

DELEGATED 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	LAND FORMING PART OF 2 ARLINGTON DRIVE RUISLIP
Development:	Erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping
LBH Ref Nos:	74323/APP/2021/2509
Drawing Nos:	Built Heritage Statement April 2021 (Ref: JCH01350 v1.) Design and Access Statement PL003 PL001 PL002 PL004 PL005 PL006 (Proposed Rear and Right Elevations) Planning Statement dated June 2021 Covering letter dated 23rd March 2021 PL006 (Arlington Drive Street Scene)

Date Plans received : 23/06/2021

Date(s) of Amendment(s):

Date Application Valid: 23/06/2021

1. SUMMARY

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION:

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping. The proposal includes the installation of a new vehicular crossover on Arlington Drive.

The proposed dwelling would have a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area, by virtue of its siting, layout, site coverage, design and external finish. Additionally, insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the health of trees at the site would not be impacted by the proposed development.

The proposal is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Building at No.2 Arlington Drive (known as Little Manor House). The proposed development would result in a loss of part of the garden area of Little Manor House, which forms an integral part of the setting of the Listed Building. Although not accounted for on the submitted drawings, the proposed vehicular crossover would require sections of the existing historic brick wall to be demolished to achieve appropriate visibility splays, thus resulting in the partial loss of a historic feature.

The proposed development is considered to amount to less than substantial harm. In respect to the planning test set out paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021), there is a requirement to weight this harm against the public benefits of the proposal. Hillingdon Council can currently demonstrate a five-year housing supply. The proposal would only provide a single private market dwelling, and so its contribution to the Borough's housing supply would be limited. The site would not constitute as previously development land based on the definition set out in the glossary of the NPPF. As such, the proposal would

not be making use of brownfield land. It is not, therefore, considered that there are any public benefits that would outweigh the harm the proposal would cause to the special interest and significance of the designated heritage asset at No.2 Arlington Drive.

The proposed development would not accord with the Development Plan, and it is recommended that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of its siting in a rear garden, layout, site coverage, design and external finish, would result in a visually incongruous form of development given its setting and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the residential area and the wider area as a whole. The proposal is, thus, detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (March 2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021).

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the location, design and layout of the proposed dwelling, the loss of sections of the historic boundary wall and the loss of the existing open garden aspect of the site, would have an unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Building at number 2 Arlington Drive (known as Little Manor House), thus causing harm to its special interest and significance. The proposal would therefore conflict with the Policies BE1 and 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 (March 2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021).

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

In the absence of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the trees at the site will be unaffected by the proposed development and has not made provision for their long term protection. As such, the proposal would be to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D1, D3 and G1 of the London Plan (March 2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (July 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 6	Garden and Backland Development
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
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 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
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 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 G1	(2021) Green infrastructure
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling

LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF15	NPPF 2021 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

3. **CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 **Site and Locality**

The application site comprises the rear garden of the Grade II Listed Building at No.2 Arlington Drive (known as Little Manor House). The site is located on the southern side of Arlington Drive and is bordered to the west by No. 8 Arlington Drive. The rear gardens of Nos. 145-161 Bury Street run along the eastern site boundary, whilst 58 and 60 Marlborough Avenue are located at the rear of the site. Nos. 7A-17 Arlington Drive are located on the opposite side of the application site. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1b (very poor) and lies within a Critical Drainage Area.

3.2 **Proposed Scheme**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping. The proposal includes the installation of a new vehicular crossover on Arlington Drive.

It is noted that the Design and Access Statement states that the existing access would be blocked up and a new access point created (refer to pages 5 and 6). However, this conflicts with the submitted drawings showing a new crossover would be installed to the front of the existing access gate along the boundary fronting Arlington Drive. For the avoidance of doubt, the following assessment is based on the submitted drawings.

An application for Listed Building Consent is being dealt with under application ref: 74323/APP/2021/2511.

3.3 **Relevant Planning History**

409/APP/2009/1010 12 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 5 rooflights, first floor rear extension with habitable roofspace and alterations to roof at side.

Decision: 15-07-2009 Approved

409/B/86/0269 12 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Householder development - residential extension(P)

Decision: 22-04-1986 Approved

71084/APP/2017/2246 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular crossovers and site landscaping

Decision: 25-08-2017 Refused **Appeal:** 12-10-2018 Dismissed

71084/APP/2017/2247 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular crossovers and site landscaping (Listed Building Consent)

Decision: 25-08-2017 Refused **Appeal:** 12-10-2018 Dismissed

71084/APP/2017/3603 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping.

Decision: 12-12-2017 Refused **Appeal:** 12-10-2018 Dismissed

71084/APP/2017/3604 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular access and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping (Application for Listed Building Consent).

Decision: 12-12-2017 Refused **Appeal:** 12-10-2018 Dismissed

71084/APP/2017/785 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive), with detached double garages, access driveway and new vehicular crossover and site landscaping

Decision: 28-04-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/786 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive), with detached double garages, access driveway and new vehicular crossover and site landscaping (Listed Building Consent)

Decision: 28-04-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2019/2289 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of a 4-bed detached 2-storey dwelling with associated parking and landscaping (Application for Listed Building Consent)

Decision: 02-09-2019 Refused

71084/APP/2019/2301 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of a detached 2-storey x 4-bed dwelling with associated parking and landscaping

Decision: 02-09-2019 Refused

74323/APP/2021/2511 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Ruislip
Erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping (Application for Listed Building Consent)

Decision: 10-09-2021 Refused

Comment on Planning History

Several planning and listed building consent applications for the erection of dwellings

within the curtilage of the application site have been submitted to the Council. All these applications have been refused and those that have been appealed have been dismissed by the Secretary of State.

