

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 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

Signature:

Date:

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 PERSPOLIS HOUSE ROBINWOOD GROVE HILLINGDON

Development: Raising of the ridge height of the roof, creation of a first floor and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include three rear dormer, three front dormers and conversion of both sides of the roof from hip to gable end

LBH Ref Nos: **72647/APP/2021/1927**

Drawing Nos: Design and Access Statement
DWG534-01
DWG534-02

Date Plans Received: 12/05/2021 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 18/05/2021

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The property is a modest detached three bedroom bungalow on a relatively small plot at the junction of Robinwood Grove and Royal Lane, where the property faces approximately south-east along Royal Lane, which is a main distributor road. The surroundings are open in character, with relatively undeveloped land either side of the main road, though there are a number of dwellings and other buildings in Robinwood Grove itself and in the surrounding area.

The site is within the Hillingdon Village Conservation Area and the Green Belt, and an Archaeological Priority Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal is to extend the property upwards to create a two storey three bedroom house, bedrooms to be served by six partly inset dormers, three to front and three to rear. The house would have a pitched roof with gable ends, and a ridge height of 7.242m -1.2m higher than that of the existing bungalow.

The footprint of the existing building would be retained. The applicant calculates an increase in internal floor area of 36sqm, calculated as a 36% increase over the existing.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

72647/APP/2017/843 Perspolis House Robinwood Grove Hillingdon

Adding double layer brick boundary wall with metal railings and metal gate.

Decision Date: 25-05-2017 Refused

Comment on Planning History

69064/APP/2014/3273

Single storey, 3-bed detached dwelling including a rear dormer and two side rooflights, installation of vehicular crossover to front with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing bungalow

72647/APP/2017/843: Double layer brick boundary wall with metal railings and metal gate. Approved on appeal.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 14th July 2021

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

The application was advertised by press notice and site notice. Two neighbouring properties were notified of the application. No responses were received.

Conservation and Design Officer:

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

PT1.EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains

Part 2 Policies:

DMEI 4 Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 14 Trees and Landscaping

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

LPP G2 (2021) London's Green Belt

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF- 2 NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development

NPPF- 12 NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places

NPPF- 13 NPPF-13 2018 - Protecting Green Belt land

NPPF- 16 NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

Green Belt

Paragraph 145 states: 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 proposal to enlarge the bungalow to a two storey house is considered a disproportionate extension of the existing building. The eaves height of the building would be increased by 1.75m to 4.3m, with the ridge height increasing by 1.2m to 6m. The increased height is accompanied by a change to a gable ended pitched roof. The applicant has not provided a calculation of the proposed additional volume, but the combination of the increased height and the replacement of an existing fully hipped roof with a gable ended roof, would result in a building of far greater mass and bulk than the existing.

The significant additional height and mass of the proposed building compared to the existing, and the siting at a junction location, would ensure the building would have a significant visual impact and harm the openness of the Green Belt.

Given the proposed building is inappropriate, very special circumstances are required to demonstrate that harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The submission does not include a case setting out any such circumstances.

Conservation Area

The Conservation Officer objects to the proposal. The full response is set out below.

"1. Summary of comments: Objection

2. Historic Environment Designation(s)

- Hillingdon Village Conservation Area
- Hillingdon Archaeological Prior Area (APA)

3. Assessment - background/ significance

3.1. The exiting modern bungalow was built in 2015. It replaced a former 19th century lodge building which had been associated to the former historic Grove House (now demolished).

3.2. Permission was granted for demolition and replacement, taking into account the nature of the replacement building. As constructed the bungalow has not entirely been built in accordance to the approved plans and details.

3.3. Externally the property is finished in a reclaimed London stock brick and include a hipped plain tiled roof. The boundary is defined by a brick wall with higher railings, detrimentally fortifying the appearance of the site.

3.4. Whilst the site includes some detracting elements, the low-rise nature of the existing bungalow limits its impact on the conservation area.

4. Assessment - impact

4.1. The existing replacement bungalow respected the original character and appearance of the site, by maintaining a low-rise built form. The proposed development would erode the low-rise nature of the site and instead establish a two-storey built form. It would go beyond the simple description of converting the existing roof space.

4.2. The bungalow aesthetic would essentially be replaced by the two-storey house. The bulk of the building would also be significantly exacerbated due to the proposed gable roof form.

4.3. The property's prominent siting at the junction of Robinwood Grove and Royal Lane, allows the site to contribute directly to the appearance of the street scene. The height increase would unduly increase the presence of the building.

4.4. The development would fail to respect the original character of the site and existing built form. As proposed, it would be considered harmful to the conservation area, amounting to less than substantial in this instance.

5. Conclusion: Objection"

Less than substantial harm has been identified. Para.196 of the NPPF states that: 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, ...'

The applicant has explained that additional space is required for a growing family. While this is noted it is not considered that it constitutes a public benefit sufficient to offset the harm identified.

The proposed extension is not subordinate in scale to the existing property, would be visually intrusive at a prominent point in the street scene, and would fail to comply with Local Plan policies on design (DMHB 11) and residential extensions (DMHD 1)

CONCLUSION

The proposal is considered unacceptable on grounds of inappropriate development in the Green Belt and harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is considered to therefore conflict with Development Plan policies BE1, HE1 and EM2 of the Local Plan Part 1 and DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMEI 4 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2.

It is recommended that permission be refused.

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development 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, Policy G2 of the

London Plan (2021), Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policy DME1 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its siting in this open, visually prominent position, size, scale, bulk, height and design, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original building, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Hillingdon Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

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.

We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

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 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.

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage
PT1.EM2	(2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains

Part 2 Policies:

DMEI 4	Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP G2	(2021) London's Green Belt
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
NPPF- 2	NPPF-2 2018 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF- 12	NPPF-12 2018 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF- 13	NPPF-13 2018 - Protecting Green Belt land
NPPF- 16	NPPF-16 2018 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Michael Gavin

Telephone No: 01895 250230