

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 an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	<input type="checkbox"/>

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	<input type="checkbox"/>

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	<input type="checkbox"/>
25.	WORKS TO TREES	<input type="checkbox"/>
26.	OTHER (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's 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 DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control**

Address: 12 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Development: Erection of a single storey extension to rear (Retrospective application)

LBH Ref Nos: 11022/APP/2024/1282

Drawing Nos: Mixed Plans
 The location plan

Date Plans received: 14-05-24 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 14-05-24

1. SUMMARY

It is therefore concluded, taking all matters into account, that planning permission should be not be granted. Retrospective planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension.

The development results in unacceptable harm to the architectural composition of the building and is detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the area including Harefield Village Conservation Area and adjoining Grade II Listed building. The proposal would therefore conflict with National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 2, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The single storey rear extension, by reason of excessive scale, design, bulk, siting and poor quality materials would result in unacceptable harm to the architectural composition of the building and is detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the area and fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Harefield Village Conservation Area and the setting of the adjoining Grade II Listed building. The proposal would therefore conflict with National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 2, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

INFORMATIVES

1. I59 Councils Local Plan : Part 1 - Strategic Policies

On this decision notice policies from the Councils Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2021). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a single storey building lawfully in use as a restaurant situated on the western side of the High Street.

The building is set within a terrace of buildings, with two and half storey buildings to the north and three storey buildings immediately to the south. These buildings comprise commercial at ground floor with residential (C3 Use Class) above. The rear of the site was an open area of land accessed from Taylor Close which appeared to provide an area of parking and bin storage for the High Street properties. The pre-existing extension has been replaced with a large single storey rear extension which is the subject of the application.

There are mature trees directly to the rear of the site protected through the Conservation Area. The site is within the Harefield Village Conservation Area, Archaeological Priority Area and adjoins a grade II listed building - no.14. The site is within the Harefield Local Centre and is a Core Shopping Area.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

Retrospective planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension.

It is noted that there are changes to the front elevation however these are subject to planning application references 11022/ADV/2024/27 and 11022/APP/2024/1367.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

11022/ADV/2024/27 12 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Installation of 1no. internally illuminated fascia sign.

11022/APP/2024/1367 12 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Retention of an internally illuminated fascia sign and alterations to shopfront (Retrospective application)

11022/APP/2022/1679 12 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Change of use from Solicitor Office (Former Class A2) to restaurant (Former Class A3) within

same Class Use E and proposed extractor flue.

Decision: 21-07-2022 Approval

11022/APP/2021/2923 12 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Replacement shopfront (including enlargement) and external alterations

Decision: 21-09-2021 Approval

11022/APP/2021/2093 12 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Replacement shopfront and fascia sign (including enlargement)

Decision: 20-07-2021 Refusal

11022/APP/2018/1822 12 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Two storey, 1-bed, attached dwelling, involving demolition of single storey office

Decision: 24-07-2018 Refusal **Appeal:** 05-04-19 Dismissed

11022/APP/2015/4259 12 HIGH STREET HAREFIELD

Three storey, 2-bed, mid terrace dwelling involving demolition of existing office

Decision: 07-03-2016 Refusal **Appeal:** 10-10-16 Dismissed

Comment on Planning History

Relevant history is listed above.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: **26th June 2024**

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

Neighbours were consulted by letter dated 24-05-24. 4 objections were received from 2 separate addresses, citing the following summarised concerns:

- Out of character
- Construction noise
- Concerns regarding appearance of CA

Highways:

Owing to the small scale of extension, there are no highway related comments or demands imposed on this retrospective application.

Conservation:

The application is for a rear extension although we note that the shopfront also appears to have been replaced with glazing and applied timber panels. The application is located within the

conservation area adjacent to a listed building and has no heritage statement. This is contrary to the government advice set out in the framework. We would object and recommend refusal. The proposal has a substantial extension to the rear with no justification provided. Its scale and design is not in keeping with the character of the conservation area and as such should be refused as it is contrary to policy and guidance due to causing harm to the designated heritage asset. We would also object to the new shopfront which has not yet been applied for. It is most out of keeping with the character of the area with garish inappropriate colours, lack of detailing and not appropriate for the conservation area. As such we believe that it causes harm both to the designated conservation area and the heritage asset of the adjacent listed building. There has been no public benefits put forward to outweigh this harm. As such it is contrary to local and national policy. Therefore we would object and recommend refusal.