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent was refused by the Council on 2nd September 2019 for the erection of a detached two-storey x 4-bed dwelling with associated parking and landscaping under application refs: 71084/APP/2019/2301 & 71084/APP/2019/2289. The grounds for refusal are as follows:

1) The proposed development, by reason of its siting in a rear garden, would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use involving the loss of existing private rear garden area is unacceptable in principle and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policy H12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMH 6 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (March 2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).

2) The proposed dwelling, by reason of its location, design, layout and loss of the existing open garden aspect of the site, would have an unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Little Manor House, contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE8, BE9, BE10 and BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMHB 1, DMHB 2 and DMHB 11 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF (February 2019).

3) In the absence of a tree report to BS5837:2012, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the trees will be unaffected by the development and has not made provision for their long term protection. As such, the proposal would be to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMHB 11 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policies 3.5 and 5.10 of the London Plan (March 2016) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4) The proposed development, by virtue of the close proximity of the proposed driveway to the existing properties at, Little Manor House and 8 Arlington Drive, would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupants of these properties, by reason of the noise and disturbance resulting from the use of this driveway and its visual impact. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Policies H12, BE13, BE19, BE21 and OE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMH 6 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) Policy and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

5) The proposal would be backland garden development which would fail to establish an active frontage with natural surveillance. By virtue of a 50 metre long access road, the

entrance to the property would not be visible from the street scene. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy DMHB 15 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent was refused by the Council on 12th December 2017 for the erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping under application refs: 71084/APP/2017/3603 & 71084/APP/2017/3604. The grounds for refusal are as follows:

1) The proposed development, by reason of its siting (in a rear garden), design, layout, and site coverage, would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site to the level proposed, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the residential area as a whole. The proposal is, thus, detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE19 and H12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the NPPF (March 2012).

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

3) The proposed development, by reason of the proximity of the boundary wall and the flank elevation of the proposed 4 Arlington Drive to the existing dwelling (2 Arlington Drive), would result in the provision of inadequate levels of daylight/sunlight and poor/no outlook to existing habitable rooms, therefore giving rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers of 2 Arlington Drive. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4) The proposed development would result in the loss of a number of existing trees within the site and side boundary with 8 Arlington Drive, and fails to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental impact on existing landscaping and tree planting within the site. The proposal would thus be to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent was refused by the Council for the erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular crossovers and site landscaping under application ref: 71084/APP/2017/2246 & 71084/APP/2017/2247. The grounds for refusal are similar to those cited for application refs: 71084/APP/2017/3603 & 71084/APP/2017/3604, excluding reason number 4.

A Joint Appeal was lodged against the refusal of applications ref:71084/APP/2017/3603 & 71084/APP/2017/3604 and 71084/APP/2017/2246 & 71084/APP/2017/2247. The Appeals were subsequently dismissed by the Secretary of State on 12th October 2018 (refs: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615 and APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617).

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent was refused by the Council for the erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with detached double garages, access driveway and new vehicular crossover and site landscaping under application refs: 71084/APP/2017/785 & 71084/APP/2017/786. The grounds for refusal are as follows:

1)The proposed development, by reason of its siting (in a rear garden), design, layout, and site coverage, would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site to the level proposed, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the residential area as a whole. The proposal is, thus, detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE19 and H12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the NPPF (March 2012).

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

3) The proposed 1.8m high brick boundary wall sub-dividing the site, by reason of its siting in proximity to the existing dwelling (2 Arlington Drive), would result in the provision of inadequate levels of daylight/sunlight and poor/no outlook to existing habitable rooms, therefore giving rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers of 2 Arlington Drive. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4) The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing street tree to facilitate the proposed driveway and fails to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental impact on existing landscaping and tree planting within the site. The proposal would thus be to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the

character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

EXTERNAL CONSULTEES:

16 neighbouring properties were consulted on 12th July 2021. A site notice was displayed on a nearby lamp post on 23rd July 2021, and a press notice was published on 21st July 2021. The consultation period expired on 13th August 2021. Eight objections were received from separate addresses and their comments are summarised as follows:

- Out of keeping with the local area
- Incongruous to the street scene
- The garden is an important part of the Little Manor House (a Grade II Listed Building)
- The applicant is allowing Little Manor House to deteriorate
- Erecting a building so close to a Grade II Listed Building will adversely impact it
- Conflicts with the requirement to conserve and enhance the Grade II listed building at 2 Arlington Drive
- Unclear whether the proposal would result in the loss of trees
- The development would require the removal of established trees
- Concerns about flooding
- Parking implications on Arlington Drive
- An example of unwelcomed tandem development in a backland residential area
- Potential disturbance and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties
- If approved, the development could set a precedent for future developments adjacent to historic assets
- Archaeological surveys should be undertaken given the historic nature of the site
- The contribution to the supply of housing would not outweigh harm to the historic site
- Noise and disturbance during the construction period

A ward Councillor has submitted the following comments: "I would like to register my concerns about this application, which as it stands, would result in overdevelopment in a site context and unacceptable loss of neighbouring residential amenity."

Eastcote Conservation Panel and Eastcote Residents' Association:

The proposed dwelling is within the curtilage of a Grade II Listed Building. There have been many applications for development on this land. All refused. The most concerning matter is the fact that many trees have been cut down before the current application was made. It must be noted that this was carried out to overcome one of the objections of the Planning Inspectorate, who stated that these trees were a very important part of the listed site and of the street scene. The application does not have a tree survey, which should be called for to protect the remaining trees on the site. An Ecology Survey should also be sought as the Listed Building, Little Manor Farm House is of an age to be conducive to bat roosts as are some of the older trees. It is noted that there is a well situated within the garden of the farmhouse, this means there must be an underground water supply. This

area sits within a Critical Drainage Area, therefore steps to include a SUDS to cope with surface water is needed. In conclusion, the proposal will be detrimental to the siting of the Farmhouse and to the street scene. The lack of reports for the trees and ecology also acknowledgement of the possibility of surface water flooding with a suitable remedy should be sought.

