

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 ALBANY CLOSE ICKENHAM	
Development:	Erection of first floor extension and associated alterations to allow for part-conversion of roof space to habitable use	
LBH Ref Nos:	79843/APP/2025/3245	
Drawing Nos:	PP-14584665v1 MS29201 MS29203 MS29204 MS29205 MS29202 HS.01.26	
Date Plans received:	23-12-25	Date(s) of Amendments(s):
Date Application valid	22-01-26	

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application relates to a single storey, detached residential property located at the end of Albany Close, a small cul-de-sac accessed off Swakeleys Drive, Ickenham. The property is of brick construction with a pitched tile roof, and is characterised by feature gable projections to the front and rear elevations. The property benefits from an integrated single garage to the front and has an existing single storey projection to the rear. It has off-street parking to the front and a modest, shallow garden to the rear.

The property is located within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area, which along Swakeleys Drive is generally characterised by two storey detached and semi-detached properties on generous plots, within a verdant streetscape. As a more recent backland development, Albany Close exhibits a different character, that is more compact and confined. It comprises of five detached residential properties, with the four forming the end of the cul-de-sac (including the application property) being single storey in nature and of a similar design and appearance, incorporating feature front gables. As a two storey dwelling, no. 1 Albany Close is the exception, however given its closer proximity to Swakeleys Drive this distinguishes it from the application site and its adjacent neighbours.

There are no other relevant constraints at the site.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for the construction of a first floor extension to part of the existing dwelling, atop the existing garage and rear projection. The extension would establish a first floor at the property, for use as a study and a further bedroom.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

Comment on Planning History

There is no relevant planning history at the site.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 25th February 2026

3. Comments on Public Consultations

Five neighbouring properties and the Ickenham Residents Association were consulted on the application. This neighbour consultation period expired on 17.02.2026. A press advertisement and site notice were also issued/displayed, with the consultation periods for these expiring on 25.02.2026 and 27.02.2026 respectively. In total, three representations were received, objecting to the proposal based on concerns over:

- Development out of character, incongruous in appearance, would change the character of the close
- Impact on neighbour amenity; overlooking/loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearingness
- Sets a precedent for other first floor extensions, further impacting the character of the close and neighbour privacy
- Exacerbates an already existing shortage of bungalows within the Borough

Officer Comments: Impacts relating to character/appearance and neighbour amenity are discussed within the relevant sections below. The application would convert a bungalow into a two storey dwelling; whilst the comment regarding a shortage of bungalows is noted, in planning terms the Council has no specific policy that would prevent such a conversion, in and of itself.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES:

Conservation Officer:
Comment.

"a. The site is located within an area of what can be considered legacy backland development. This raises the question of whether such development should, in principle, remain subordinate to the townscape of the primary street from which it originates (Swakeleys Drive).

b. The site's position at the end of the cul-de-sac renders it a prominent feature - a focal point for the cul-de-sac, increasing its visual sensitivity.

c. While No. 1 provides a two-storey precedent within the Close, its proximity to the Swakeleys Drive junction distinguishes it from the application site, where the flanking properties are mostly exclusively single-storey.

d. An approval here would likely establish a precedent for upward extension across the remaining single-storey plots within the Close.

e. As one of the smaller plots in the Close, ground-level expansion may significantly deplete the

remaining private amenity space located at rear. Upward extension, therefore, appears to be the sensible way to densify, should such densification be considered acceptable in its principle.

f. The current low-eave design may result in compromised internal head height. The officer should consider whether a higher eave level is required for quality of accommodation, and if so, how that impact affects the external bulk.

g. There is a concern that an upward extension to two storeys may appear incongruous given the single-storey character of the immediate neighbours and the site's prominent position as a terminal focal point. However, this impact may be mitigated by the modest scale of the proposal and change, as well as the use of blending materials and architectural features. Should the officer find the proposal acceptable in principle, a key consideration remains the tension between maintaining this low profile and ensuring a high standard of internal accommodation, given the restricted head height currently proposed. Whether the proposal strikes an appropriate balance between sympathetic character preservation and gentle densification is a matter of planning judgment for the case officer.

