SIDE GARAGE)

Decision: 05-03-2001 Refused

54716/APP/2000/269 100 LONG LANE ICKENHAM

ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY SIDE
CONSERVATORY (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE)

Decision: 01-08-2000 Refused

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above. It is noted that planning permission was granted on 26-11-25 for an outbuilding measuring 4m x 8.5m (footprint / GEA of 34sqm with an internal floor area of 27sqm) with a dual pitched roof with ridge height of 3.2m and an eaves height of 2.3m.

The current application is for a larger version of that approved.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 11th June 2026

3. Comments on Public Consultations

Six neighbouring properties and Ickenham Residents Association were consulted on 09-03-26. The consultation period expired on 30-03-26.

One objection has been received from a local resident on the following grounds:

- Excessive increase in size, bulk and massing compared to the approved scheme
- Disproportionate in relation to dwelling
- Loss of open outlook and spacious corner plot character
- Visually intrusive siting in front of neighbouring property
- Harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

- Concerns regarding future independent residential use
- Objection to revised orientation/siting of the outbuilding
- Concerns regarding lack of dimensions and excavation/foundation impacts.

Officer Response:

It is acknowledged that the amended proposal represents an increase in the size, bulk and massing over the previously approved outbuilding. It is also acknowledged that the enlarged structure would appear more visually prominent within this exposed corner plot location and would result in a greater erosion of the open and spacious character of the site.

The proposed outbuilding is considered disproportionate in relation to both the host dwelling and the curtilage of the site. Furthermore, by reason of its scale, siting and increased visibility, the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. These matters are discussed in further detail below.

With regard to concerns relating to future independent residential use, whilst no kitchen, bathroom or sleeping accommodation is shown on the submitted plans, this concern is noted.

In relation to the lack of dimensions and concerns regarding excavation/foundation impacts, the Council is satisfied that the submitted plans are sufficiently detailed for the purposes of determining the planning application. Matters relating to structural integrity, excavation methods and foundations are controlled separately and are not material planning considerations.

LBH Conservation & Design Officer:

The previous proposal for the outbuilding comprised smaller footprint, lower height, sedum / green roof, and complementary red brick cladding, matching existing area's prevailing materiality. The previous height was also comparable to the height of the existing structure on site.

The new outbuilding is taller and larger. The proposed materials shown in elevation depicts white render and grey tiled roof. The annotations clarify that the proposed materials are meant to be brick to match existing house and tiled roof to match existing.

The new proposal being taller and larger in footprint would result in greater discernibility as seen from the street which would have greater adverse impacts. The elevations are misleading and should be revised to depict the correct colour tones (matching the existing house - red brick cladding and red tiled roof).

Our preference would be to defer back to the previous proposal given additional adverse impacts, discrepancies and lack of justification.

Officer Response:

The comments from the Conservation and Design Officer are noted. It is agreed that the previously approved scheme under ref. 54716/APP/2025/2494 was less visually prominent. That scheme was considered to be at the upper limit of acceptability for this prominent corner plot site.

The amended proposal increases the footprint and height of the outbuilding, resulting in a bulkier and more visually prominent form of development that would have a greater adverse impact on the open character of the site and the appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is also noted that there are inconsistencies between the annotated materials and the coloured elevations submitted, however these details could be secured by condition. Nonetheless, officers agree that the amended proposal represents an unacceptable increase in bulk and intensification beyond the previously approved scheme.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

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

Part 2 Policies:

LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHD 2	Outbuildings
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF16 -24	NPPF16 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are:

- Principle of Development
- Use of the Outbuilding
- Impact on Character and Appearance / Heritage Impact
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Impact on Highway Safety and Parking.

- Principle of Development

The application site resides within an established residential area wherein appropriate residential development is acceptable, in accordance with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1. The key considerations with respect to the erection of an outbuilding within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse is whether it would remain incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling and is appropriately sited and designed, in this case having regard to the impact on the Conservation Area.

- Use of the Outbuilding

Policy DMHD 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 lists a number of criteria for outbuildings, including that the use of an outbuilding shall be for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house and not be of a scale or layout that would enable their use as independent residential accommodation or for primary living purposes.

The Council aims to safeguard the character and appearance of an area and the amenity of local residents from inappropriate development, such as 'beds in sheds'. The Local Plan clearly states that the Council will strongly resist proposals for detached outbuildings which are considered to:

- i) be capable of independent occupation from the main dwelling and which effectively constitute a separate dwelling in a position where such a dwelling would not be accepted; or
- ii) result in an over dominant and visually obtrusive form of development and as a result have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider locality.

