APPLICATION FOR: **10622/APP/2021/1490**
HIGHGROVE HOUSE LIDGOULD GROVE RUISLIP

COMMITTEE: Major Apps PC

DATE: 16th November 2021

I confirm:-

- All consultations have been completec
- All consultations are reflected in the report.
- The report is free from spelling, typing and grammatical errors.

Final formatting:

Signed:- _____
Case Officer

Signed:- _____
Team Manager

Signed:- _____
Senior Manager

I agree this report can go on the agenda for the above Committee.

Signed:- _____
DC Tech Admin

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

Address HIGHGROVE HOUSE LIDGOULD GROVE RUISLIP

Development: Erection of a detached three-bedroom house

LBH Ref Nos: 10622/APP/2021/1490

Drawing Nos: Planning, Design, Heritage and Access Statement
Briefing Note - Badger Survey Results
Energy and Sustainability Statement E1071-ESS-00
Arboricultural Implications Report SJA air 20561-01
FLU.1324.01 Rev. J
FLU.1324.02 Rev B
FLU.1324.03 Rev B

Date Plans Recieved: 14/04/2021 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):** 15/04/2021
14/04/2021

Date Application Valid: 08/07/2021

1. SUMMARY

This application seeks permission for the erection of a 3 bedroom detached house and associated works.

The proposed development is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the grade II listed Highgrove House, local ecology and the residential amenity of existing and proposed occupiers. As such the proposals are contrary to policy as set out within this report.

Had an appeal against non determination not been lodged the application would have been refused.

2. RECOMMENDATION

Had an appeal against non determination not been lodged the application would have been refused for the following reasons:

1 NON2 **Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed development by reason of its location, scale, bulk and design would be an inappropriate development of the site that would fail to either preserve or enhance the setting of the grade II listed Highgrove House. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 189-208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

2 NON2 **Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed location of the new detached house would be directly in front of the main elevation of No. 17 Lidgould Grove and would encroach into its front garden space resulting in the new house being built just 1.5 metres from its primary frontage. The new house, as a result, would have a significant detrimental impact on the outlook of No. 17 which would lose views across the grounds of the Highgrove house, overshadowing the property and significantly reducing sunlight and daylight for residential occupiers. This arrangement would have a totally unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of this

property. The detrimental impact would be exacerbated by the fact that No. 17 has no windows in the rear elevation for privacy purposes, thus relies even more strongly than usual on the windows in the front elevation to provide outlook and daylight.

The proposed detached dwelling would also be located only 6m from the most southern elevation of the existing Highgrove House which includes a living room window (as approved under application references 10622/APP/2009/2504 and 10622/APP/2009/2506). In addition it would be located only 14m from the main southern elevation of the listed building and the proposed Bedroom 1 would therefore have a window below 21m from the bedroom windows approved in the southern elevation of Highgrove House. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 (2012).

3 NON2 **Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed development would fail to provide sufficient external amenity space to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

4 NON2 **Non Standard reason for refusal**

Insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the ecology of the immediate locality, including the adjacent Highgrove Nature Reserve (Nature Conservation Site of Borough Grade II or Local Importance). As such the proposed development is contrary to Policy EM4 (Open Space and Informal Recreation) and Policy EM7 (Biodiversity and Geological conservation) of the Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 and Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy G6 of the London Plan (2021).

INFORMATIVES

1 I52 **Compulsory Informative (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 I53 **Compulsory Informative (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.

DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMH 4	Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
	Highways Impacts

DMT 2	
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LLP D1	(2021) London's form character and capacity for growth
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP D11	(2021) Safety, security and resilience to emergency
LPP GG1	(2021) Building strong and inclusive communities
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP H2	(2021) Small sites
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP SI2	(2021) Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
LPP SI3	(2021) Energy infrastructure
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking

3 I59 **Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies**

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2016). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

4 I71 **LBH worked applicant in a positive & proactive (Refusing)**

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.

5 I74 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Refusing Consent)**

This is a reminder that Under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), should an application for appeal be allowed, the proposed development would be deemed as 'chargeable development' and therefore liable to pay the London Borough of Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This would be calculated in accordance with the London Borough of Hillingdon CIL Charging Schedule 2014 and the Mayor of London's CIL Charging Schedule 2012.
For more information on CIL matters please visit the planning portal page at: www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises Highgrove House, together with its grounds, located to the south east of Eastcote Road and west of Kent Gardens. The application site previously formed part of a larger site, including land to the north of the access road. This has now been redeveloped to provide a sheltered housing scheme known as Yew Tree Lodge.

Highgrove House is a two storey Grade II listed building, which dates from 1881, but was gutted by fire in 1978. Following the grant of planning and listed building consent, the building has been refurbished/converted and is now in use as residential flats. Two blocks of mews housing have also been erected within the grounds.

Access is from an internal access road from Eastcote Road. The access road sweeps around into the site, between Highgrove House and the adjoining Yew Tree Lodge to the north, providing an access and adjoining parking for both buildings. Yew Tree Lodge is a purpose built two storey L-shaped building, with 12 units of sheltered accommodation, together with office and staff accommodation. Planning permission for this building formed part of the wider redevelopment proposals for the Highgrove House site.

The site slopes gently from east to west. It contains a number of trees which are more dense on the south and west boundaries, where the site abuts the wooded area of the Highgrove Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). To the east, the site adjoins two storey houses on Kent Gardens, while to the north, beyond a public footpath, is the former RAF Eastcote site which has been developed for residential purposes.

The majority of the application site forms part of the developed area, although as noted above the area to the south and west is designated as being a Nature Conservation Site of Borough Grade II or Local Importance as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application proposes the erection of a three-bedroom house on land adjacent to No. 17 Lidgould Grove within the grounds of Highgrove House. One of the proposed bedrooms is below the minimum space standards as required by Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

According to the Design and Access Statement the proposed scheme would have cycle storage in the garden, though there are no details of the cycle parking or of the proposed external amenity area. A new parking space is proposed at the entrance to the Mews with an electric vehicle charging point.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

10622/APP/2006/2490 Highgrove House Eastcote Road Ruislip

REFURBISHMENT AND CONVERSION OF LISTED BUILDING TO 12 RESIDENTIAL UNITS COMPRISING ONE STUDIO, 6 ONE BED, 2 TWO BED AND 1 THREE BED FLATS AND 2 TWO BED MAISONETTES AND ERECTION OF 4 TWO-BEDROOM MEWS DWELLINGHOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED AMENITY SPACE AND LANDSCAPING (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF DETACHED STABLE BUILDING).

Decision: 11-01-2007 Approved

10622/APP/2006/2494 Highgrove House Annex Eastcote Road Ruislip

ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE TWELVE RESIDENTIAL FLATS (FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DIFFICULTIES), COMMUNAL AMENITY SPACE, ANCILLARY OFFICE AND STAFF ACCOMMODATION AND LANDSCAPING (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOSTEL BUILDING)

Decision: 11-01-2007 Approved

10622/APP/2009/2504 Highgrove House Eastcote Road Ruislip

Refurbishment and conversion of listed building to 12 residential units comprising 1 studio, 6 one- bedroom, 2 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats and 2 two-bedroom maisonettes and erection of 4 two-bedroom mews dwellinghouses, with associated amenity space and landscaping, involving demolition of detached stable building (Time extension of planning permission ref.10622/APP/2006/2490 dated 11/01/2007.)

