

Listed Building Consent Appeal Statement of Case

2 ARLINGTON DRIVE, RUISLIP HA4 7RL



Introduction

1. This appeal relates to the decision of Hillingdon Borough Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping. The application was refused on 10th September 2021 under Officer's delegated powers.

The Site

2. The site is located within the curtilage of the Grade II listed Little Manor House. The site is immediately bound by Arlington Drive to the north-west. To the south-west is 8 Arlington Drive, a mid-twentieth century residential property which has recently been extended. The other boundaries form the residual curtilage of Little Manor House. The site is made up of amenity grassland with a number of mature conifer trees positioned close to the boundary with Arlington Drive. The topography of the site is flat and sits at the same level as surrounding residential land.
3. Little Manor House is a timber framed building, which has largely been refaced with brick and painted white. There are some areas where the timber framing is externally visible, most notably on the first floor of the south-west elevation which faces the site. The building has a gabled roof, which is covered with plain tiles. The building is two storeys in height, except for a small north-eastern extension which is of one storey and attic.
4. The surrounding area is residential in character, with Arlington Drive being characterised by single and two storey detached dwellings constructed during the post-war period. These buildings are set back from the highway and predominantly constructed in brick and plain clay tile.

The Proposed Development

5. The proposed development is for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Decision Notice

6. The Council refused the planning application for one reason. This reason is considered in detail below.

Refusal Reason 1

7. This reason for refusal relates to the impact of the proposed dwelling on the character, appearance and setting of Little Manor House.
8. A Built Heritage Appeal Statement (BHAS) is submitted with this Statement of Case. The full report is provided in appendix 1. The Tree Statement referred to in the BHAS is provided in appendix 2.

9. The BHAS has been prepared specifically to respond to this reason for refusal and assess the potential impacts arising from the proposed development on the setting and significance of Little Manor House. It is not considered necessary to repeat the content of the BHAS other than to confirm that the BHAS concludes that there would be a small degree of “less than substantial harm” to the setting and significance of the Grade II listed building arising from the appeal scheme. The BHAS demonstrates that the degree to which the setting of Little Manor House contributes to its significance is very limited and so any perceived harm would sit at the very lowest end of “less than substantial harm”.
10. It should also be noted that whilst the refusal reason refers to the loss of sections of the historic boundary wall, the appeal scheme does not result in any loss of the boundary wall, although this matter is covered within the BHAS.

Conclusion

11. The BHAS concludes that the appeal scheme will result in a small degree of “less than substantial harm” to the setting and significance of the Grade II listed building, with any perceived harm to the setting of Little Manor House sitting at the very lowest end of “less than substantial harm”.
12. Nevertheless, having identified this level of harm, paragraph 202 of the NPPF is engaged, which requires 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.
13. A main public benefit of the proposal is considered to be the provision of an additional housing unit. In the appeal decision dated 12th October for various applications for two houses fronting Arlington Drive within the curtilage of Little Manor House (ref appendix 3-5 for the appeal decision and accompanying site plans), the Inspector considered that the contribution to the supply of housing to be made by the appeal would be a very minor one, to which limited weight was accorded. However, since that appeal, it is considered that there has been a material change in planning circumstances that accentuates the significance of the delivery of housing from small sites such as the appeal site.
14. Specifically, the London Plan 2021 sets out a challenging growth agenda for London with a main underlying objective of this growth agenda being to significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meeting London’s housing needs. This is a distinct change in focus within the strategic plan for London with the Plan now providing minimum targets that boroughs are to meet for net housing completions on small sites. The figure for LB Hillingdon is set at 2,950 dwellings from 2019/20 – 2028/29, which is a considerable target against which each individual dwelling will make an important contribution. The delivery of an additional dwelling from this appeal will therefore make a relevant contribution towards achieving this target.
15. The development will also create economic benefits from its construction, which would stimulate employment. Moreover, the development of a single dwelling aligns with the

Government's objective of promoting self-build housing and supporting small and medium sized housebuilders, as evidenced for example through the Levelling Up Building Fund. A single building plot can provide an excellent construction opportunity for a start-up business, enabling that business to gain experience in the construction industry and to grow.

16. As the level of harm to Little Manor House is less than substantial and at the lowest end of that wide spectrum of harm, it is reasonable to conclude that the public benefits capable of outweighing the harm will also only be at the lower end of the spectrum. Whilst the public benefits arising from the development may be fairly limited in their scope due to the limited scale of the development, they are nevertheless material and will make an important contribution to delivering the growth objectives of the London Plan and to promoting employment and growth within the construction industry. As such, these public benefits are considered to outweigh the very limited harm to the heritage asset generated by the development, thereby satisfying para 202 of the NPPF.
17. Accordingly, the proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the development plan. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. There are not considered to be any material considerations to suggest this application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan and it is therefore considered that listed building consent should be granted.
18. For the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that the appeal be allowed.