It has been established through case law that the distinctive characteristic of a dwelling house is its ability to afford those who use it, the facilities required for day-to-day private domestic existence (Gravesham BC v SSE & O'Brien). Section 254 of the Housing Act 2004 refers to basic amenities comprising a toilet, personal washing facilities and cooking facilities.

The submitted plans indicate use as a games room and store, which would ordinarily be incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. No kitchen, bathroom or sleeping accommodation is shown. No objection is raised in principle to the stated use.

However, compliance with Policy DMHD 2 also requires assessment of scale, proportionality and design, which are not considered acceptable in this case.

- Impact on Character and Appearance / Heritage Impact

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, Policy D4 of the London Plan, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 seek to ensure that new development harmonises with the surrounding area, and that new development respects adjoining properties in terms of layout, scale, height, bulk and materials.

As outlined above, the site resides within Ickenham Village Conservation Area, wherein Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that local authorities should have special regard to preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets when considering the impact of a proposed development and Policy DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 states that new development within a Conservation Area will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. In accordance with paragraphs 214-215 of the NPPF, any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The site occupies a prominent triangular corner plot at the junction of Long Lane and Swakeleys Drive. The openness of the front/side garden area contributes positively to the spacious suburban character of the site and surrounding street scene.

The previously approved scheme was materially smaller and officers considered that proposal to

represent the maximum scale capable of being accommodated without unacceptable harm. By contrast, the current proposal increases the footprint, bulk and massing to approximately 42.5sq.m and introduces a substantially larger roof form. The enlarged structure would appear highly visible and prominent within this exposed corner position notwithstanding the boundary fencing.

The outbuilding would read as an unduly dominant built form within the front/side curtilage and would erode the open character of the plot. Due to its size and siting, it would compete visually with the host dwelling rather than appearing as a clearly subordinate ancillary structure.

Furthermore, the scale of the building is not considered proportionate to either the footprint of the dwellinghouse or the curtilage in which it stands. As such, the proposal conflicts directly with criterion (ii) of Policy DMHD 2. For these reasons, the development would result in an overdevelopment of the site and would harm the character and appearance of the area.

The excessive scale, bulk and prominence of the proposed outbuilding within this prominent corner plot would fail to preserve the open and spacious character that contributes positively to this part of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would result in less than substantial harm to its significance. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The proposal would provide additional ancillary accommodation for the occupiers of the existing dwelling in the form of a larger games room and storage space. However, these are private benefits and attract very limited weight in the planning balance. The proposal would not deliver any wider public benefits, such as housing, heritage enhancement or other social, economic or environmental benefits. Whilst the replacement of the existing outbuilding would provide a modern ancillary structure, this does not amount to a public benefit sufficient to outweigh the identified less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area.

Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would result in an unduly dominant and disproportionate form of development that would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area, and conflict with criterion (ii) of Policy DMHD 2 by reason of its disproportionate footprint in relation to the host dwelling and its curtilage. The proposal therefore fails to comply with paragraphs 135, 212 and 215 of the NPPF, Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1, and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2.

- Impact on Residential Amenity

Paragraph 135 f) of the NPPF and Policy D3 of the London Plan outline the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 seeks to ensure that new development does not result in a detrimental impact upon adjacent properties and their amenity space in terms of outlook, privacy, amenity and daylight / sunlight.

The outbuilding would provide incidental accommodation that would be tied to the residential use of the main dwelling. As the outbuilding does not represent a separate dwelling, the comings and goings associated with the use of the outbuilding would be limited and not unduly harmful on the amenity of the area.

Given the separation distances, single-storey nature of the building and boundary treatment, the

proposal would not give rise to significant loss of light, outlook or privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

- Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

The parking provision would be unaffected by the proposed development. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not significantly exacerbate the demand for street parking or prejudice highway safety, in accordance with DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2.

- Conclusion

The amended proposal represents an unacceptable enlargement beyond the existing development and the previously approved scheme. By reason of its excessive size, bulk, massing and prominent siting, the development would appear as a dominant and disproportionate outbuilding that would erode the open character of the corner plot and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. It has been identified that the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, which in accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, is not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed outbuilding, by reason of its excessive size, bulk, massing and prominent siting within the front/side curtilage of this prominent corner plot, would appear as an unduly dominant and disproportionate form of development that would fail to remain subordinate to the host dwelling. The development would erode the open and spacious character of the site, be visually intrusive within the street scene, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area, resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The limited public benefits associated with the proposal would not outweigh the identified heritage harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Sections 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraphs 135, 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One (2012), and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020).

INFORMATIVES

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

Part 2 Policies:

LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHD 2	Outbuildings
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF16 -24	NPPF16 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer:	Sally Robbins	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	---------------	----------------------	--------------