Decision: 11-02-2010 Approved

10622/APP/2009/2506 Highgrove House Eastcote Road Ruislip

Refurbishment and conversion of listed building to 12 residential units comprising one studio, 6 one- bedroom, 2 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats and 2 two-bedroom maisonettes (Time extension of Listed Building Consent ref.10622/APP/2006/2491 dated 12/01/2007.)

Decision: 12-02-2010 Approved

10622/APP/2010/1822 Highgrove House Eastcote Road Ruislip

Variation of Condition 3 - Minor material amendment to planning permission ref: 10622/APP/2009/2504 dated 11/02/2010: Refurbishment and conversion of listed building to 12 residential units and erection of 4 two-bedroom mews dwellinghouses and associated works (time extension of planning permission ref: 10622/APP/ 2006/2490 dated 11/01/2007) to allow alterations to the siting and design of the two blocks of mews housing (Retrospective application).

Decision: 25-10-2011 Approved

10622/APP/2011/3041 Highgrove House Eastcote Road Ruislip

Variation of Condition 3 (Compliance with Approved Plans) of Planning Permission dated 11/02/11, ref. 10622/APP/2009/2504 to allow the retention of the conversion of Flat 7 from a one-bedroom flat into a two bedroom flat (Retrospective Application).

Decision: 08-02-2012 Refused **Appeal:** 05-07-2012 Dismissed

10622/APP/2012/1984 Highgrove House Annex Eastcote Road Ruislip

Non-material amendment to planning permission 10622/APP/2006/2494, to provide an additional unit for use by a person with learning difficulties replacing the existing staff flat (Application for non-material amendment)

Decision: 17-08-2012 Approved

10622/APP/2021/1491 Highgrove House Lidgould Grove Ruislip

Erection of a detached three bedroom house (Application for Listed Building Consent)

Decision:

Comment on Relevant Planning History

Applications for planning permission and listed building consent (refs. 10622/APP/2006/2490 and 2491) were originally presented to Planning Committee meeting on the 09/01/07 for the refurbishment and conversion of Highgrove House to 12

residential units comprising 1 studio, 6 one-bedroom, 2 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats and 2 two-bedroom maisonettes, together with the erection of 4 two-bedroom mews dwellinghouses in two blocks on the eastern boundary of the site. The works included associated amenity space, off-street parking and landscaping and involved the demolition of a detached stable building at the rear of Highgrove House. Members resolved to grant permission and listed building consent and these were issued on the 11 and 12/01/07 respectively.

Also presented to the committee was application ref. 10622/APP/2006/2494 on the adjoining site to the north of the access road for the erection of a two storey building to provide 12 residential flats for people with learning difficulties, communal amenity space, ancillary office and staff accommodation and landscaping (involving the demolition of the existing hostel building). This was also granted on the 11/01/07.

Subsequently, applications seeking to extend the time limits of the un-implemented planning permission and listed building consent at Highgrove House were presented to the Planning Committee meeting on the 04/02/10 and these were approved on the 11 and 12/02/10 respectively (refs. 10622/APP/2009/2504 and 2506).

Applications have been submitted seeking to discharge the various conditions attached to the renewed planning and listed building consent permissions, in particular:

10622/APP/2010/887 - Details in compliance with conditions 4 (existing and proposed levels), 6 (fencing and gates), 10 (fenestration), 11 (detailed design and layout of mews housing), 18 (tree survey), 20 (protective fencing), 21 (landscape scheme), 23 (landscape maintenance), 26 (elevations), 32 (sustainability measures and renewable energy) and 35 (sustainable homes assessment) was approved on 31/05/11.

It was subsequently brought to the attention of the Local Planning Authority that works had commenced on the mews houses at the end of March 2011. A temporary stop notice was served on the 14/04/11 requiring the cessation of works to Block A. On 11 May 2011, the developers agreed to enter into a legal undertaking preventing the developers from undertaking further works on Block A until planning permission for the re-siting of the mews blocks had been obtained.

On 03-08-10 application reference 10622/APP/2010/1822 for the 'Variation of Condition 3 - Minor material amendment to planning permission ref: 10622/APP/2009/2504 dated 11/02/2010: Refurbishment and conversion of listed building to 12 residential units and erection of 4 two-bedroom mews dwellinghouses and associated works (time extension of planning permission ref: 10622/APP/ 2006/2490 dated 11/01/2007) to allow alterations to the siting and design of the two blocks of mews housing (Retrospective application)' was submitted and approved on 27-10-11.

It is worth noting that application references 10622/APP/2006/2490, 10622/APP/2006/2491 and 10622/APP/2010/1822 all proposed that there would be an area of recreation and soft landscaping to the west of No. 17 Lidgould Grove where the detached house subject to this application is proposed to be located. However the area remains as unmaintained hard standing.

Application reference 10622/APP/2011/2691 also discharged Condition 12 (Sustainable Urban Drainage) of planning permission Ref. 10622/APP/ 2010/1822, and consented a rainwater harvesting tank and perforated soakaway in the location of the proposed new dwelling.

In addition to the above a listed building consent application (reference 10622/APP/2021/1491) has also been submitted to run alongside this planning application for the same proposals.

4. Planning Policies and Standards

Development Plan

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:
The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)
The West London Waste Plan (2015)
The London Plan (2021)

Material Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

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.H1	(2012) Housing Growth

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 2	Housing Mix
DMH 4	Residential Conversions and Redevelopment
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 16	Housing Standards
DMHB 17	Residential Density
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LLP D1	(2021) London's form character and capacity for growth
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP D7	(2021) Accessible housing
LPP D11	(2021) Safety, security and resilience to emergency
LPP GG1	(2021) Building strong and inclusive communities
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG4	(2021) Delivering the homes Londoners needs
LPP H1	(2021) Increasing housing supply
LPP H2	(2021) Small sites
LPP H10	(2021) Housing size mix
LPP SI2	(2021) Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
LPP SI3	(2021) Energy infrastructure
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking

5. Advertisement and Site Notice

5.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

6. Consultations

External Consultees

Consultation letters were sent to 62 local owner/occupiers and the Ruislip and Eastcote Residents' Associations on 03-08-21. Site notices were also posted. 21 letters of objection were received as well as two petitions against the proposals with 154 signatures.

The two petitions in objection state:
'We the undersigned petition Hillingdon Council to Refuse the proposals for the over development of the Grade II Highgrove House Site 10622/APP/2021/1490 & 10622/APP/2021/1491. We the undersigned are opposed to the addition of new residential buildings on this site. The proposed building will have significant negative impact to the council listed SINC and its wildlife, who make use of the green open space the new residential building will be built on. It will have a significantly negative impact on the beauty and characteristics of Highgrove House which is a Grade II listed building. There is inadequate parking for current residents and Yew Tree Lodge which shares the site. Over development of the site will put future strain on an already problematic parking situation. Given Pembroke Park is a stones throw away, we urge the council to very seriously scrutinize the need for one additional home on this Grade II listed site which has a significant ecological value relative to the SINC and refuse both planning applications.'