h. There is a concern regarding the proposed rear window and its potential for significant overlooking of Nos. 38 42 Halford Road. The officer should evaluate if this requires relocation, redirection, or other mitigation (e.g. obscured glazing or other) to design out privacy issues. Please note, this window is likely to overlook both other habitable room windows and the private amenity gardens of those other plots.

i. The Close maintains a high degree of visual uniformity in brickwork and detailing (e.g., timber shutters, fascia / barge boards, consistent palette of colours and materials for the front entrances, garage doors, and other elements / features). To blend in with the local character, it is recommended that any approval be conditioned on the retention of these features (including timber shutters which are currently omitted from both existing and proposed dwgs) and the use of matching materials".

Officer Comments: Comments noted.

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:

DMEI 7	Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
NPPF16 -24	NPPF16 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact of the development on the character of the existing property, street scene and wider Ickenham Village Conservation Area, and the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers. Other matters to consider include parking, indoor and outdoor amenity space, and biodiversity and ecology. These are discussed in turn below.

HERITAGE, CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE:

The application property is an unlisted building situated within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) details the obligations of Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas in exercising planning functions.

Paragraphs 212 and 213 of the NPPF (2024) state that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset and that any harm to the significance of such an asset (from its alteration....or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.

Policy HC1 of The London Plan (2021) states development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. Councils should actively manage the cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings.

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council will expect all development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment.

Policy DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development within a Conservation Area or on its fringes, will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. Development should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

In general design terms:

Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) states that developments should enhance the local context, be of high quality, and respond to a place's existing character. They should also respect, enhance,

and utilise architectural features that contribute to the local character.

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 street scene, should appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their

floor area, width, depth and height, and should ensure a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved. Further, the policy requires that all extensions in Conservation Areas are designed in keeping with the original house, in terms of layout, scale, proportions, roof form, window pattern, detailed design and materials.

As above, Albany Close is comprised of five detached residential properties, with the four forming the end of the cul-de-sac (including the application property) being single storey in nature and of a similar design and appearance, incorporating feature front gables. Whilst it is noted that no. 1 Albany Close is a two storey dwelling, given its location and closer proximity, it reads as more associated with the character of dwellings along Swakeleys Drive, and appears distinguished from the application site and nos. 2, 3 and 5, which as single storey properties of similar design form a separate character.

The character of nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 is of single storey dwellings, which have a more compact appearance with limited separation distance between properties. The four bungalows each feature a singular front gable and have a consistent eaves height when viewed from the street. Whilst nos. 2, 3 and 5 are characterised by hipped roofs, the application property is unique in the fact that it has a pitched roof with a gable also to the side. At present, the wide, front gable of the application property dominates its visual appearance. The existing integrated garage (along with the existing rear extension) has a flat roof, whilst the side gable is set at a lower ridge height to the front gable, ensuring that it reads as subservient. The side wall of the application dwelling runs along the boundary of the site, resulting in a narrow separation distance of 1m between no. 4 and no. 3.

The application proposes the construction of a first floor extension to part of the existing dwelling, atop the existing garage and rear projection. The extension would have a ridge height of 5.4m, 0.9m above the ridge of the existing front gable, and be finished in a pitched roof with front and rear gables.

In this instance, it is considered that the first floor extension would not represent a sympathetic addition to the property. The ridge of the extension would notably exceed the ridge of the existing feature front gable, thereby failing to appear as subservient to the main dwelling. This lack of subservience in height would be conflicted by the much narrower gable width than the main front gable, which together undermines the visual coherence of the dwelling. This confliction, between being the tallest feature of the dwelling but attempting to retain the appearance as a secondary gable, would negatively impact upon the overall visual appearance of the existing property, with the first floor extension drawing attention away from the existing feature front gable due to its superior

height. Overall, the first floor extension would appear as disproportionate in comparison to the existing front gable, undermining its appearance as the primary, focal visual feature of the dwelling.

This lack of visual coherence would be exacerbated with the design of the extension itself. In addition to being higher than surrounding properties, the eaves of the extension would be of differing heights, thereby appearing as unequal / unbalanced in proportions and asymmetrical - conflicting with the design of the existing property and surrounding bungalows. Furthermore, the large expanse of brickwork to the east-facing side elevation would appear as out of scale with the proportions of the existing dwelling, appearing as an unduly large and imposing feature which fails to appropriately integrate with or respect the generally modest proportions of the property.