Access:

I have considered the detail of this retrospective planning application and deem there to be no accessibility issues raised by the proposal. However, the following informative should be attached to any grant of planning permission: The Equality Act 2010 seeks to protect people accessing goods, facilities and services from discrimination on the basis of a 'protected characteristic', which includes those with a disability. As part of the Act, service providers are obliged to improve access to and within the structure of their building, particularly in situations where reasonable adjustment can be incorporated with relative ease. The Act states that service providers should think ahead to take steps to address barriers that impede disabled people.

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

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

In addition: 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) (2023) 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 BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012) states that all new development should seek to protect the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential properties.

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

The proposal consist of a single storey rear extension which measures approx 7.4m deep with a flat roof max height 2.7m high.

Number 14 High Street benefits from planning permission for a seating area to the rear including 1.7m boundary fencing. There is one low level window and door to the ground floor rear elevation with the entrance to the flats gained by stairs to the side. Therefore, given the modest height of the proposal and the fencing on site, despite the depth of the single storey rear extension projecting approx. 4.7m past the rear elevation of No.14 High Street, it is considered that the development would not adversely impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No. 14 High Street, in terms of daylight/sunlight, overlooking, outlook and overbearing effect.

Similarly, No.s 12E and F are located to the other boundary, with residential flats to the first floor. While the proposal would project past the rear elevation of the ground floor, given the existing 2m high fencing and modest eaves height it is considered that the development would not adversely impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No. 12 E and F High Street, in terms of daylight/sunlight, overlooking, outlook and overbearing effect.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not adversely effect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, in accordance with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic (2012) and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies

(2020).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

This section of the report considers the street scene and character impact of the development, including the impact on heritage assets.

POLICY CONTEXT:

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, imposes a statutory duty on Local Planning Authorities requiring that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The NPPF at Chapter 16, places great importance on the protection of heritage assets.

Para. 205 states: '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). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'

Para. 208 states: 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) states, inter alia, 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. The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings should also be actively managed. Development proposals should avoid harm and identify enhancement opportunities by integrating heritage considerations early on in the design process.'

Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) states that the Council will conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape (including locally and statutorily Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character and Archaeological Priority Zones and Areas), and encourage the reuse, modification and regeneration of historic assets.

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment and to prevent the loss of significance or harm to the character, appearance and setting of heritage assets.

ASSESSMENT:

The application seeks retrospective consent for a single storey rear extension which measures approx 7.4m deep with a flat roof max height 2.7m high. The application is located within the conservation area adjacent to a Grade II listed building and has no heritage statement, contrary to the government advice set out in the framework. The Conservation Officer has raised objections to the extension as it is substantial with no justification provided. In addition, the scale, design and use of poor quality materials are not in keeping with the character of the conservation area and no other building has extended to such a depth, which would set an unfavourable precedent. There are no

similar sized extensions within the immediate area and given its proximity to the Grade II Listed Building and its conservation area, it would fail to enhance and also detract of the local character.

There has been no public benefits put forward to outweigh this harm.

Considerable importance and weight has been attached to, and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and that the less than substantial harm caused would be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.

Overall, the development results in unacceptable harm to the architectural composition of the building and is detrimental to the character and visual amenity of the area including Harefield Village Conservation Area and adjoining Grade II Listed building. The proposal would therefore conflict with National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 2, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

The parking provision and traffic generation would remain unaffected by the proposal, in accordance with Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020). Furthermore, the Highways Officer has no objections to the proposal.

7.4 Carparking & Layout

See above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

7.6 Other Issues

It is therefore concluded, taking all matters into account, that planning permission should be not be granted.

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 (2021)

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

Contact Officer:

Emilie Bateman

Telephone No:

01895 250230