

DELEGATED LISTED BUILDING 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 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 Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval | ☐ |
| 25. WORKS TO TREES | ☐ |
| 26. OTHER (please specify) | ☐ |

The delegation powers schedule has been checked. Director of Residents Services can determine this application.

Case Officer

Katherine Mills

Signature:

Date: 12th December 2017

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informatives 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 DATES SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS TO THE ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration**

Address LAND FORMING PART OF 2 ARLINGTON DRIVE RUISLIP

Development: Erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular access and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping (Application for Listed Building Consent).

LBH Ref Nos: **71084/APP/2017/3604**

Drawing Nos: 21641/3/12
Listed Building Description
Location Plan (1:1250)
Design, Access and Heritage Statement
21641/3/11
21641/3/10

Date Plans Received: 05/10/2017 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 16/10/2017

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises the rear garden of the Grade II Listed Little Manor House, 2 Arlington Drive. The site is located on the southern side of Arlington Drive and is bordered to the west by 8 Arlington Drive. The rear gardens of Nos 145-161 Bury Street run along the eastern site boundary whilst 58 and 60 Marlborough Avenue are located at the rear of the site. Nos 7A-17 Arlington Drive are located on the opposite side of the application site. The site has a PTAI of 1b.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Listed Building Consent is sought for the erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular access and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping.

An application for planning permission is being dealt with under application ref: 71084/APP/2017/3603.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

71084/APP/2017/2246 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular crossovers and site landscaping

Decision Date: 25-08-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/2247 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular crossovers and site landscaping (Listed Building Consent)

Decision Date: 25-08-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/3603 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping.

Decision Date: 12-12-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/785 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive), with detached double garages, access driveway and new vehicular crossover and site landscaping

Decision Date: 28-04-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/786 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive), with detached double garages, access driveway and new vehicular crossover and site landscaping (Listed Building Consent)

Decision Date: 28-04-2017 Refused

71084/PRC/2015/117 Land To The Rear Of 2 Arlington Drive Ruislip

One new house in the rear garden of 2 Arlington Drive

Decision Date: 09-11-2015 PRC

Comment on Planning History

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

EXTERNAL

Consultation letters were sent to 19 local owners/occupiers and a site notice was displayed. Six responses have been received:

- i) impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Building
- ii) overdevelopment of the site
- iii) loss of parts of the boundary wall adjoining Arlington Drive - integral part of the property
- vi) previous reasons for refusal not addressed
- vii) proposed dwellings appear higher than the Listed Building and 8 Arlington Drive
- viii) existing well will be in-filled

The impact of the proposal on the Grade II Listed Building, including the loss of parts of the boundary wall, has been discussed elsewhere in this report.

Ruislip Residents Association:
No response received.

Ruislip Village Conservation Panel:
This letter concerns the present planning application, but I should like to be assured that my letter of 28 Mar 17, which set out the historic and archaeological importance of the site, will be taken into account.

If this application were to be granted, two new houses would be inserted between the listed building called Little Manor Farm and 8 Arlington Drive. The latter was built in the 1950s and houses opposite were begun in the mid - 1930s. It is most important that any new houses should respect Little Manor Farm, by enhancing its surroundings and should be smaller and lower in height. They should also merge gracefully with the tidy modern houses in the tree-lined street with its generous grass verges and spacious appearance, typical of a place planned, as was suburban Ruislip, on Garden Suburb lines.

There is nothing on the plans to say what kind of boundary - brick wall, fence, hedge - is intended to divide number 4 Arlington Drive from Little Manor Farm, nor to give any indication of its height. We should like to be assured that the old building will not be entirely hidden from the road, and that the inhabitants will not be deprived of light and outlook.

From the plans provided which do not show a scale, it is difficult to estimate the exact height of the new houses, but both appear to be very wide, occupying most of their plots and from the elevations high, making each wider and possibly higher than the listed building. The new houses will be squashed onto narrow plots and have an inadequate space for parking cars off the road. Parking on the street is a major problem in Arlington Drive. Provision of cycle sheds blocking the narrow pathways to the back of the houses will not solve this problem.

In our opinion, the two new houses are too big for the site and will overshadow the listed building.

Members of the Conservation Panel beg that this application and the accompanying Listed Building Consent be refused.

Historic England Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service:

The proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest.

The application site lies outside of an Archaeological Priority Area and does not affect the adjacent listed manor house.

No further assessment or conditions are therefore necessary.

INTERNAL

Conservation Officer:

Little Manor Farm is a brick clad (painted), Grade II Listed, timber framed former farm house, dating from the 16th century or earlier. It is thought that the central bay of the building may originally have been a hall house and the building includes early wall paintings on the upper floor. The northern bay is a 19th century extension, originally a covered area, but now enclosed. It relates to the building's previous use as a dairy.

Early OS maps also show that there was an enclosed farm yard with related structures located to the east of the house and the site was directly accessed off Bury Street. This was later moved to Old Howlett's Lane and then to Arlington Drive when the surrounding houses were developed in the 20th century.

As existing, the house is located in a good sized mature garden plot, with a number of trees and is enclosed along Arlington Drive by a tall brick wall of some age. It is noted that

there is a well on the site.

The principal elevation of the house faces north east and the garden elevation south west. The large garden is an integral part of the setting of the house, particularly as regards the outlook from the rear elevation.

Given the age of the building, this site is likely to be archaeologically sensitive, advice from GLAAS will be required on this proposal.

The proposed new houses are of a design that reflects something of the detailing and character of the existing 20th century houses that line the road. However, on the eastern side of the street these are detached, with gaps between each building. A semi- detached pair would, therefore, be conspicuous within the street scene.

If the site were developed as proposed, the listed building would retain only a narrow plot with its principal rooms looking onto a wall/fence located just 8m away, and above this, the 2 storey flank of the proposed new houses.

The existing open garden aspect to the rear of the house would be lost, as would a number of the mature trees on the site boundary and within the garden.

The historic building would be left with a significantly smaller and awkwardly shaped plot, that would not reflect its rural character, its size or orientation. The historic boundary wall to the garden would also need to be demolished to create the open frontage and wide access points for the new houses and car parking.

The submitted Design and Access statement fails to identify the significance of the site and to adequately consider the impact of the proposal on the significance of the historic house, its setting and the archaeology of the site.

The proposals would be detrimental to the outlook and setting of the listed building and require the loss of historic features, such as the garden wall.

Objection.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

BE8 Planning applications for alteration or extension of listed buildings

BE9 Listed building consent applications for alterations or extensions

BE10 Proposals detrimental to the setting of a listed building

LPP 7.8 (2016) Heritage assets and archaeology

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issue relates to the impact the proposed dwellings would have on the

character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Little Manor House, 2 Arlington Drive.

Policy BE8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) will not permit applications to alter or extend Listed Buildings where damage may be caused to the historic structure. External and internal alterations should harmonise with their surroundings. Policy BE10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states planning permission will not be granted for proposals that are detrimental to the setting of the Listed Building.

The application site forms part of the garden curtilage of Little Manor House; the curtilage of a Listed Building is considered to be the land, buildings and structures which go with or are ancillary to the principal building and it therefore forms part of the setting of the heritage asset. As such, any development on this area of land would need to be sympathetic to the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Building.

The Council's Conservation Officer objects to the proposed development due to its impact on the Grade II Listed Little Manor House. The proposed dwellings would result in the loss of a large part of the garden which forms an integral part of the setting of the house, which was originally surrounded by farmland and orchards. In addition, a number of the mature trees on the site boundary and within the garden would be lost. The existing Grade II Listed Building would be left within a significantly smaller, narrower and awkwardly shaped plot, with its principal rooms looking onto the flank elevation of the proposed 4 Arlington Drive, and so the proposal would not reflect the Grade II Listed Building's rural character, size or orientation.

Whilst the design of the proposed new houses does reflect something of the detailing and character of the existing 20th century houses that line the road, given that the majority of the houses on the street and surrounding area are detached, with gaps between each building, the proposed semi-detached pair of houses would be conspicuous within the street scene; due to the limited set in from the existing and proposed side boundaries, the proposed dwellings would not be in keeping with the character, appearance and design of the neighbouring detached properties in the immediate street scene and wider area.

The proposed development would result in part of the historic garden wall along the front boundary being demolished in order to create two new accesses to the site. In addition, an existing well on the site would be in-filled. The opening up of the wall and the loss of the well would result in the loss of historic features within the site and so would have a detrimental impact on the significance and setting of the Grade II Listed Building.

The Design and Access Statement submitted as part of the application fails to identify the significance of the site and to adequately consider the impact of the proposal on the significance of the historic house, its setting and the archaeology of the site.

As such, the proposed development does not comply with Policies BE8, BE9 and BE10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). The application for Listed Building Consent is therefore recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the location, design and layout of the dwellings, the loss of historic features and the loss of the existing open garden aspect of the site, would have an unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Little Manor House, contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE8, BE9, BE10 and BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF.

INFORMATIVES

- 1** The decision to REFUSE Listed Building Consent 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 Listed Building Consent has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) 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.

BE8 Planning applications for alteration or extension of listed buildings

BE9 Listed building consent applications for alterations or extensions

BE10 Proposals detrimental to the setting of a listed building

LPP 7.8 (2016) Heritage assets and archaeology

Contact Officer: Katherine Mills

Telephone No: 01895 250230