Overall, the proposed extension would fail to appear as appropriately subservient which, together with the unsatisfactory design, would result in the extension appearing as a disagreeing and discordant addition which fails to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing property.

In terms of the surrounding area, the introduction of the first floor extension would conflict with the single storey, low-density nature of the surrounding bungalows. The first floor extension would harmfully disrupt the visual consistency between nos. 2 to 5, given the presence of an additional front gable to the application property, its notably higher eaves and comparably short roof pitch. Whilst it is recognised that the extension would remain below the ridge height of no. 3, the height of the gable, and introduction of fenestration as first floor level, would conflict with the form and design of surrounding bungalows and overall result in an unbalanced appearance which would appear as out of keeping in relation to the surrounding bungalows.

Additionally, the unequal / unbalanced eaves of the extension, and large expanse of brickwork to the east-facing side elevation (which rises above the height of the eaves of the neighbouring dwelling) would also be uncharacteristic features which would further dilute the existing uniform character exhibited at the end of the Close, negatively impacting the existing appearance of the street scene.

Whilst not a side extension per se, Local Policy also generally requires two storey domestic extensions to be set in at least 1m from side boundaries, so as to retain sufficient openness in the street scene. The flank wall of the first floor extension would run flush with the side boundary of the site which, given the proximity of no. 3, would result in an overly cramped appearance, particularly given the current low roof height of the existing garage and rear extension.

Higher standards of development are required within Conservation Areas, and it is not considered that the proposal is of the architectural or design quality expected to meet such standards. The proposed extension would appear as uncharacteristic and incongruous in the street scene, owing to its disproportionate scale and conflicting design.

As noted by the Conservation Area, the site's central position at the end of the cul-de-sac, facing directly onto the road and visible also from Swakeley's Drive, would additionally increase its visual prominence and therefore the requirement for sensitivity.

Given all the above, the proposed development in its entirety would fail to respect the local context and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would neither conserve nor enhance the Conservation Area, but rather detract from its existing character and appearance.

Paras 212 and 213 of the NPPF (2024) state that great weight should be given to the conservation

of a designated heritage asset and that any harm to the significance of such an asset (from its alteration....or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.

The proposal would result in a less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There is no public benefit from the scheme to outweigh this harm. As such, the outlined harm to the Conservation Area it is not sufficiently justified.

The proposal fails to respect the local context and character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and in light of the assessment above would be in direct conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and the requirements of the NPPF (2024).

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOUR AMENITY:

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.

Paragraph 5.28 of the supporting text states that "a minimum of 21 metres separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain levels of privacy and to prevent the possibility of overlooking".

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon 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.

Part B vi) states that "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".

The application dwelling is flanked by neighbouring no. 3 Albany Close to the east. There is a limited separation distance of approximately 1m between the two properties. No. 5 Albany Close is situated to the northwest of the application site and would not be impacted by the proposal given its siting and the nature of the development. To the immediate west of the site is the rear garden to no. 42 Halford Road. The application property has a shallow garden, which borders onto the garden of no. 40 Halford Road to the immediate rear.

The application property's existing flat roofed extension projects approximately 3m beyond the rear build line of neighbouring no. 3. Whilst the proposal would not increase the existing footprint of the property, the addition of a first floor above the existing garage and rear extension would increase the height of the flank wall of the existing rear extension from approximately 2.8m to 4m. At present, there is a tall hedge at the boundary of the two properties, however the presence of this hedge cannot be guaranteed long-term. Irrespective of the hedge, the increase in flank wall height would no doubt increase the prominence of no. 4 when viewed from the rear of this neighbouring property. Despite this, it has been assessed that the extension would not breach the Council's 45-degree ruling, when taken from the centre of the nearest habitable room rear window. To this extent, whilst the increase in flank wall height is noted, owing to the continued compliance with the 45-degree

ruling and relatively modest extent of the projection beyond no. 3, it is considered on balance that the proposal would not result in significant harm to this neighbour in terms of loss of light, outlook or overbearingness, with any impact being within tolerable limits. Additionally, whilst this neighbour has two side windows facing the application property, these relate to non-habitable rooms and therefore any impact to these spaces would also be considered acceptable.