Ruislip Village Conservation Panel has raised an objection to the planning application and they have provided the following comments.

Scale: The plans provided do not show a scale. There are no measurements of the height of Little Manor Farm and the proposed building. The plans give the impression that the length of the site along Arlington Drive is longer than in reality. To judge the difference in height between the properties further information would be required on this point.

Boundary Wall: The existing northwest boundary wall provides an interesting break in the street scene. The latest proposals are inconsistent regarding the proposed access. In some places it is implied that the current gate will be moved to a new position and the current (historical) wall made good. Whereas the Footprint Layout indicates the access is at the location of existing entrance. If this application were to be approved, it would be preferable not to move the access location along this wall.

Trees: It has been previously acknowledged that there are trees on the site visible from the public realm that contribute to the character and appearance of the area. There are also young trees in the grass verge in front of the application site. A major concern is that the plans confirm that trees along the boundary with 8 Arlington Drive have already been removed since the last application was refused in direct conflict with point 11 of the Appeal Report dated 12/10/18 that stated: "The Appeal A development would entail the removal of a number of trees on the street frontage of the site and its boundary with No. 8. The affected trees are largely conifers, with some self-sown native species. While not in themselves meriting individual protection, as a group they make a positive contribution to the open and green character and appearance of the area. Their loss and replacement with open areas of hardstanding for parking or with built form would exacerbate the harm I have identified above".

No tree survey has been submitted to quantify or qualify further tree removal. The precise location of the access drive, and the impact of removing a portion of the historic boundary wall and associated trees to be removed have not been clearly specified.

The new house will be squashed across the site that will mean that it will not be possible to re-plant trees / hedges along the side boundary with no 8 Arlington Drive. We are concerned that important landscape components have already been removed before plans were submitted, and that these proposals will further deplete important landscape components that contribute to the appearance and character of the area.

Boundary, Landscaping, Cycle & Bin Stores: The plans do not state the kind of boundary - brick wall, fence, hedge - is intended to divide the new house from Little Manor Farm, nor to give any indication of its height.

Cycle storage is mentioned in the planning proposals, but the size or location of bin stores and cycle storage are not indicated. Is there space for all this along with the parking provision? A landscape plan to include location of the bin, cycle stores and soft landscaping should be provided before a judgement of these proposals can be considered.

Other surveys: Given that Little Manor Farm is the type of building that would house bat roosts, and because of the amount of tree cover on the site that could provide bat roosts. It is surprising that no Bat Survey has been submitted. Similarly, the site is within a CDA.

A drainage survey should be submitted to fully consider this application.

Conclusion: The many reasons for appeal dismissal in Appeal Report dated 12/1018 apply to these latest planning proposals, in particular point 22 :

"The Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. It also states that the extent of setting is not fixed, and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. In this case, while the suburban development around the listed building has reduced the extent of open land about it, nonetheless the large garden area survives as a relic of its former open, rural setting in a farmyard with farmlands beyond. Part of the special interest and significance also therefore resides in this garden setting"

A new house on this the site will have detrimental impact on the street scene and character of the area and will overshadow the listed building. These latest proposals would still conflict with the requirement to conserve and enhance the Grade II listed building at 2 Arlington Drive (Little Manor Farm) - a designated heritage asset, and still negatively impact the setting of the listed building and fail to conserve its significance by being sympathetic to its form and scale.

Ruislip Residents Association: No comments received.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES:

Council's Highways Officer: The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are satisfied that the proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any measurable highway safety concerns, in accordance with Local Plan: Part 2 Development Plan Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021). The Highways Officer's comments are incorporated into the main body of the report (refer to the section titled 'Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety').

The Council's Conservation Officer has objected to the planning application and has provided the following consultation response.

Listed Building

Little Manor House is a Grade II listed, timber framed building, dating from the 16th century, however it may have earlier origins. It is highly likely the building was originally constructed as a medieval hall house with the central bay relating to such origins. The building has benefitted from few alterations over the centuries including the front elevation refaced in 18th century brickwork and addition of the northern bay in the 19th century. Overtime the building became a farmhouse, and early OS maps depict an enclosed farmyard, with structures located to the east of Little Manor House.

The building is two-storeys in height, with a central range and gabled cross-wings at the ends. The roof is finished in plain clay tiles, and tall compound chimney stacks are evident externally. The majority of windows are small paned casements however one 18th century sash window is evident. The external brick skin has been finished in a white paint which defines the external appearance of the building. Later mock Tudor timber detailing appears to have been added to the property. Internally some timber framing is exposed, and the early wall paintings are evident on the upper floors. The original plan form of the building has been retained.

Site and Setting

Historic access to the house was originally, directly off Bury Street, however this was then moved to Old Howletts Lane to the north. Following the suburbanisation of the area, Arlington Road provided access to the building and site, resulting in the unique orientation of the property today. The front elevation faces north-east towards Bury Street with the rear elevation facing south-west onto what is the private rear garden associated to the house.

Annex 2: Glossary within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) states that 'Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence but also from its setting.' The heritage value of the Listed Building is duly recognised by its notable historic and architectural interest however, its setting and surroundings also contribute to its significance and how it is experienced. This can be influenced by a number of natural and/or human factors.

