

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	28 MANOR ROAD RUISLIP		
Development:	Single storey rear extension, conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a front dormer, 4 rooflights and rear roof alteration from hipped to gable end. Relocation of side entry door to front elevation and internal layout remodelling.		
LBH Ref Nos:	75898/APP/2021/1062		
Drawing Nos:	A-0001 Rev. 02 A-0002 Rev. 02 A-0200 Rev. 00 A-0201 Rev. 00 A-0202 Rev. 00 A-0203 Rev. 00 A-0300 Rev. 00 A-0301 Rev. 00 A-0302 Rev. 00 A-0303 Rev. 00 A-0304 Rev. 00 A-0305 Rev. 00 Heritage Statement and Design and Access Statement		

Date Plans Received: 17/03/2021 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**
Date Application Valid: 24/03/2021

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

This application site is located on the north side of Manor Road. The site comprises a bungalow. The bungalow has been finished in white render and tiling. and has a pitched roof, with front elevation chimney. The property is set back from the road allowing for off street parking and some landscaping.

The neighbouring property to the west of the site (No. 30) is a detached two storey building which has been extended by way of single storey rear extensions, the other neighbouring property at No. 26 is also a detached, two storey house.

Properties within the wider area are detached and semi detached . They are between one and three storeys in height and vary in their design and material finish. The majority of dwellings are set back from the street allowing for off road parking and landscaping. It is worth noting that front and side dormers of various design and size are visible within the street scene.

The property is within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension, conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a front dormer, 4 rooflights and rear roof alteration from hipped to gable end. Relocation of side entry door to front elevation and internal

layout remodelling.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

75898/APP/2020/3000 28 Manor Road Ruislip

Single storey rear extension, two storey front extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 side dormers, 2 side roof lights and conversion of rear of roof from hip to gable end and balcony/terrace to the rear.

Decision Date: 20-11-2020 Refused

75898/PRC/2021/9 28 Manor Road Ruislip

Single storey rear extension, loft conversion including a new front dormer, 4 rooflights and rear roof alteration from hipped to gable end. Relocation of side entry door to front elevation and internal layout remodelling.

Decision Date: 25-02-2021 NO

Comment on Planning History

Planning Application No. 75898/APP/2020/3000 sought permission for the erection of a 'Single storey rear extension, two storey front extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 side dormers, 2 side roof lights and conversion of rear of roof from hip to gable end and balcony/terrace to the rear'. The application was refused for the following reasons.

1. The roof alteration/extensions and terrace, by reason of the hip to gable end roof design and the size, scale, bulk, and design of the dormer windows would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, 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 Ruislip 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 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

2. The proposed front extension, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk, height and design, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, 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 Ruislip 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 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

3. The proposed roof extension to the east side elevation, by virtue of its siting, size, scale, bulk, design and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupier at 26 Manor Road by reason of visual intrusion, loss of light, loss of outlook and loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

4. The proposal, by reason of the siting of the flank bedroom window, given its proximity to the adjoining property and use of obscure glazing, would result in the provision of a habitable room with no outlook and limited levels of natural lighting that would result in a substandard form of living accommodation and reliance upon artificial means of lighting

which would fail to satisfy sustainability and energy efficiency objectives and would be to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies 3.5 and 5.3 of the London Plan (March 2016).

Since the refusal, pre application advice was sought for a scheme identical to this scheme. No in principle objections were raised against the proposed development, however the advice given clearly stated:

'The proposal, based on the plans and supporting documents that have been submitted are supported as it would be generally in accordance with Policies DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), as discussed above. A formal application would be subject to further internal and public consultation which may raise other issues.'

The conservation officer has been consulted on this formal application and has raised objections against the scheme. Those objections are set out below.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 26th May 2021

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

9 neighbours including the Ruislip Residents Association and the Ruislip Village Conservation Panel were consulted on the 26/03/21. A site notice was also placed at the site. In response to consultation on the application 2 objections were received. Those objections have been summarised below.

- The dormer windows will result in overlooking and loss of privacy.
- The proposed balcony/terrace will result in loss of privacy.
- The development will have a negative impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

Conservation Officer:

The proposed development would significantly alter the character and appearance of the existing building, and as proposed it would be considered unacceptable.

The principal of converting the existing roof space for habitable use would be deemed admissible. However, the proposed roof alterations would fail to respect the original built form. It would result in the loss of the interesting roof form to the rear with the introduction of a gable end and the front dormer would diminish the roof form to the front.

The large dormer to the front would be a notably prominent feature. It would be considered an overly large bulky addition to the property, and dormers along front roof slope are not usually accepted in conservation areas.

If any consideration is given the dormer would need to be reduced in size. The window opening should be proportionately smaller than the windows below and fill out the entire front elevation of the dormer, avoiding any front facing cheeks.

To copy existing precedents in the area would be inappropriate, as each case should be assessed upon its own merits. Many of the precedent examples referenced detract from the character of the conservation area. It would also need to be noted that some of the precedents referenced are likely to date prior to the designation of this part of the conservation area.

As per previous comments in relation to this site, the alteration of the roof form from hip to gable to the rear would inappropriately increase the bulk of the building. It would detrimentally alter the original form of the bungalow. The inclusion of the Juliette balcony is not a characteristic feature of the area.

It would need to be duly noted that conservation areas are not designated as a series of street scenes. The rear alterations would be visible from within the rear garden of the application site and neighbouring gardens. These form part of the environment in which the heritage asset is experienced and just because there are not public views does not lessen the requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the conservation area.

The application of a smooth white render to the existing property would be deemed admissible in this instance, however details of the proposed render product and depth of the render would need to be confirmed prior to works taking place.

The alteration of the roof finish to a grey tile would be considered in principle unacceptable. Manor Road is predominantly characterised by clay tiled roofs. The proposal would significantly detract from the existing street scene. Furthermore, it would dramatically alter the appearance of the existing bungalow, failing to respect its existing character and appearance. slate would introduce a new roofing material into the area.

The alteration to the windows would significantly alter the character of the property as it would introduce a new window type along the street scene. Whilst the principle of using Crittall style windows can be considered, the altered glazing arrangement would be a concern.

The proposal would result in less than substantial harm, therefore, paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) would need to be considered in this instance.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, places a statutory duty upon the decision maker to pay special attention to the desire of preserving or enhancing the conservation area. From a historic environment perspective, the proposal would have a negative impact on the conservation area, failing to preserve or enhance it.

Conclusion: Objection

Officer response: The conservation officers comments have been taken into consideration below.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
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
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main issues for consideration in determining this application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the street scene and conservation area, impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property and parking provision.

Design Considerations

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy BE1 seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character. The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policy HE1 seeks to preserve and enhance the borough's heritage assets.

The site is located within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and Policy DMHB 4 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that development should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area in which it is sited.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) requires that alterations and extensions of dwellings should not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate and visually complimentary to the main dwelling. With regard

to rear extensions the policy states:

ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth; iii) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level; iv) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet.

With regard to roof extensions the policy states:

i) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line; ii) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable; iii) raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported; iv) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling; and v) in Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character and on Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, roof extensions should take the form of traditional 'dormer' windows, on the rear elevation, to harmonise with the existing building. The highest point of the dormer should be kept well within the back roof slope, away from the ridge, eaves or valleys, whilst each window should match the proportions, size and glazing pattern of the first floor windows.

The single storey rear extension would be approximately 2.9m deep and 3.5m high (as it is sited upon a raised rear patio). The extension is of an acceptable depth and despite the fact that it would exceed the height limitations set out in the policy, it would sit well below the properties first floor windows, would be finished in materials to match (which could be conditioned) and would be within the width of the existing dwelling. The rear single storey extension is therefore considered to be acceptable and no objections have been raised by the conservation officer regarding this element of the scheme.

Together, the proposed front dormer and rear hip to gable roof extension would completely alter the form and appearance of the properties roof, causing harm to its simple yet interesting original architectural composition. Front elevation dormers are advised against in the Local Plan (especially in conservation areas) and due to its size and window proportions the proposed dormer would form a bulky and visually dominant addition to the host dwelling, unbalancing its fenestration. The dormer would also form another unwanted addition to the street scene.

The proposed Juliet balcony is an uncommon feature in the area and would therefore be out of character. The alteration of the roof finish to a grey slate tile would be out of keeping with neighbouring properties which are predominantly finished with brown, red and orange clay tiled roofs. The material finish of the roof would therefore be out of character, furthermore it would add to the visual harm identified above, as it would increase the prominence of the property in the street scene. The alteration to the windows would significantly alter the character of the property and they would introduce a new window type to the street scene, therefore failing to integrate into the areas existing character.

As mentioned by the conservation officer 'to copy existing precedents in the area would be inappropriate, as each case should be assessed upon its own merits. Many of the

precedent examples referenced detract from the character of the conservation area. It would also need to be noted that some of the precedents referenced are likely to date prior to the designation of this part of the conservation area...it would need to be duly noted that conservation areas are not designated as a series of street scenes. The rear alterations would be visible from within the rear garden of the application site and neighbouring gardens. These form part of the environment in which the heritage asset is experienced and just because there are not public views does not lessen the requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the conservation area'

It is agreed that other development in the area should not set a precedence for this proposal, especially as planning policy guidance has been updated in recent years (NPPF 2021 and Local Plan Part 2 Policies - 2020) to improve the design quality of development and protect heritage assets. Additionally because works are sited to the rear of the property, they are not considered to be exempt from seeking to preserve or enhance the conservation area.

Taking into consideration the above it is considered that due to its bulky and poorly designed front dormer, unsympathetic rear hip to gable roof extension, uncharacteristic Crittal windows, Juliet Balcony, and roof finish (in terms of colour and material), the proposed works would form a harmful additions to the property which fail to integrate with the original architectural composition or material palette of the host dwelling, subsequently harming its character and appearance. Due to the mentioned uncharacteristic features and its design, the resulting dwelling would fail to integrate with other properties in the area, forming a unduly prominent and unusual addition to the street scene which would cause less than substantial harm to the conservation area (failing to preserve or enhance it).

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021) 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'. No public benefits have been demonstrated to outweigh the harm to the conservation area. The proposal is therefore considered to cause unacceptable harm to the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and it is 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), as well as Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and NPPF Guidance.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DMHB 11 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development should not have an adverse impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. Policy DMHD 1 provides similar guidance and advises that extensions should cause no harmful loss of outlook.

The new front dormer would face towards Manor Road where it would cause no adverse increase in overlooking or a loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed side elevation rooflights would provide skyward views as opposed to direct views into the side elevation windows of the neighbouring properties. If minded to approve the submission, it is considered that a condition would be applied to the side facing rooflights requiring obscure glazing and non opening below 1.8m.

Due to the separation distance between the development site and its nearest neighbours (No.26 and No.30 Manor Road), as well as the fact that the mentioned neighbours are significantly larger in scale than the resulting dwelling, the proposed works would lead to no overbearing or overshadowing impact on No.26 and No.30 Manor Road. For the same reasons the resulting dwelling is unlikely to lead to any harmful loss of outlook to the neighbouring properties.

The roof alterations and single storey rear extensions are sited far enough away from both neighbouring properties to not cause any undue loss of light to their habitable room windows or rear patio areas.

In this area, it is common for the first floor rear windows of properties to look into the gardens of their neighbours. The proposed rear Juliet balcony and surrounding windows would therefore provide a level of overlooking which is common in this area. The first floor rear windows of the development are therefore unlikely to lead to any significant or undue loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings.

To the rear of the site are properties on Sharps Lane. Those dwellings are over 60m away from No.28 and therefore their amenities are unlikely to be harmed by the proposed development in any way.

For the reasons mentioned above the proposal is considered to cause no harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties, which would warrant refusal of the application.

The extension would provide additional accommodation for the sites occupiers improving their amenities. The development includes a guest/cloak room and play room, those spaces could be used as bedrooms due to their size. If they were to be used as bedrooms, they like other rooms in the dwelling would have access to natural light and good spacing. The London Plan 2021 internal space standards is clear that the requirements should only be applied to new builds, conversions and changes of use. The standards are therefore not relevant to this development. Nevertheless the potential 4 bedroom 7 person property would meet the requirements for storage and internal floor space and is therefore of good design in terms of the space provided for future occupants. Policy DMHB 18 advises that 4 bedroom properties should be provided with 100sqm of private amenity space. The resulting dwelling would have 331sqm and therefore provides adequate amenity space. It is therefore likely that a good level of amenity would be provided for future occupiers of the dwelling.

Parking Provision and Highway Safety

The proposed development includes no changes to the sites vehicular access. Nor does it include a loss of parking space. 2-3 vehicles could be parked on the properties front drive, as such adequate off street parking would be provided for the resulting 4 bedroom dwelling. The proposed development is therefore unlikely to worsen the demand for parking at the site, nor is it likely to cause any highways or pedestrian safety issues, especially when compared with the sites existing situation. The proposal therefore complies with Policies DMT 2 and DMT6 of the Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies: January 2020.

Conclusion

Taking into consideration the above the proposed works are considered to cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and conservation area. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

The Council has, in considering this planning application, had special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area, its setting and buildings within it, as required under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed roof alterations/extensions, by reason of the bulky and poorly designed front dormer, unsympathetic hip to gable roof extension, inclusion of uncharacteristic design features (crittal windows, grey slate tiles, Juliet balcony) would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would form an unduly prominent addition to the street scene which would fail to integrate with the appearance of other properties in the area, subsequently causing harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposed development would also fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be 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), as well as Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 130 (a), 130 (b), 130 (c) and 202 of the NPPF (2021).

INFORMATIVES

- 1** The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
- 2** The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan (2021) and national guidance.

DMHB 1 Heritage Assets

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 1 Design of New Development

DMHB 1 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 1 Trees and Landscaping

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

LPP HC (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

NPPF12 NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places

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

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
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
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Haydon Richardson

Telephone No: 01895 250230