No other neighbours would be impacted in the above respects owing to their siting and that of the development.

In terms of privacy, no side windows are proposed, whilst the roof light openings would not result in undue overlooking of neighbours owing to their angled siting.

In addition to the above, the creation of a first floor would however introduce front and rear windows to the property at first floor level. Whilst the front window would only look onto areas of the close that are already publicly visible, the rear window would face onto the rear of no. 40 Halford Road, a detached bungalow. There is currently no overlooking between the application property and this neighbour owing to their single storey nature and the existing boundary treatments between the gardens of the two properties, consisting of a high brick wall. Furthermore, no. 40 has a good level of privacy as existing, given that the adjacent no. 38 has no first floor side windows (only roof lights) and the first floor side openings of no. 42 (permitted under ref: 21435/APP/2024/2384) are shown on the approved drawings to be obscurely glazed (and a condition is in place to ensure this long-term).

The rear first floor window would, ordinarily, introduce overlooking into the garden of no. 40 from the application property, whilst the rear-to-rear separation distance between the properties is approximately 19m, below the minimum limit specified within the Local Plan. As such, the overlooking introduced would be above the specified tolerable limits. In this instance, this level of overlooking would then be greatly exacerbated by the shallow depth of the garden of the application property. The distance from the rear of the first floor extension to the rear boundary of the application site is approximately 6m. To this extent, the view afforded by the proposed first floor rear bedroom window would effectively be directly onto the garden of no. 40, with no reasonable buffer in between. Such an opening would therefore significantly undermine the privacy of this neighbour and, appearing at the rear end of the garden, would be visually intrusive for this neighbour being directly visible from their rear-facing habitable rooms. This loss of privacy would be significantly over and above any (negligible) existing overlooking of the site.

Whilst it is indicated on the proposed plans for this window to be obscurely glazed, the plans do not indicate this window to be fixed shut, hence the issue of overlooking remains unresolved. Furthermore, given that the proposed window would be the sole window serving a habitable room (bedroom), it would also not be considered appropriate for such a window to be conditioned to be obscurely glazed and fixed shut, as this would not provide an acceptable internal living environment for the occupier of the habitable room, given the lack of an adequate outlook. To this extent, to impose such a condition would not be considered an acceptable compromise in this instance.

Consequently, on the basis of the application submitted, as above the proposal would result in the introduction of a harmful level of overlooking to the rear of the site, resulting in a significant loss of privacy for an adjacent neighbour.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would adversely impact upon the amenity of a neighbour and as such would not achieve a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings. The proposed development would therefore not conform to the requirements of Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

INDOOR AND OUTDOOR AMENITY SPACE:

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity for occupiers and achieve indoor and outdoor environments that are comfortable and inviting for people to use.

As above, it would not be considered acceptable for a sole habitable room window to be both obscurely glazed and fixed shut, as this would not provide an acceptable internal living environment for the occupier of the habitable room, given the lack of an adequate outlook. Given that the proposed plans do not indicate the bedroom window to be fixed shut, it is considered that an adequate internal environment would, on balance, be achieved, however this would be at the expense of the privacy of the facing neighbour, as noted above.

It is noted in the Conservation Officer's response that the current low-eave design may result in compromised internal head height. Whilst internal floor levels have not been shown on the proposed plans, it is considered that an adequate internal head height could be achieved to both the ground and first floor, though this may require the lowering of the existing ground floor ceiling. In any case, it is considered that building control regulations with regard to internal room heights would ensure this is satisfactorily achieved.

In terms of outdoor 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, inter alia, 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. For a four-bedroomed dwelling as proposed, a minimum 100 sqm of private amenity space would be required to be retained.

The existing rear amenity/garden space of the property is in excess of 100 sqm and as such would comply with Policies DMHB 18 and DMHD 1 with respect to outdoor amenity space.