The setting of the listed building is not solely defined by its immediate visual context. Albeit somewhat hidden amongst suburbia, Little Manor House forms part of a pleasant group of traditionally constructed historic buildings, located along the central section of Bury Street. The buildings are located to the east and south-east of the site and collectively have a strong historic connection. The buildings are all Grade II listed buildings, and the group comprises of The Plough, Woodman Farm, The Berries, Bury Street Farm and Little Manor House.

The central portion of Bury Street was historically known as Silver Street Green, and the small group of timber-framed buildings were the first forms of development, within the once vast, open rural environment. Whilst the onslaught of suburban housing has somewhat diminished the visual relationship between the buildings, collectively they are relics and local landmark buildings of Ruislip's rural origins, informing and enhancing their historic interest as designated heritage assets.

As existing Little Manor House is surrounded by suburban housing, predominantly comprising of detached and semi-detached houses dating from the mid-20th century. The development of the area has eroded its former historic open rural character and negatively contributes to the setting of the building. However, the retained open rear garden associated to Little Manor House provides the much needed buffer between the historic building and surrounding suburbia.

Little Manor House forms part of the history of the area and is a good example of a traditional building of its time. The spacious, verdant nature of the site serves as a reminder of the area's rural origins and the historic use of the surrounding land and house. It positively contributes to the visual character of the area, providing a sense of openness and is an integral part of the listed building's setting.

It is not disputed that settings change overtime however historic uses contribute to the heritage asset's significance. The rear garden related to the historic function of the building and site as a farmyard as is evidence on historic OS maps. It is evident that the rear garden clearly relates to the function of the listed building as a residential dwelling, therefore forming part of its setting.

As existing, there appear to be a number of ancillary detached structures/buildings within the curtilage of the listed building. To the south-east there is a garage and shed-like structure. Recently a new structure appears to have been erected to the west of the main house. According to our records permission for such structure, within the curtilage of the listed building, has not been given. It is recommended this matter is sent to the Planning Enforcement team to investigate.

To the west of the main house, a well exists on site. The well and above ground structure

appears to be still extant and relates to the historic function of the land as a farmyard contributing to building's significance. The well is considered to be curtilage listed.

The historic brick wall which defines the boundary of the site along Arlington Road is also considered to be curtilage listed as part of Little Manor House.

Contrary to the conclusion made by the Heritage Consultant, the setting of the listed building is made up of its spacious, open and verdant garden environs, curtilage listed structures and its historic relationship with nearby listed buildings, contributing to its significance.

The site has been subject to a number of previous applications and appeals (Appeal Decisions ref: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615, APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617)

Assessment - Impact and harm

The proposed development would erect a new dwelling within the curtilage of the Grade II listed building. The nature of the proposal would fundamentally be a garden grabbing development, which would unacceptably harm the setting and significance of the listed building.

The land in question positively contributes to the setting of the site and the relates to the functionality of the residential dwelling as existing and historically. It would uncharacteristically subdivide the historic curtilage of the site, permanently severing its relationship with the listed building. The historic relationship between the land and listed building was also duly highlighted under paragraph 26, by the Appeal's Inspector within the Appeal Decisions.

Suburban housing would essentially encroach closer to Little Manor House, exacerbating the harm already caused by the surrounding 20th century housing development. The cumulative impact of incremental changes to the heritage asset's setting would need to be considered, as per paragraph 28 with Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning:2, Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (GPA 2, July 2015).

The development would significantly diminish the site's existing sense of openness, harming the visual character of the area and historic interest of the listed building and site. As noted under point 4.8. the existing garden area is an essential buffer, allowing the historic building to be truly appreciated and a historic landmark building.

The inevitable prominence of the proposed two-storey dwelling would be dominant in comparison to the listed building, particularly in terms of the width of the dwelling.

Due to the orientation of Little Manor House, the rear elevation would face onto the side elevation of the proposed dwelling. This would create an odd relationship between the two built forms, and an enclosing impact on the listed building, particularly within the remaining garden area.

The upper floor windows along the east elevation of the proposed property would directly overlook the rear garden associated to the listed building and rear elevation. There would be significant concerns in terms of the lack of distance between the proposed dwelling and rear elevation of the existing listed building. - please see paragraph 5.38 within Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 2 (HLPP2, January 2020).

The development would have no relationship with the original building, ignoring the fact

that the land in question is located within the existing curtilage of the listed building.

The proposal aims to retain a reasonable garden area for the original building. However, there is no guarantee that the site boundaries/plot areas as defined would remain in the future.

Design of proposed development:

The form of the proposed building would loosely relate to the surrounding 20th century housing. However, the overall design and materiality would fail to remain in keeping. The box dormer would be considered a poor design element, which diminishes the principle of the low-rise roof form.

The proposed buff/white brickwork, grey roof tiles and grey windows would not be considered in keeping. No other building along Arlington Road is constructed in a white/buff brick, predominantly natural brick with red/brown tones are evident. The proposed building would have a stark and incongruous contrasting appearance along the street scene.

Boundary treatment:

The proposed boundary treatment, close boarded fence, between Little Manor House and the development site would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the heritage asset's setting and surroundings. The fence would be located in close proximity to the listed building, further suburbanising its immediate context.

The submitted information appears to propose no works to the curtilage listed wall. In any instance, any works to the wall, including alterations, new opening and/or new gates would require Listed Building Consent. If this application is to be approved, prior to the commencement of any development, a condition and structural survey of the wall would need to be carried out, alongside detailed methodology as to how the wall shall be safeguarded during works.

Archaeology:

Remnants of the historic farmyard may be evident below ground, and therefore development of the wider site may have archaeological implications. It is important such features are appropriately recorded, and where possible preserved as it provides evidence of past human activity associated to this site and the listed building, contributing to its significance. Archaeological investigations may be required and/or a watching brief is advised if this application is to be approved.

Harm:

The proposed development would be considered detrimentally harmful to the setting and significance of the Listed Building and character and appearance of the wider street scene.

In isolation the development would result in less than substantial harm. However, as per comments under point 5.3. and paragraph 28 within Historic England's GPA 2 (July 2015) the cumulative impact of development on the setting of the listed building would also be relevant in this case.

The development would exacerbate the harm already caused by the existing 20th century housing. It would erase the spaciousness of the site and sever the historic curtilage of the listed building, harming its setting and significance.

The proposal would be of no heritage benefit and I am not convinced that the public benefits (if any) would outweigh the harm caused. There is no evidence to suggest that such housing provision must be accommodated on this site or in this specific location. A less sensitive site within the borough could achieve the same provision, without causing any harm to the historic built environment, and this could be evidenced by the use of a sequential test.

In determining this application duties under sections 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 would need to be applied by the decision maker. From a historic environment perspective, the development would fail to adequately preserve the setting of the listed buildings.

Conclusion: Objection - Harm to the setting of the listed building.

6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage
PT1.H1	(2012) Housing Growth

Part 2 Policies:

DMH 6	Garden and Backland Development
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
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 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
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 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 G1	(2021) Green infrastructure
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T5	(2021) Cycling
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking
NPPF2	NPPF 2021 - Achieving sustainable development
NPPF5	NPPF 2021 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
NPPF11	NPPF 2021 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF15	NPPF 2021 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

In addition: 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.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

It is noted that there are a number of windows serving habitable rooms in the rear elevation of No.2 Arlington Drive which face onto the garden area. Since the previous 2017 refusals, the separation distance between these windows and the two-storey flank

wall of the proposed building envelope has now been increased to 17.5 metres (approximately). Taking this into account, coupled with the siting, scale and height of the proposed dwelling, it is considered that the development would not result in an unreasonable loss of light and outlook for the occupiers at No.2 Arlington Drive.

Drawing number PL003 shows that secondary side (east) facing windows would serve the study, stairway and open plan kitchen and dining room (these windows are missing on drawing no. PL004). Given that these windows would face towards the proposed boundary treatment, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to a loss of privacy or overlooking for the existing occupiers at No.2 Arlington Drive, in this respect. If planning permission were to be granted, the first floor window serving the stairway would be conditioned to be obscure glazed and non-opening up to 1.8 metres of the internal floor level.

The proposed dwelling would be set behind the front building line of No. 8 Arlington Drive. This neighbouring property has recently been extended by a two-storey side/rear extension and roof extension which was granted planning consent under application ref: 74983/APP/2019/2452. There are ground and first floor side windows at No.8 which faces towards the application site. However, according to the drawings associated with application ref: 74983/APP/2019/2452, these windows serve non-habitable rooms. The rear building line of the proposed dwelling would not breach the 45-degree line of sight taken from the rear elevation windows at No. 8. There would be a separation distance of approximately 4.7 metres between the nearest two-storey flank wall at No.8 and the two-storey flank wall of the proposed dwelling. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not cause undue harm to the living conditions of No.8, in terms of loss of light and outlook.

No details have been provided to indicate the height of the decking area to the rear of the proposed dwelling. In the event of an approval, full details of the patio area, including its height, would be secured by way of a condition. This is to prevent any issues with overlooking or loss of privacy for the respective users of the private amenity spaces at Nos. 2 and 8 Arlington Drive.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal would not cause harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

IMPACT ON THE LISTED BUILDING AND ITS SETTING

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2021) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021) states that were 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.

Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings.

Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning permission will not be granted for proposals which are

considered detrimental to the setting of a Listed Building. This is reinforced by Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) which states that the Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment, and that planning permission will not be granted for proposals which are considered detrimental to the setting of a Listed Building.

As noted by the Conservation Officer, Little Manor House is a Grade II listed, timber framed building, dating from the 16th century, however it may have earlier origins. It is highly likely the building was originally constructed as a medieval hall house with the central bay relating to such origins. The building has benefitted from few alterations over the centuries including the front elevation refaced in 18th century brickwork and addition of the northern bay in the 19th century. Overtime the building became a farmhouse, and early OS maps depict an enclosed farmyard, with structures located to the east of Little Manor House.

The Conservation Officer has commented that the spacious, verdant nature of the site serves as a reminder of the area's rural origins and the historic use of the surrounding land and house. It positively contributes to the visual character of the area, providing a sense of openness and is an integral part of the listed building's setting. It is not disputed that settings change overtime, however, historic uses contribute to the heritage asset's significance. The rear garden related to the historic function of the building and site as a farmyard as is evidence on historic OS maps. It is evident that the rear garden clearly relates to the function of the listed building as a residential dwelling, therefore forming part of its setting.

The Conservation Officer's stance about the rear garden forming part of the setting of the Listed Building is shared by the Inspector in the dismissed Appeal Decision dated 12th October 2018. As highlighted by the following extracts.

"22. The Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. It also states that the extent of setting is not fixed, and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. In this case, while the suburban development around the listed building has reduced the extent of open land about it, nonetheless the large garden area survives as a relic of its former open, rural setting in a farmyard with farmlands beyond. Part of the special interest and significance also therefore resides in this garden setting.

23. The appeal proposals would, by infilling a significant part of the garden, diminish this open setting and harm the ability to appreciate the historic rural origins and function of the building. They would thereby fail to preserve the special interest of the building and would harm its significance." (Appeal refs: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615 and APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617)

Whilst the number of dwellings being proposed has been reduced since the dismissed Appeal Decision, it is considered that the current proposal has not overcome the issues raised by the Inspector in respect to the erosion of the open setting of the site and harm to the special interest and significance of the listed building at No.2 Arlington Drive. The land in question positively contributes to the setting of the site and the relates to the functionality of the residential dwelling as existing and historically. The Conservation Officer has commented that the current proposal would uncharacteristically subdivide the historic curtilage of the site, permanently severing its relationship with the listed building. The historic relationship between the land and listed building was also duly highlighted under paragraph 26 of the dismissed Appeal Decision. The Inspector states that:

"26. At the time of my visit the appeal site had been divided from the area around of No. 2 by a temporary fence of plastic netting, but there was no evidence that it had previously been separated from it. In any event, national Planning Practice Guidance is clear that as setting is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced, it may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage. It may also include land which has a historic relationship with the listed building, which is so in this case. Therefore, the harm caused to the special interest and significance of the listed building by virtue of the harm to its setting cannot be set aside due to the status of the appeal site as a separately owned unit." (Appeal refs: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615 and APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617)

Although the submitted drawings show that no works are proposed to the curtilage listed wall, the Council's Highways Officer has commented that sections of the wall would need to be demolished in order to achieve satisfactory visibility splays. The proposal would therefore result in the loss of historic fabric to detriment of the significance of the listed building.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would cause harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II Listed Building at No.2 Arlington Drive and its setting. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2021).

Please refer to the first section of the report for the planning balance assessment, as required by paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021).

CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE:

Paragraph 126 of the NPPF (2021) seeks the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings. Parts b) and c) of paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) requires development proposals to be of high quality and to enhance the local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) requires all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states, amongst other things, that all development, including new buildings, 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) requires developments to be well integrated with the surrounding area and accessible.

Officers agree with the Inspector's views in that "The appeal site, while unusual in its large frontage onto Arlington Drive, due to its spacious nature and the mature trees and shrubs it contains, positively reinforces the visual character of the area and serves, along with the obvious vernacular construction of No. 2, as a reminder of its rural origins." (Paragraph 8

of Appeal refs: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615 and APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617)

In respect to this current application, it is considered that proposed development would fail to respect the rhythm and open spacing between buildings and the overall pattern of development within the immediate locality of the site. Similar concerns were raised by the Inspector in paragraph 10 of the Appeal Decision which states that, "Although the insertion of two houses, either detached or semi-detached, would not be uncharacteristic of the pattern of development elsewhere along the street, they would in both cases significantly reduce the openness of the appeal site and the area around No. 2, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area."

It is considered that the reduction of the number of proposed dwelling from two to one has not adequately addressed the harm identified in this report, and by the Inspector in the dismissed Appeal Decision. The proposed development still seeks to erect a dwelling on open area of garden space forms an integral part of the openness of the site. As a result, the current proposal would have a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the area.

In terms of design, it is considered that the proposed dwelling would not be in keeping with the character of the the street scene. The southern side of Arlington Drive between Nos. 8 to 18 Arlington Drive comprises two-storey dwellings that are uniform in appearance, in terms of their scale and architectural style. It is noted that some of these properties have been extended; however, their front bay window features, first floor front gable feature, hipped roof profile and natural brick work finish remains generally intact. Although the proposed dwelling would contain a front gable face feature, the box style dormers, window detailing, Jerkinhead inspired roof and projecting brickwork feature would be at complete odds with the surrounding street scape.

The proposed box-style zinc cladded dormers would appear as incongruous features that pay no regard to the immediate locality of the site. It should be noted that no other property on Arlington Drive contain dormers of a style and form such as those currently being proposed. No. 7 Arlington Drive contains front dormers; however, they have a pitched roof that matches the main roof profile of the property, thus helping to reduce their prominence when viewed from the street scene. Whilst the rear dormer would not be readily visible from the public domain. This is not considered to be justification in itself to justify a poorly designed form of development. The proposed rear dormer, by virtue of its width, proximity to the eaves of the main building and inconsistent window sizes, would result in an unsympathetic addition to the roof.

According to the submitted drawings, the proposed dwelling would be externally finished in buff/white brickwork and grey tiles, with the dormers externally cladded in zinc. The proposed bricks would be in stark contrast to the properties along this section on Arlington Drive which are predominately finished in natural brick with red/brown tones. Similarly, the proposed zinc cladded on the dormers would not be characteristic of the immediately locality. It is therefore considered that the proposal would have a jarring appearance when viewed from the street scene on Arlington Drive.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the area contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2021).

IMPACT ON TREES:

Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications for proposals that would affect existing trees will be required to provide an accurate tree survey showing the location, height, spread and species of trees. Where the tree survey identifies trees of merit, tree root protection areas and an arboricultural method statement will be required to show how the trees will be protected.

There are no tree or landscape planning designations affecting the site. There are, however, trees on the site which are visible from the public realm and positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area. This is evidenced in paragraph 11 of the Joint Appeal Decision where the Inspector states the following.

"11. The Appeal A development would entail the removal of a number of trees on the street frontage of the site and its boundary with No. 8. The affected trees are largely conifers, with some self-sown native species. While not in themselves meriting individual protection, as a group they make a positive contribution to the open and green character and appearance of the area. Their loss and replacement with open areas of hardstanding for parking or with built form would exacerbate the harm I have identified above." (Appeal refs: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615 and APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617)

The current application was not accompanied by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan. Consequently, the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause harm to the trees at the site. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal would result in possible threats to the continued health and longevity of the trees from the pressure of future occupiers. Such pressures could potentially occur because of concerns relating to restriction of light, overshadowing, overbearing presence and damage to the property.

It is noted that trees along the mutual boundary shared with No.8 Arlington Drive have already been removed, with the applicant suggesting during the Officer site visit that this was due to the concerns about potential damage to the property at No.8 Arlington Drive.

It is considered that the application fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on existing trees within and adjoining the site. The proposal would therefore have a harmful impact on the verdant character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and G1 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

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 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals will be required to ensure provision of cycle parking in accordance with Appendix C, Table 1 or, in agreement with the Council.

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.

In terms of vehicular trip generation, it is clear that the proposal would raise the level of vehicular activity to and from the site as compared to the existing situation. However, the Council's Highways Officer has commented that traffic movement into and out of the site is not expected to exceed 1-2 additional vehicle movements during the most sensitive and therefore crucial peak morning and late afternoon/evening periods. This uplift is considered marginal in generation terms and therefore can be absorbed within the local road network without notable detriment to traffic congestion and road safety.

The maximum requirement for a 4-bedroom dwelling is for up to 2 spaces to be provided on-site in order to comply with the adopted parking standard set out in Appendix C, Table 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020). The submitted plans show two on-site car parking spaces would be provided to the proposed dwelling. The Council's Highways Officer has raised no objection to the maximum level of on-site car parking provision as it reduces the potential for untoward on-street parking displacement resulting from the higher dependency on the private vehicle due to the site's PTAL rating of 1b (very poor).

In line with Policy T6 of the London Plan (2021), within any final parking quantum there is a requirement for a minimum 20% 'active' electric vehicle charging point provision with all remaining spaces being designated as 'passive' provisions which in this case equates to 1 'active' and 1 'passive' space. This requirement is not indicated on the submitted drawings; however, could readily be addressed by the imposition of a planning application, in the event of an approval.

The proposed vehicular crossover and on-site parking layout would allow for vehicles using the site to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. The Council's Highways Officer has therefore raised no objection, in principle, to the proposed vehicular crossover, from a highway safety perspective. However, the Highways Officer has commented that the frontage wall should not exceed 0.6 metres in height for at least a length of 1 to 2 metres in length on both sides of the proposed crossover to achieve satisfactory visibility splays. Consequently, this would require the removal of part of the boundary wall at the site. Please refer to the section of the report titled 'Character and Appearance' for the historic impact assessment in respect to the removal of part of the boundary wall at the site.

It is noted that an area of grass verge would be lost as a consequence of the proposed crossover. However, all of the preceding refused planning applications from 2017 onwards raised no objection to the loss of a section of the grass verge. All of the detached dwellings along the length of the south-eastern side of Arlington Drive incorporate an established carriageway crossing, which at one-time, necessitated removal or omission of an area of verge. It is therefore considered that a reason for refusal on this basis would be difficult to sustain, in the event of an appeal.

The Council's Highways Officer has commented that the proposed crossover would need to accord with the Council's 'Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover' Policy (2019) and executed under S.184 of the Highways Act 1980 (or suitable alternative arrangement) at the applicant's expense. This information would have been covered by way of an informative, if planning permission were to be granted.

The submitted plans show refuse/recycling store positioned adjacent to the side wall of the proposed dwelling, along the western site boundary. The siting of the refuse/recycling store would conform to the Council's 'waste collection' maximum distance parameter of 10

metres, i.e. distance from the refuse vehicle to the point of collection. However, it is anticipated that prospective occupiers of the proposed dwelling would move their bins to the kerbside on collection day, particularly given that a gate is being proposed to front of the side passageway to the refuse/recycling store.

In the event of an approval, a pre-commencement condition would be secured requiring a Construction Logistics Plan to be submitted to the Council for consideration. This is due to the significant constraints and sensitivities of the local residential road network and to minimise potential detriment to the public realm.

In terms of bicycle parking, there would be a requirement to provide 2 secure and accessible space for the 4-bedroom dwelling in order to meet the Council's adopted cycle parking standard. The submitted plans do not indicate any bicycle storage facilities. However, this could be secured by way of a condition.

The Council's Highways Officer has raised no objection to the proposal, in respect to the new vehicular access, on-site car parking provision and highway safety.

It is considered that the proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any measurable highway safety concerns, in accordance with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2, DMT 5 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021).

7.4 Carparking & Layout

Please refer to the above section of the report.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

INTERNAL AMENITY SPACE PROVISION:

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.

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) sets out the requirements for the gross internal floor area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy. Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021) states that a two-bedroom, 4 bedroom 8-person, 2 storey dwelling must have a minimum gross internal floor area of 124 square metres.

The proposed dwelling would have a gross internal area of 180 square metres and would therefore comply with Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021). All of the proposed double bedrooms would exceed the minimum 11.5 square metre floor area requirement set out in the Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard (2015). The submitted plans show a study at ground floor level. However, given that the floor area of this study room is 7.4 square metres, it would not constitute as a single bedroom based on the interpretation set out in paragraph 10 (c) of the Technical housing standards - nationally described space standard (2015).

The habitable rooms within the proposed dwelling would be served by windows fitted in the front and rear elevations of the building, thereby providing an adequate level of outlook and light for future occupiers.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed dwelling would provide satisfactory internal living conditions for future occupants, in accordance with Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development

Management Policies (2020).

EXTERNAL AMENITY SPACE PROVISION:

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 four-bedroom (plus) houses should have a minimum of 100 square metres of private usable amenity space.

The proposed development would provide the existing dwelling at No.2 Arlington Drive and the proposed dwelling in excess of 100 square metres of private amenity space in compliance with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020). Notwithstanding this, the garden would be sub-divided in such a way that the listed building at No.2 Arlington Drive would be left with a significantly smaller and awkwardly shaped plot that would not reflect its historic setting, rural character, size or orientation. The proposed development would therefore diminish the open setting of the garden at No.2 Arlington Drive, which in turn, cause harm to the special interest of this Grade II Listed Building. (Refer to the section of the report titled 'Character and Appearance' for further details).

INCLUSIVE DESIGN AND ACCESS:

Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021) states that at least 10 per cent of dwellings (which are created via works to which Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations applies) must meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'.

If planning permission were to be granted, conditions would be secured requiring the submission of details of step free access via the principal private entrance and for the proposed dwelling to be constructed to meet the standards for a Category 2 M4(2) dwelling, as set out in Approved Document M to the Building Regulations (2010) 2015. Subject to such conditions, the proposal would accord with Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021).

7.6 Other Issues

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT:

Paragraph 119 of the NPPF (2021) states that planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

Policy GG4 of the London Plan (2021) seeks to ensure that more homes are delivered. This is reinforced by Policy H1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) which gives general support to housing provision on brownfield sites to meet and exceed the Council's minimum strategic dwelling requirement, where this can be achieved in accordance with other Local Plan policies

Policy DMH 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that there is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable, subject to the following criteria:

- i) Neighbouring residential amenity and privacy of existing homes and gardens must be maintained and unacceptable light spillage avoided;
- ii) Vehicular access or car parking should not have an adverse impact on neighbours in terms of noise or light. Access roads between dwellings and unnecessarily long access roads will not normally be acceptable;
- iii) Development on backland sites must be more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties; and
- iv) Features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat must be retained or re-provided.

Policy DMHB 6 of the Local Plan Part 2 (2020) does not define what constitutes an 'exception case' where a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable, nor does the supporting text contain a definition of this term. However, the supporting text to Policy DMH 6 explains that the Council's restrictive approach has been informed by the 2016 London Plan and reflects the direct and indirect value of gardens which includes the contribution to local character.

The proposed dwelling being considered under this current proposal would be sited in a similar location to houses considered by the Inspector for the dismissed Joint Appeal Decision dated 12th October 2018. Paragraph 13 of the Appeal Decision states that:

"Although the houses in the appeal developments would be in what is effectively the rear garden to No. 2, they would have their own access directly onto Arlington Drive. I thus conclude that the developments would not constitute tandem development of a backland area, and that this policy [H12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies 2012] would not be applicable to them."

Whilst it is agreed with the Inspector that the proposal would not constitute 'tandem development of a backland area', it is important to note that the wording of Policy DMHB 6 of the Local Plan Part 2 (2020) (which supersedes Policy H12 of the UDP) specifically refers to the 'presumption against the loss of gardens' rather than 'backland development'. Given this clear distinguishment, it is considered that Policy DMHB 6 of the Local Plan Part 2 (2020) is applicable.

As previously mentioned, the application site does not constitute as previously development land (or developed land). As such, the benefits of using brownfield land is not applicable in this instance.

It is considered, in principle, that the proposal would be an inappropriate form development in a residential garden that would have a harmful impact to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the area, and fails to preserve the special interest and significance of the Grade II Listed Building at No.2 Arlington Drive and its setting. Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to the NPPF (2021), Policies HC1, D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 2, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMH 6 of the Local Plan Part 2 (2020).

DENSITY:

The density matrix found in the 2016 London Plan does not form part of the new London Plan (2021). Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites.

Policy DMHB 17 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies

(2020) states that all new residential development should take account of the Residential Density Matrix contained in Table 5.2.

Numerical density levels are considered to be more appropriate to larger sites and are not typically used in the assessment of schemes of less than 10 units. The key consideration is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building at No.2 Arlington Drive, and the effect on its significance. Please refer to the section of the report titled 'Character and Appearance' for this assessment.

ARCHEOLOGY:

Paragraph 194 of the NPPF (2021) states that where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Remnants of the historic farmyard may be evident below ground. Given that the previously refused applications at the site were not refused on archaeology grounds, it is considered that a refusal on this ground would be difficult to sustain, in the event of an appeal. Instead, a condition would be secured requiring the submission of an archaeology report desk based assessment and a geophysical survey, in the event that planning permission were to be granted.

FLOODING AND DRAINAGE:

Policy DMEI 9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (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.

Policy DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that applications for all new build developments (not conversions, change of use, or refurbishment) are required to include a drainage assessment demonstrating that appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) have been incorporated in accordance with the London Plan Hierarchy.

The application site is in Flood Zone 1 where the risk of flooding from rivers or seas is low. As such, all forms of development, including 'more vulnerable' uses, are acceptable in terms of fluvial and tidal flood risk in this location.

The site lies within a Critical Drainage Area. A sustainable water management scheme would be secured by way of a condition, in the event of approval. Subject to this condition, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to significantly exacerbate surface water flooding at the site. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies DMEI 9 and DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies SI 12 and SI 13 of the London Plan (2021).

SUSTAINABILITY:

Policy DMEI 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) requires all developments to make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the 2016 London Plan targets.

If planning permission were to be granted, a condition would be secured requiring the

proposed dwelling to achieve an energy efficiency standard of 19% CO2 improvement over Building Regulations requirements Part L 2013 (TER Baseline).

Also, a condition would be secured requiring the proposed dwelling to achieve as a minimum, a water efficiency standard of no more than 110 litres per person per day maximum water consumption (to include a fixed factor of water for outdoor use of 5 litres per person per day, in accordance with the option requirement defined within Approved Document G of the Building Regulations).

Subject to the above conditions, the proposal would be compliant with Policies DME1 2 and DME1 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy SI 2 of the London Plan (2021).

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY:

The Council adopted its own Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on August 1st 2014, and the Hillingdon CIL charge for residential developments is £95 per square metre of additional floorspace. This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £60 per square metre. CIL rates are index linked. The proposal involves the erection of a new dwelling and would therefore be liable to pay CIL.

8. 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)
Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (July 2014)
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

Contact Officer: Nesha Burnham

Telephone No: 01895 250230