The 21 letters of objection can be summarised as:
- Detrimental impact on Highgrove House and its setting
- Encroachment towards and detrimental impact on views of Highgrove House
- Lack of broader consultation beyond statutory requirements
- Impact on existing wildlife/ecology (including adjacent badger sett, newts, bats and birds)
- Impact on and loss of trees
- Loss of much needed recreational/amenity/green space
- Impact on safety
- Inadequate parking/increased congestion
- Disruption during construction
- Would be better to have landscaping and cycle parking

- Loss of light
- Loss of sunlight warm leading to increased heating requirements
- Impact on character of the area
- There is already substantial housing provision
- Loss of privacy for existing residents
- Lack of privacy for new residents
- Loss of outlook
- Loss of airflow to No. 17 Lidgould Grove
- Insufficient space for proposed car parking
- Insufficient waste/food/recycling provision
- Proven history of non-compliance with previous consents (building locations/subdivision of rooms/landscaping/drainage/services/waste/cycle storage)
- Errors in the existing elevation plans
- DAS Picture 3 is labelled No.17 Lidgould Grove, whereas it is actually No. 16.
- English Heritage advised against any development in the 'Drying Area' where the dwelling is proposed
- Increased risk of flooding
- Proposal is not affordable housing, first time buy or step down housing
- Increased strain on infrastructure

EASTCOTE CONSERVATION PANEL
This proposal is totally unacceptable, reasons for our objections are set out below.

The proposed new build will be approximately 2 metres away from the windows of the mews house, number 17. These front windows are the only natural light source for this dwelling. It is not acceptable that any of the habitable rooms should be deprived of natural light. Part of the private amenity space, which is already meagre, will also be removed. Natural light will also be reduced to the windows of the flats within High Grove House. The private amenity space for the ground floor flats will also become cast into permanent shade. The proposal will also detract from the setting of the Grade II Listed Building High Grove House.

The Design and Access Statement is rather confused, incorrect and the content should be disregarded. It refers several times to a two bedroom two storey house when in fact, if the drawings are correct, it is a three bedroom two storey house. The gross internal area indicated of 70m2 is less than the required 84m2 for a two storey 3b 4p dwelling. Page 3 shows a photograph captioned 17 Lidgould Grove when the house shown is number 16 Lidgould Grove. Page 3 also refers to the application site being 'largely hard surfaced, a long standing feature'.

This area forms part of the amenity space for the whole site. Condition 21 of application 10622/APP/2009/2504 was dispersed within application 10622/APP/2010/657 drawing number MCA031/01A a landscaping plan showing this area laid to turf. The developer never implemented the plan. Therefore, despite the developer not complying with his obligations, this area is part of the amenity space, making this proposal green field not brown field. It is 100% 'garden grab'.

Page 4 omits to mention that the site has a PTAL of 1a. Which indicates, that access to public transport is poor. Therefore this is not a highly sustainable location.

Page 5 refers to Yew Tree Lodge as a new building to the site. It is actually a replacement for the hostel annex that was already on the site.

Page 6 of this document, points 1-10 and further pages make many incorrect and outlandish statements, most of which are dealt with in full within the rest of this submission.

Energy and Sustainability Statement.
This is a 56 page document that is mainly conjecture, the only sustainable method of energy saving indicated are solar panels. Section 3.11 of the statement says 'Surface Water Drainage a) Surface

water drainage at the site will follow the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) management train. b) The surface water will drain into the existing watercourse on site, with the permeable surfacing acting as an attenuation device for slowing and holding the surface water run-off.' Where is the water course on site? There are ponds in the adjoining SINC, but this is not part of the site.

Application 10622/APP/2011/2691 dispersal of condition 12 of 10622/2010/1822 Drawing 1134/40 shows the approved SUDS system for surface water drainage. If this system was installed then the proposed house would disrupt this system, being build on top of it.
If as mentioned above, there is a SUDS system already on site, why is this not adapted and used? It must be noted that the land drainage on site is poor, with lying water after any rainfall. The basement of High Grove House regularly floods during wet weather. This gives rise to the premise that as with other approved plans the SUDS was never installed.

Parking.
Currently there are insufficient parking spaces within the grounds of High Grove House for the number of cars belonging to residents, staff and visitors to Yew Tree Lodge. Regrettably this situation was allowed on the original applications.
The position allocated for the single parking space for the new house, on the walkway serving the mews houses is inappropriate. The space is sited in a narrow walkway, between the houses, the vehicle would need to either back into or out of the space, along a very narrow and long drive. The railings at the entrance to the mews houses would need to be removed. The roadway is narrow and would not give a turning circle anywhere. Once parked the vehicle could only be exited from one side. This would leave a very narrow gap on the footpath for pedestrians. Again this is a ruse to try to make this application appear acceptable.

Boundary Change.
The applicants appear to have conveniently changed the boundary outline of the site, incorporating a large section of High Grove Woods SINC into the proposed site. Attached is the Land Registry map for this area showing the boundaries exactly the same as they were in 2006 with the first application and all later applications after Westholme Estates took over the site. This manipulation of the boundaries negates all the reports dealing with trees and ecology on the site.

Ecology Report.
This report deals only with badgers, it does not mention the other protected species, bats and great crested newts, slow worms and stag beetles, that are found in Highgrove Woods. Full surveys for bats and newts and all other wildlife should have been submitted with this application. Both bats and newts have a wide foraging area. Bats, have both hibernating and maternity roosts in trees as well as old buildings. A Newt spends most of its life away from the breeding pond, some have been found in the basement of High Grove House. This image was taken in the basement below number 5 Highgrove House.

To claim that the badgers will not be disturbed by this proposal is totally incorrect. The report does not ascertain how far underground the badger sett extends or how deep it is. The report also mentions rabbit holes, rabbits are not known to inhabit Highgrove Woods. It is our opinion that all forms of protected species will be caused great harm should this proposal be granted permission.

Tree Report.
This report deals solely with trees that form part of Highgrove Woods SINC, not Highgrove House. The developer has no right to assume that this behaviour is acceptable. As part of the landscaping report mentioned above, a buffer zone of trees and shrubs should have been planted along the boundary between the two sites to give protection to the woods and its inhabitants, this was never carried out. The photograph below shows the boundary with the SINC, evidence that no boundary planting was ever carried out.

The sycamore noted for felling, is ivy covered, therefore a perfect tree for bat roosts. Cutting back other trees to stop overshadowing of the new building is pointless, the trees will quickly grow back

and then pressure will be brought to fell even more trees.

We ask that this application be refused for the many justifiable reasons given above.

Case Officer's comments
With regard to the internal floorspace, the smallest upstairs room is below the minimum floorspace standard for a single bedroom and is therefore deemed to be a study or other similar use in planning terms. The internal floorspace for the proposed unit is therefore in accordance with Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021) for a 2 bedroom 3 person two storey dwelling.

RUISLIP RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION
I write in support of the concerns raised by Eastcote Conservation Area Panel. The proposed dwelling lies just outside the area presented by Ruislip Residents' Association. Many residents on the east side of Ruislip have raised concerns regarding these plans as follows:
1. The proposals should be refused by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook.
The locations plans show that the proposed detached house will be very close to the front habitable window of no 17 a mews house, the only natural light source for this dwelling. Some of the private amenity space, will also be removed. The development will reduce natural light to the windows of the flats within High Grove House, and the private amenity space for the ground floor flats will lose natural sunlight.

2. The proposal will be detrimental to setting of the Grade II Listed Building High Grove House.

3. The application site has a PTAL rating of 1a because public transport is poor in this vicinity. Consequently, when I visited the site by car on Saturday 14th August it was clear there are insufficient parking spaces for existing residents and users of the site. The parking arrangements and the access to the proposed house look impractical. The access looks extremely narrow from the entrance to the mews houses that seemed only wide enough for pedestrians! At this point I had great difficulty turning round to leave the site as there were so many cars parked.

4. In addition, on my visit on 14th August it was pouring with rain at around 1pm. I noted a lot of surface water sloshing around. I am not surprised therefore that the basement of High Grove House regularly floods in heavy rain. Should this proposal or any further developments be approved on this site then careful consideration should be given to the provision of adequate drainage.

5. It is well known locally that there were a lot of problems and delays with the expansion programme of Bishop Ramsey School located the other side of High Grove Woods, "because of the newts". However, no survey for bats or newts was submitted with this planning application!

Internal Consultees

DESIGN AND CONSERVATION OFFICER
The application seeks planning permission to erect a detached three-bedroom house within the grounds of High Grove House, a grade II listed building in Eastcote.

Site and surrounds
The application relates to a 0.6 ha site located to the south east of Eastcote Road and west of Kent Gardens. The application site comprises Highgrove House and its adjoining garden areas and more recent mews style house to the rear of the building. The application site forms part of the larger Highgrove House site, including land to the north of the access road which has been redeveloped to provide a sheltered housing scheme known as Yew Tree Lodge. To the east, the site adjoins two-storey houses on Kent Gardens, while to the north, beyond a public footpath, is a new housing estate built on the former RAF Eastcote site.

Highgrove House is an attractive Arts and Crafts style listed building, by Edward Prior, a

distinguished architect active in this part of Middlesex in the late 1880's. The exterior is ornate, with its tall chimneys, two-storey bays, dentilled eaves, ground porch and red brick and terracotta detailing. Its interior, other than the main staircase and the plan form, is of much less interest, owing to extensive damage by fire in 1978, and its subsequent subdivision into bedsits for hostel accommodation and then later as flats. The house has an attractive setting which sits within a lawned garden with Highgrove woods to the south and east which originally formed part of the house's wider grounds.

Access is from an internal access road from Eastcote Road. The access road sweeps around into the site, between Highgrove House and the adjoining Yew Tree Lodge to the north, providing parking and access for both buildings. Yew Tree Lodge is a purpose built two storey L-shaped building, with 12 units of sheltered accommodation for people with learning difficulties, together with office and staff accommodation. Planning permission for this building was approved around the same time as the listed building's conversion to flats and the erection of 4 mews style houses.

The proposals
The application seeks planning permission to erect a new detached three-bedroomed house within the grounds of Highgrove House directly to the west of 17 Lidgould Grove.

The location and design of the four previously approved 'mews' houses (14-17 Lidgould Grove) had been discussed at length with planning and conservation officers as well as English Heritage (now Historic England) at the time. It was requested that the mews houses did not extend too far into the space known as the "drying area" and that the mews houses remain within the environs of the ancillary buildings and to reflect their size and character. This was sound advice at the time and is still relevant to this application if the setting of the principal grade II listed building is not to be harmed.

It should also be noted that the previously approved scheme proposed soft landscaping to the west of the mews houses (17 Lingould Grove) directly south of the principal listed building, but this does not appear to have been undertaken and there still remains areas of hardstanding.

There are concerns with the proposal to erect another 'mews' house which would encroach into the open space to the south of the principal listed building and would face directly onto one of the building's principal facades. The new house would contribute to the erosion of the formal garden space at odds with its open and soft landscaped character which is of great importance to the setting of Highgrove House.

The proposal disregards the original design intent of keeping the mews houses to the eastern and less sensitive parts of the site so that they remain within the environs of the ancillary buildings.

The location of the building and the clear conflict between the frontage of no. 17 with the gable end of the proposed house would result in an uncomfortable and cramped juxtaposition drawing further attention to the buildings in this location exacerbating the harm to setting of the listed building.

The proposal to erect a further house within the grounds of Highgrove House, would for the above reasons, harm the setting of the grade II listed building.

When making a decision on all listed building consent applications or any decision on a planning application for development that affects a listed building's setting, a local planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

This obligation, found in section 16 and 66 of the Planning (listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, applies to all decisions concerning listed buildings.

The NPPF requires its own exercise to be undertaken as set out in its chapter 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraphs 189-208 require consideration of the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset and assessment of the identification of any harm. In particular, where there is harm identified. Paragraph 202 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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

The harm identified in this case is considered 'less than substantial harm' to the setting of Highgrove House a grade II listed building. In line with paragraph 202 of the NPPF, the less than substantial harm arising from the impact of the development on the setting of Highgrove House would need to be weighed against the package of public benefits arising from the scheme. The public benefits that have been put forward by the applicant, in my view, would not outweigh the harm identified. The development would be contrary to the NPPF, local policies and the London Plan policies.

Notwithstanding the harm to the setting of the listed building that would result from the proposed development there are also other design concerns.

The proposed location of the new house does not appear to have considered No. 17 Lingould Grove as it encroaches into its front garden space resulting in the new house being built just a few metres from its primary frontage. The new house, as a result, would have a harmful impact on the outlook of no. 17 which would lose its views across the grounds of the Highgrove house, overshadowing the property and significantly reducing sunlight and daylight into the property.

The location of the building and the clear conflict between the frontage of no. 17 and the gable end of the proposed house would result in an uncomfortable and cramped juxtaposition drawing further attention to the mews houses exacerbating the harm a further house would have within this part of the grounds of Highgrove House.

It is noted that a listed building consent application has also been submitted to run alongside this planning application (10622/APP/2021/1491) for the same proposals. No alterations are proposed to the grade II listed building and therefore an LBC application is not required. The impact of the new house on the setting of the listed building would be assessed under the planning application 10622/APP/2021/1490.

Case Officer's comments
The above advice that a listed building consent application is not required was put to the agent, who stated that the fixtures of the structures in the curtilage of Highgrove House are also listed, and therefore the removal of railings to facilitate the proposed parking space and the house would require listed building consent. There is no mention of the railings within the submission, nor on any of the submitted plans, which explains the Conservation and Design Officer being unaware of any. It is considered that if the full planning application is recommended for refusal based on the impact of the proposals on the grade II listed building, then it should also be the case that the listed building consent application also be recommended for refusal.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
This site is occupied by an area of open ground situated to the south of Highgrove House, a Grade II Listed Building, located to the south-east of Eastcote Road and west of Kent Gardens.

The site slopes gently from east to west and there is deciduous woodland adjacent to the south and west boundaries, designated the Highgrove SINC. The residential areas of Lidgould Grove lies to the north, with Kent Gardens to the east.

There are no TPO's or Conservation Area designations affecting the site.

A tree report, to BS5837:2012 has been prepared by SJA Trees, dated January 2021. The report has identified and assessed the condition and value of 22 individual trees, of which none are A grade. There are 7 B grade trees; T9 oak, T10 oak, T13 Lawson cypress, T15 Lawson cypress, T20 Field maple, T21 Common lime, T22 Common lime which will all be protected and retained. There are 2 U grade trees; T18 whitebeam and T19 ash - which could be removed due to their poor condition and short life expectancy. The remaining individual specimens are C grade (poor), of which one, T1 a C category sycamore, will be removed to improve the relationship of the proposed dwelling with the woodland to the south.

There are 4 tree groups, C category, which will be retained and one woodland area, B category, which will be unaffected by the proposal.

The report concludes (S1 and S2) that the arboricultural impact of the scheme is negligible with no category A or B trees on site and no trees of high landscape or biodiversity value to be removed. It also provides tree protection details, an arboricultural method statement and proposes a pre-commencement meeting between the consultant and the contractor to check the protection measures.

There is no objection to the conclusions of the tree report or the proposed development. The loss of the single (C grade) sycamore is acceptable, as it will create space for the remaining woodland to develop, or regenerate. Replacement tree planting should be secured as part of a c landscape scheme

No objection subject to landscaping condition RES9 (parts 1,2,and 5).

HOUSING
The application is for a well proportioned detached 3 bedroom house that will contribute to boroughs Housing Targets and demand for family homes as evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment as such the application is supported.

ACCESS OFFICER
Any grant of planning permission for this 3 bedroom dwelling should include the following conditions:

1. Prior to works commencing, details of step free access via the principal private entrance, and all other points of entry and exit, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall remain in place for the life of the building.

Reason
To ensure that an appropriate standard of housing stock, in accordance with the 2021 London Plan policy D7 is achieved and maintained.

2. The dwelling(s) hereby approved shall accord with the requirements of Policy D7 of the London Plan, and shall not be occupied until certification of compliance with the technical specifications for an M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015, has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. All such provisions must remain in place for the life of the building.

Reason
To not only allow the Building Control body to require the development to comply with the optional Building Regulations standards, but to also ensure the appropriate quantity and standard of accessible and adaptable housing is constructed and maintained in accordance with policy D7 of the London Plan.

HIGHWAYS

The application site has a PTAL ranking of 1a bordering 0 indicating that access to public transport is very poor compared to London as a whole. For this development in this location the published London Plan (2021) would allow a maximum of 1.5 car parking spaces to be provided, the 1no. space proposed is therefore in accordance with Policy T6.1 Residential Parking. The Highway Authority is however concerned that access to the proposed car parking space is currently restricted. There is already a vehicle crossover that has a flat section of 1.8m, the Councils Guidelines require a flat section of 2.4m as a minimum. There are no highway objections to this application on condition that details of the proposed vehicle crossover are submitted to the Highway Authority for approval.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.01 The principle of the development

Policy H1 of the London Plan (2021) states that London Borough of Hillingdon 10 year target for net housing completions (2019/20-2028/29) is to deliver 10,830 houses.

The principle of the development is considered acceptable, however the proposal is contrary to policies as set out within this report.

7.02 Density of the proposed development

Not relevant to the determination of the application.

7.03 Impact on archaeology/CAs/LBs or Areas of Special Character

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that the Local Planning Authority pay special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting and any architectural features that they possess.

The NPPF (2021) Chapter 16 requires the conserving and enhancing of the historic environment. Paragraphs 189-208 require consideration of the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset and assessment of the identification of any harm. In particular, where there is harm identified. Paragraph 201 states that "Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use".

Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) requires development to identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, including registered historic parks, where appropriate. Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

Policy HE1 of the Local Plan: Part One (2012) states the Council will conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape, which includes Registered Parks and Gardens and historic landscapes, both natural and designed.

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states:
A) The Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment. Development that has an effect on heritage assets will only be supported where:
i) it sustains and enhances the significance of the heritage asset and puts them into viable uses consistent with their conservation;
ii) it will not lead to a loss of significance or harm to an asset, unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide public benefit that would outweigh the harm or loss, in accordance with the NPPF;
iii) it makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area;
iv) any extensions or alterations are designed in sympathy, without detracting from or

competing with the heritage asset;
v) the proposal would relate appropriately in terms of siting, style, scale, massing, height, design and materials;
vi) buildings and structures within the curtilage of a heritage asset, or in close proximity to it, do not compromise its setting; and
vii) opportunities are taken to conserve or enhance the setting, so that the significance of the asset can be appreciated more readily.

Policy DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states:
Planning permission will not be granted for proposals which are considered detrimental to the setting of a Listed Building.

The application seeks planning permission to erect a detached three-bedroom house within the grounds of High Grove House, a grade II listed building in Eastcote. The application site comprises Highgrove House and its adjoining garden areas and more recent mews style house to the rear of the building.

Highgrove House is an attractive Arts and Crafts style listed building, by Edward Prior, a distinguished architect active in this part of Middlesex in the late 1880's. The exterior is ornate, with its tall chimneys, two-storey bays, dentilled eaves, ground porch and red brick and terracotta detailing. The house has an attractive setting which sits within a lawned garden with Highgrove woods to the south and east which originally formed part of the house's wider grounds.

The Council's Conservation and Design Officer has reviewed the proposals and comments that the location and design of the four previously approved 'mews' houses (14-17 Lidgould Grove) had been discussed at length with planning and conservation officers as well as English Heritage (now Historic England) at the time they were considered for planning consent. It was requested that the mews houses did not extend too far into the space known as the "drying area" and that the mews houses remain within the environs of the ancillary buildings and to reflect their size and character. The Council's Conservation and Design Officer considers that this was sound advice at the time and is still relevant to this application if the setting of the principal grade II listed building is not to be harmed.

There are concerns with the proposal to erect another 'mews' house which would encroach into the open space to the south of the principal listed building and would face directly onto one of the building's principal facades. The new house would contribute to the erosion of the formal garden space at odds with its open and soft landscaped character which is of great importance to the setting of Highgrove House. The proposal disregards the original design intent of keeping the mews houses to the eastern and less sensitive parts of the site so that they remain within the environs of the ancillary buildings.

The Council's Conservation and Design Officer has stated that the location of the building and the clear conflict between the frontage of No. 17 with the gable end of the proposed house would result in an uncomfortable and cramped juxtaposition drawing further attention to the buildings in this location exacerbating the harm to setting of the listed building. The proposal to erect a further house within the grounds of Highgrove House, would for the above reasons, harm the setting of the grade II listed building.

When making a decision on all listed building consent applications or any decision on a planning application for development that affects a listed building's setting, a local planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or

its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This obligation, found in section 16 and 66 of the Planning (listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, applies to all decisions concerning listed buildings.

The NPPF requires its own exercise to be undertaken as set out in its chapter 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraphs 189-208 require consideration of the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset and assessment of the identification of any harm. In particular, where there is harm identified. Paragraph 202 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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

The harm identified in this case is considered by the Council's Conservation and Design Officer to be 'less than substantial harm' to the setting of Highgrove House a grade II listed building. In line with paragraph 202 of the NPPF, the less than substantial harm arising from the impact of the development on the setting of Highgrove House would need to be weighed against the package of public benefits arising from the scheme. The public benefits that have been put forward by the applicant, in the Council's Conservation and Design Officer's view, would not outweigh the harm identified. The development would therefore be contrary to the NPPF, local policies and the London Plan policies.

It is noted that a listed building consent application has been submitted to run alongside this planning application (10622/APP/2021/1491) for the same proposals. No alterations are proposed to the grade II listed building and therefore the Council's Conservation and Design Officer has advised that a listed building consent application is not required. The above advice that a listed building consent application is not required was put to the agent, who stated that the fixtures of the structures in the curtilage of Highgrove House are also listed, and therefore the removal of railings to facilitate the proposed parking space and the house would require listed building consent. There is no mention of the railings within the submission, nor on any of the submitted plans, which explains the Conservation and Design Officer being unaware of any. It is considered that if the full planning application is recommended for refusal based on the impact of the proposals on the grade II listed building, then it is recommended that the listed building consent application also be recommended for refusal.

7.04 Airport safeguarding

Not relevant to the determination of the application.

7.05 Impact on the green belt

Not relevant to the determination of the application.

7.07 Impact on the character & appearance of the area

Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) requires that new development is of high quality design and responds to a site site's context.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) states that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings and the public realm contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that development should be well integrated with the surrounding area.

The proposed development is located with the wider grounds of Highgrove House and will not be visible from the streetscene. However the proposals are considered to have an unacceptable impact on the immediate locality (including the setting of the Listed Building) as set out within Section 7.03 of this report.

7.08 Impact on neighbours

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

Supporting paragraph 5.38 states that the Council will aim to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents and it will resist proposals where there is an unreasonable level of overlooking between habitable rooms of adjacent residential properties, schools or onto private open spaces. 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.

The proposed location of the new detached house would be directly in front of the main elevation of No. 17 Lingould Grove and would encroach into its front garden space resulting in the new house being built just 1.5 metres from its primary frontage. The new house, as a result, would have a significant detrimental impact on the outlook of No. 17 which would lose views across the grounds of the Highgrove house, overshadowing the property and significantly reducing sunlight and daylight for residential occupiers. This arrangement would have a totally unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of this property. The detrimental impact would be exacerbated by the fact that No. 17 has no windows in the rear elevation for privacy purposes, thus relies even more strongly than usual on the windows in the front elevation to provide outlook and daylight.

The location of the building and the clear conflict between the frontage of No. 17 and the gable end of the proposed house would also result in an uncomfortable and cramped juxtaposition drawing further attention to the mews houses exacerbating the harm a further house would have within this part of the grounds of Highgrove House.

The proposed detached dwelling would also be located only 6m from the most southern elevation of the existing Highgrove House which includes a living room window (as approved under application references 10622/APP/2009/2504 and 10622/APP/2009/2506). In addition it would be located only 14m from the main southern elevation of the listed building and the proposed Bedroom 1 would therefore have a window below 21m from the bedroom windows approved in the southern elevation of Highgrove House.

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk, design and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupies by reason of overdominance, visual intrusion, loss of outlook, overlooking and loss of privacy. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

External Amenity

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all new residential development and conversions will be required to provide good quality and usable private outdoor amenity space. Table 5.3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) states that 2 and 3 bedroom houses should have a minimum of 60 square metres of private usable amenity space.

When consent was granted for the existing adjacent properties (under application references 10622/APP/2006/2490, 10622/APP/2006/2491 and 10622/APP/2010/1822) the consents included an area of recreation and soft landscaping to the west of No. 17 Lidgould Grove where the detached house subject to this application is proposed to be located. The consents were not fully implemented and the area remains as unmaintained hard standing, however that does not preclude its use for external amenity. If the current application were approved then this area of external amenity would be lost, leaving an insufficient level of external amenity area for the occupiers of the adjacent properties.

The proposed scheme is therefore contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.09 Living conditions for future occupiers

Internal Space

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) sets out the minimum internal floor space standards (Table 3.1) required for residential developments in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for future occupants.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment.

The DCLG's Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard (2015) requires double bedrooms to have a floor area of at least 11.5 square metres and single bedrooms to have a floor area of at least 7.5 square metres. Any area with a headroom of less than 1.5m is not counted within the Gross Internal Area unless used solely for storage.

The submitted Design and Access Statement includes the following text 'The nationally prescribed floor standards require a total floor space of 70 square metres for a two-bedroom house (three person). These standards are exceeded.' However the proposed scheme as per the application form and the floor plans as submitted all refer to a three bedroom 4 person two storey dwelling, and Table 3.1 requires such dwellings to have an internal area of 84m2. The proposed dwelling would have a gross internal area that would meet the minimum floor space requirements of 84m2 as set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021). However the proposed Bedroom 3 would not exceed the minimum floor area standard as excluding the area with limited headroom the internal area of that room would be only 5.6m2. As such the proposed scheme is required to have a floor area of 70m2 as a 2 bedroom 3 person two storey dwelling.

Outlook and Privacy

The supporting text to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council will expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook. Single aspect dwellings should be avoided. This is supported by Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

Supporting paragraph 5.38 to Policy DMHB 11 states that the Council will aim to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents and it will resist proposals where there is an unreasonable level of overlooking between habitable rooms of adjacent residential properties, schools or onto private open spaces. 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.

The proposed dwelling would be dual aspect, thus providing an adequate level of natural light. However the building is proposed to be located only 6m from the most southern part of the existing Highgrove House and only 14m from the main southern elevation of the listed building. Whilst the single bedroom (Bedroom 2) has a gable window and the bathroom and en-suite could be conditioned to have obscure glazing, the proposed Bedroom 1 would have a single window below 21m from the habitable room windows of the converted Highgrove House.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not provide a satisfactory level of amenity for future occupiers, and therefore fails to accord with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

External amenity

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all new residential development and conversions will be required to provide good quality and usable private outdoor amenity space. Table 5.3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) states that 2 and 3 bedroom houses should have a minimum of 60 square metres of private usable amenity space.

The proposed plans do not indicate where the external amenity space for the proposed unit would be located. As set out in Section 7.08 of this report there are concerns raised with regards to the loss of external amenity for existing residents. The submission includes no explanation of where the proposed external amenity for the proposed dweling would be located, nor how the loss of existing amenity space would be mitigated against. As such the scheme is not considered to be able to provide sufficient amenity for the proposed dwelling and is therefore contrary to Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.10 Traffic impact, Car/cycle parking, pedestrian safety

Policy T6 Car parking of the London Plan (2021) states that car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity. The maximum car parking standards set out in Policy T6 .1 Residential parking to Policy T6 .5 Non-residential disabled persons parking should be applied to development proposals and used to set local standards within Development Plans. Appropriate disabled persons parking for Blue Badge holders should be provided as set out in Policy T6 .1 Residential parking to Policy T6 .5 Non-residential disabled persons parking. Where car parking is provided in new developments, provision should be made for infrastructure for electric or other Ultra-Low Emission vehicles in line with Policy T6 .1 Residential parking, Policy T6 .2 Office Parking, Policy T6 .3 Retail parking, and Policy T6 .4 Hotel and leisure uses parking.

Policy T6.1 Residential parking of the London Plan (2021) states that new residential development should not exceed the maximum parking standards set out in Table 10.3. These standards are a hierarchy with the more restrictive standard applying when a site falls into more than one category. All residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles. At least 20 per cent of spaces should have active charging facilities, with passive provision for all remaining spaces. Parking must be designed in accordance with the design guidance in BS8300vol.1 and be located to minimise the distance between disabled persons parking bays and the dwelling or the relevant block entrance or lift core, and the route should be preferably level or where this is not possible, should be gently sloping (1:60-1:20) on a suitable firm ground surface.

Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires the Council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway, junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - 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.

The application site has a PTAL ranking of 1a bordering 0 indicating that access to public transport is very poor compared to London as a whole. The Council's Highways Officer has reviewed the submitted details and confirmed that for this development in this location the published London Plan (2021) would allow a maximum of 1.5 car parking spaces to be provided. Therefore the proposed single parking space is in accordance with Policy T6.1 Residential Parking.

The Highways Officer is however concerned that access to the proposed car parking space is currently restricted by bollards. There is an existing vehicle crossover that has a dropped section of only 1.8m and the Councils Guidelines require a dropped section of 2.4m as a minimum. The Highways Officer has no highway objections to the application on condition that details of the proposed vehicle crossover are submitted for approval.

The proposed scheme is therefore considered to be acceptable from highways perspective, subject to the above recommended condition.

7.11 Urban design, access and security

Not relevant to the determination of the application.

7.12 Disabled access

The Equality Act 2010 seeks to protect people accessing goods, facilities and services from direct discrimination on the basis of a protected characteristic, which includes those with a disability. As part of the Act, service providers are obliged to improve access to and within the structure of their building, particularly in situations where reasonable adjustment can be incorporated with relative ease. The Act states that service providers should think ahead to take steps to address barriers that might impede disabled people.

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) seek to ensure that new development achieves the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design. Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) requires that at least 10% of new build dwellings meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' (designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users); and all other new build dwellings must meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.

Policy DMHB 16: 'Housing Standards' of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) requires that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment. To achieve this all residential development or conversions should meet or exceed the most up to date internal space standards, and in the case of major developments, provide at least 10% of new housing to be accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair users.

The Council's Access Officer has reviewed the submitted details and raised no objection to the proposals subject to conditions to secure details of step free access and certification of compliance with the technical specifications for an M4(2) dwelling. Given that the proposed building would be located on the access path to the adjacent No.17

Lidgould Grove the proposed access arrangements would also be required to detail access to that dwelling. Subject to the attachment of these conditions the proposal is deemed acceptable in terms of accessibility.

7.13 Provision of affordable & special needs housing

Not relevant to the determination of the application.

7.14 Trees, landscaping and Ecology

Policy EM4 (Open Space and Informal Recreation) of the Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) says that the Council will safeguard, enhance and extend the network of open spaces, informal recreational and environmental opportunities that operate as carbon sinks and that meet local community needs and facilitate active lifestyles by providing spaces within walking distance of homes. Provision should be made as close as possible to the community it will serve. There will be a presumption against any net loss of open space in the Borough. The Council will identify new opportunities for open space through an Open Space Strategy. Major developments will be expected to make appropriate contributions to the delivery of new opportunities, or to the improvement and enhancements of existing facilities. The Council will seek to protect existing tree and landscape features and enhance open spaces with new areas of vegetation cover (including the linking of existing fragmented areas) including front and back gardens for the benefit of wildlife and a healthier lifestyle, mitigating climate change.

Policy EM7 (Biodiversity and Geological conservation) of the Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) seeks the protection and enhancement of populations of protected species as well as priority species and habitats identified within the UK, London and the Hillingdon Biodiversity Action Plan and will (amongst other things) seek the provision of biodiversity improvements from all development, where feasible.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) also requires that new development is high quality, sustainable, adaptable, and harmonises with the local context. Landscaping and tree planting should also enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.

Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states (amongst other things) that all developments will be expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural features of merit and that development proposals will be required to provide a landscape scheme. The policy also seeks to protect existing trees through tree root protection areas and an arboricultural method statement where appropriate. Where trees are to be removed, proposals for replanting of new trees on-site must be provided or include contributions to offsite provision.

Policy G6 of the London Plan (2021) states that:
A Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) should be protected.
B Boroughs, in developing Development Plans, should:
1) use up-to-date information about the natural environment and the relevant procedures to identify SINCs and ecological corridors to identify coherent ecological networks
2) identify areas of deficiency in access to nature (i.e. areas that are more than 1km walking distance from an accessible Metropolitan or Borough SINC) and seek opportunities to address them
3) support the protection and conservation of priority species and habitats that sit outside the SINC network, and promote opportunities for enhancing them using Biodiversity Action Plans
4) seek opportunities to create other habitats, or features such as artificial nest sites, that are of particular relevance and benefit in an urban context
5) ensure designated sites of European or national nature conservation importance are

clearly identified and impacts assessed in accordance with legislative requirements.
C Where harm to a SINC is unavoidable, and where the benefits of the development proposal clearly outweigh the impacts on biodiversity, the following mitigation hierarchy should be applied to minimise development impacts:
1) avoid damaging the significant ecological features of the site
2) minimise the overall spatial impact and mitigate it by improving the quality or management of the rest of the site
3) deliver off-site compensation of better biodiversity value.
D Development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain. This should be informed by the best available ecological information and addressed from the start of the development process.
E Proposals which reduce deficiencies in access to nature should be considered positively.

Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021) states that:
A London's urban forest and woodlands should be protected and maintained, and new trees and woodlands should be planted in appropriate locations in order to increase the extent of London's urban forest - the area of London under the canopy of trees.
B In their Development Plans, boroughs should:
1) protect 'veteran' trees and ancient woodland where these are not already part of a protected site139
2) identify opportunities for tree planting in strategic locations.
C Development proposals should ensure that, wherever possible, existing trees of value are retained.140 If planning permission is granted that necessitates the removal of trees there should be adequate replacement based on the existing value of the benefits of the trees removed, determined by, for example, i-tree or CAVAT or another appropriate valuation system. The planting of additional trees should generally be included in new developments - particularly large-canopied species which provide a wider range of benefits because of the larger surface area of their canopy.

The application is supported by an Arboricultural Implications Report that states a Sycamore is to be removed and a further Wild Cherry tree is to be pruned. Also submitted with the application is a report on the results of a badger survey. No detailed landscaping information on the proposals is provided.

The Council's Landscape Architect has reviewed the proposals and raised no objections subject to the attachment of appropriate conditions. However the submission does not include details of the landscaping that was approved under the previous consent and has not been implemented. The proposals would prevent this landscaping from being implemented. At present there is a small area of soft landscaping to the front of No.17 Lidgould Grove that would be lost entirely if the new proposed dwelling was constructed less than 2m away from this buildings front elevation. The impact on the residential amenity is considered to be unacceptable as set out within Section 7.08 of this report. In addition there are no details within the submission that indicate what impact the proposal may have on other wildlife within the immediate vicinity, including the adjacent Nature Conservation Site of Borough Grade II or Local Importance.

As such insufficient information has been provided to determine the impact of the proposals on ecology, the proposals are therefore considered to be contrary to Policy EM4 (Open Space and Informal Recreation) and Policy EM7 (Biodiversity and Geological conservation) of the Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 and Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy G6 of the London Plan (2021).

7.15 Sustainable waste management

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that development proposals should make sufficient provision for well designed internal and external storage space for general, recycling and organic waste, with suitable access for collection. External bins should be located and screened to avoid nuisance and adverse visual impacts to occupiers and neighbours.
This is supported by policy EM11 of the Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012).

Servicing for the new dwelling would be as per the arrangements for the wider area. However to ensure that the correct management measures are put in place it is recommended that a Delivery and Servicing Plan be required via an appropriately worded condition should the application be approved.

As such the proposal is considered to be in accordance with London Plan Policies 5.16 and 5.17 and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020).

7.16 Renewable energy / Sustainability

Policy EM1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that the Council will ensure that climate change mitigation is addressed at every stage of the development process.

Policy DMEI 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) requires that:
A) All developments make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with London Plan targets;
B) All major development proposals must be accompanied by an energy assessment showing how these reductions will be achieved;
C) Proposals that fail to take reasonable steps to achieve the required savings will be resisted. However, if the Council is minded to approve the application despite not meeting the carbon reduction targets, then it will seek an off-site contribution to make up for the shortfall. The contribution will be sought at a flat rate at of £/tonne over the lifetime of the development, in accordance with the current 'allowable solutions cost'.

The proposed development is supported by a an Energy and Sustainability Statement (E1071-ESS-00 - 16th March 2021) that concludes through further design the scheme could achieve policy compliance in terms of carbon dioxide reduction, incorporation of low and zero carbon technologies and water consumption. As such, should the scheme be recommended for approval then an appropriate condition could be attached to require an updated Energy Statement to be submitted and approved and that the development be in accordance with the approved Energy Statement.

7.17 Flooding or Drainage Issues

Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that applicants must demonstrate that Flood Risk can be suitably mitigated.

Policy DMEI 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that proposals that fail to make appropriate provision for flood risk mitigation, or which would increase the risk or consequences of flooding, will be refused.

The site does fall within the Critical Drainage Area. As set out within Section 3.3 of this report, planning permission reference 10622/APP/2010/1822 granted consent for the adjacent mews housing within the grounds of Highgrove House. Application reference 10622/APP/2011/2691 discharged Condition 12 (Sustainable Urban Drainage) of that consent and the approved details included a drainage tank and perforated soakaway in the location of the proposed new dwelling. No details have been submitted for the

drainage proposed for the new dwelling or how the existing drainage for the mews housing, if implemented, would be amended to accommodate the new building.

As such the proposals, if recommended for approval, would require an appropriately worded condition to ensure that a new sustainable urban drainage scheme be approved that amends the existing approved drainage and accommodates the new dwelling.

7.18 Noise or Air Quality Issues

It is considered that the proposal would not give rise to any additional noise or air quality issues of concern.

7.19 Comments on Public Consultations

Where the comments raised through the public consultation process are material planning considerations they have been discussed within the relevant sections of this report.

7.20 Planning obligations

PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

No Planning Obligations are sought.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

From 1 April 2012, all planning approvals for schemes with a net additional internal floor area of 100m2 or more will be liable for the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (Mayoral CIL), as legislated by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011. The liability payable will be equal to £60 per square metre (from April 2019). The London Borough of Hillingdon is a collecting authority for the Mayor of London and this liability shall be paid to LBH in the first instance.

In addition the development represents Chargeable Development under the Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy, which came into effect on 1st August 2014. The liability payable will be £95 per square metre.

7.21 Expediency of enforcement action

Not relevant to the determination of the application.

7.22 Other Issues

None

8. Observations of the Borough Solicitor

General
Members must determine planning applications having due regard to the provisions of the development plan so far as material to the application, any local finance considerations so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations (including regional and national policy and guidance). Members must also determine applications in accordance with all relevant primary and secondary legislation.

Material considerations are those which are relevant to regulating the development and use of land in the public interest. The considerations must fairly and reasonably relate to the application concerned.

Members should also ensure that their involvement in the determination of planning applications adheres to the Members Code of Conduct as adopted by Full Council and also the guidance contained in Probity in Planning, 2009.

Planning Conditions

Members may decide to grant planning consent subject to conditions. Planning consent should not be refused where planning conditions can overcome a reason for refusal. Planning conditions should only be imposed where Members are satisfied that imposing the conditions are necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Where conditions are imposed, the Council is required to provide full reasons for imposing those conditions.

Planning Obligations
Members must be satisfied that any planning obligations to be secured by way of an agreement or undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The obligations must be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind to the development (Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy 2010).

Equalities and Human Rights
Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, requires the Council, in considering planning applications to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunities and foster good relations between people who have different protected characteristics. The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The requirement to have due regard to the above goals means that members should consider whether persons with particular protected characteristics would be affected by a proposal when compared to persons who do not share that protected characteristic. Where equalities issues arise, members should weigh up the equalities impact of the proposals against the other material considerations relating to the planning application. Equalities impacts are not necessarily decisive, but the objective of advancing equalities must be taken into account in weighing up the merits of an application. The weight to be given to any equalities issues is a matter for the decision maker to determine in all of the circumstances.

Members should also consider whether a planning decision would affect human rights, in particular the right to a fair hearing, the right to respect for private and family life, the protection of property and the prohibition of discrimination. Any decision must be proportionate and achieve a fair balance between private interests and the public interest.

9. Observations of the Director of Finance

Not applicable

10. CONCLUSION

This application seeks permission for the erection of a 3 bedroom detached house and associated works.

The proposed development is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the grade II listed Highgrove House, local ecology and the residential amenity of existing and proposed occupiers. As such the proposals are contrary to policy as set out within this report and had an appeal against non determination not been lodged the application would have been refused.

11. Reference Documents

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012)
Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020)
The London Plan (March 2021)

Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)
Hillingdon Local Plan Accessible Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document (September 2017)
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

Contact Officer: Ed Laughton **Telephone No:** 01895 250230