PARKING:

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the Council's adopted parking standards, unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

London Plan (2021): Policy T6.1 (Residential Parking) requires that new residential development should not exceed the maximum parking standards as set out in Table 10.3 of the document. As proposed, for a house with four bedrooms in this location (PTAL 2), this would equate to a maximum of 1 space.

In this instance, the existing garage is not of the sufficient dimensions to count towards the property's off-street parking provision, hence from a parking perspective there would be no concern as a result of its loss. Additionally, the existing hardstanding to the front of the property is already sufficient to accommodate two vehicles.

The proposed development would make no alterations to the existing front hardstanding or access. Whilst the off-street parking availability would therefore marginally exceed the limits specified in the

overriding London plan, this would be acceptable in this instance given that the proposal represents no change from the existing arrangement, and no enlargement would be required as per the limits of this Policy.

To this extent, the proposal would not raise any measurable parking or highway safety concerns.

BIODIVERSITY AND ECOLOGY:

Whilst as a householder application the proposal would be exempt from national biodiversity net gain requirements, this would not override Local Policy requirements with respect to mitigation for any losses of site biodiversity or impact on existing trees. In this instance however, the extension would however be concentrated to an area of the site that is already developed, and as such there would be no impact on site biodiversity.

In terms of protected species, the site lies in an urban location and the roof appears to be in a good condition. As such, it would not be considered proportionate to request a Preliminary Roost Assessment for bats, in this instance.

OTHER MATTERS:

In correspondence with the Applicant's agent, the creation of a first floor to no. 38 Halford Road, refused by the LPA under 73860/APP/2018/2011, but allowed at appeal in 2018 (appeal ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3213099), has been raised.

The LPA is aware of the appeal decision at no. 38 Halford Road, however it is contended that there are clear material differences between the two schemes which would hence justify a different outcome, namely:

- The design of the scheme to no. 38 was entirely different to that proposed, and along a different road with a different immediate character.
- The application site lies within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area, no. 38 Halford Road does not.
- The garden of no. 38 Halford Road is much deeper than the application property. As such, the impacts on the privacy of the respective neighbour would be lessened. The garden of the application property is notably shallow (approx. 6m), meaning the proposed rear first floor window would effectively look directly onto the garden of no. 40 Halford Road, failing to appropriately preserve the amenity of this neighbour, whereas the principal outlook to the first floor window of no. 38 Halford Road would be to their own garden. It is noted that the back-to-back distance between no. 38 Halford Road and the respective neighbour no. 3 Albany Close is also approximately 21m, compliant with Local Policy.

Overall, the proposal would conflict with a number of Development Plan policies, and there are no other material considerations relevant to the proposal which would justify such a deviation. The application is therefore recommended to be refused.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Impact on Character/Appearance

The proposed development, by virtue of its size, siting, form and design, would result in a disproportionate and unsympathetic addition to the property which would fail to appropriately integrate with the dwelling or the immediate surrounding built form of the Conservation Area. The first floor extension would fail to appear as appropriately subservient which, together with the unsatisfactory design, would result in the extension appearing as a disagreeing and discordant addition, and would introduce an uncharacteristic feature to the Close, diluting the existing uniform character exhibited. Furthermore, the immediate proximity of the extension to the side boundary at first floor level would also result in a visually cramped appearance, over and above what currently exists at the site, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. Overall, the proposal would fail to create a positive satisfactory appearance and design which improves and enhances the character and appearance of the street scene and locality.

The proposal would result in a less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There is no public benefit from the scheme to outweigh this harm. The proposal therefore fails to respect the local context and overall does not comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. NON2 Impact on Neighbour Amenity

The proposed first floor rear opening, by virtue of its siting, height, openable nature and the limited separation distances involved, would result in the introduction of a harmful level of overlooking to the rear of the site, significantly impacting upon the privacy of an adjacent neighbour, namely no. 40 Halford Road. As such, the proposal would represent an un-neighbourly form of development which would not achieve a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings, failing to preserve the amenity of a neighbouring property. The proposed development would therefore not conform to the requirements of Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (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 Polices

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Polices:

DMEI 7 Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

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

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

LPP T6 (2021) Car parking

LPP T6.1 (2021) Residential parking

NPPF16 -24 NPPF16 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer:

Christopher Lamb

Telephone No: