

Officers Report

Planning Applications Team
Hillingdon Council
Civic Centre, High Street
Uxbridge
UB8 1UW

J Wang
Unit 312 Wey House
15 Church Street
Weybridge
Surrey
KT13 8N

Tel:
Case Officer: Christopher Lamb
Email: CLamb@hillingdon.gov.uk
Date: 5th January 2026
Our Ref: 15806/PRC/2025/169

Dear J Wang

RE: Erection of a single storey rear and two storey side extension, loft conversion including rear dormer, replacement garage outbuilding following demolition of existing, and new boundary walls

SITE: 1 ALMOND AVENUE ICKENHAM

I refer to your request for pre-application planning advice dated 27.10.25 relating to the above development. The advice provided is based on the following drawings and documents issued to the Local Planning Authority for consideration:

Drawing Nos:	A101 REV P1	Received: 12th November 2025
	A100 REV P1	Received: 12th November 2025
	A102 REV P1	Received: 12th November 2025
	A103 REV P1	Received: 12th November 2025
	A104 REV P1	Received: 12th November 2025

Outlined below is a preliminary assessment of the proposal, including an indication of the main issues that should be addressed should you choose to submit a formal planning application. Please note that the views expressed in this letter represent officer opinion only and cannot be taken to prejudice the formal decision of the Council in respect of any subsequent planning application, on which consultation would be carried out which may raise additional issues. In addition, the depth of analysis provided corresponds with the scope of information made available to Council officers.

The Site and Surrounds

This pre-application relates to a detached, two storey residential property located on a corner plot to the north of Almond Avenue and west of Long Lane, Ickenham. The property is of brick construction with a hipped tile roof, and is characterised by feature front projections and ground floor bay window. It benefits from front and rear gardens, with an existing single storey garage outbuilding located to the rear of the site. An area of hardstanding serving the garage outbuilding provides off-street parking, accessed via a fenced opening in the north-eastern corner of the site.

The property falls within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area and Ickenham Local Centre boundary. It is located in a residential setting, with Almond Avenue characterised by two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings of an attractive Metroland style. To the rear the site is bordered by an Esso petrol station, with the commercial centre of Ickenham lying further beyond.

The Proposal

This pre-application seeks advice on householder extensions and alterations to the property. Principally, this would include a proposed part single, part two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, loft conversion with rear dormer, construction of rear outbuilding following demolition of existing, and erection of new boundary wall.

The side extension would have a width of 3m at ground floor level and 2.1m at first floor level. The rear extension would have a depth of 4.5m. The extensions would incorporate pitched roofs, with the rear extension characterised by a dual rear gables. The rear dormer would have a flat roof.

Planning Policy

The proposed development would be assessed against the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and all other relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (2021) and national guidance.

Part 1 Polices:

PT1.BE1	(2012) Built Environment
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Other Polices

DMEI 7	Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMHD 2	Outbuildings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.1	(2021) Residential parking

Main Planning Issues

Principle of development

The application site is located within an urban area of the borough where enlargements and alterations to existing dwellings would be considered acceptable in principle, subject to complying with all other relevant development plan policies and material considerations.

Design

The site falls within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) details the obligation of Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in exercising planning functions.

Paragraphs 212 and 213 of the NPPF (2024) state that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset and that any harm to the significance of such an asset (from its alteration....or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification.

Policy HC1 of The London Plan (2021) states development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. Councils should actively manage the cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings.

Policy DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, within a Conservation Area or on its fringes, will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. Development should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

In terms of general appearance and design:

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

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping.

Policy DMHD 1 requires that alterations and extension of dwellings would not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

Specific to this application, with regard to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 requires that:

- Single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4 metres in depth.
- Pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level.
- Pitched roofs on extensions should be of a similar pitch and materials to that of the original roof and subordinate to it in design.

With regard to side extensions, Policy DMHD1 requires that:

- Side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property.
- Extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded.
- Two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary.
- Two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation.
- In Conservation Areas, single storey side extensions may be required to be set back.

With regard to roof extensions, Policy DMHD1 requires that:

- Roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line.
- All roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling.
- In Conservation Areas, roof extensions should take the form of traditional 'dormer' windows, on the rear elevation, to harmonise with the existing building. The highest point of the dormer should be kept well within the back roof slope, away from the ridge, eaves or valleys, whilst each window should match the proportions, size and glazing pattern of the first floor windows.

With regard to boundary walls, Policy DMHD1 requires that:

- The design, materials and height of any front boundary must be in keeping with the character of the area to ensure harmonisation with the existing street scene.

Finally, with regard to outbuildings, Policy DMHD 2 requires that:

- The outbuilding must be constructed to a high standard of design without compromising the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- The developed footprint of the proposed building must be proportionate to the footprint of the dwelling house and to the residential curtilage in which it stands and have regard to existing trees.
- The use shall be for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house and not capable for use as independent residential accommodation.

The proposal property lies on a corner plot, and as such in addition to the front, any alterations to the side and rear require a sensitive approach given that they will be also be visible from views within the public domain. The side and rear elevation should be designed to be sensitive to the sites visual prominence, and not designed as elevations that will not be seen in the context with other surrounding buildings.

In this instance the rear extension would span the width of the existing property, with a depth of 4.5m. It would be of an unconventional design, incorporating dual rear gables. The depth and height of the rear extension would exceed the limits specified in Policy DMHD1. Whilst the depth of the rear extension may be acceptable on balance given that it would not impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbour, this element should be reduced in height to increase its overall subservience. A differing roof design, which better reflects the design of the existing dwelling, would be favourable and would help to reduce the overall prominence of this structure.

The side extension would be set back 1m from the front elevation at first floor level and set back also at ground floor level, affording a degree of subservience. Furthermore, it would be set down from the main roof ridge and be of an appropriate width that appears as proportionate. It is of a complementary design, incorporating hipped roofs and would marry in well with the existing property. The side extension would be set in approximately 1.5m from the side boundary at ground floor level and 2.5m at first floor level. This would be an appropriate level of separation which takes into account the corner plot location and retains a suitable level of openness, complemented by the green space that exists between the side site boundary and Long Lane. Overall, no concerns are raised with regard to this aspect.

Cumulatively, the rear dormer and rooflights appear cluttered and overly complicated. Many of the properties along Almond Avenue have unbroken roof slopes, retaining their natural roof form. The rear dormer, though set down from the roof ridge and set in from the sides, would not appear as a traditional feature. The depth of the dormer, combined with its thin width and flat roof design, would result in a boxy, awkward appearance which would not complement the existing character of the property. Furthermore, the roof lights on the rear roof slope are set too close to the roof edge, appearing as inharmonious. This aspect of the scheme should be revised - the rear dormer should either be removed or replaced with, for instance, two smaller dormers incorporating more complementary and traditional design features (such as pitched/hipped roofs). The rear roof lights should be set further down from the roof edge.

Boundary treatments for properties facing onto Almond Avenue generally consist of open frontages with low feature brick walls, as currently exists at the site. The proposal seeks to introduce a higher brick wall with horizontal metal bars, with a maximum height of 1.85m. It is considered that such a boundary wall would harmfully enclose the site and appear at odds with the open frontages that are characteristic of the street scene and Conservation Area more generally. This visual harm would be exacerbated by the corner plot location of the site, with properties along Long Lane also characterised by open frontages. Give the above, this aspect should therefore be removed from any future planning application.

The proposed outbuilding would be of a similar height to the existing structure, however significantly larger in footprint. Indeed, the proposed width, at 10.1m, would notably exceed the width of the existing dwelling (9.9m). As such, the building would fail to appear as appropriately subservient, and should therefore be reduced in overall width. Should a reduction in the width additionally allow for more of the rear boundary hedgerow to be retained, this would also be favourable, as discussed further below. A condition is likely to be included on any permission to ensure the outbuilding is used solely for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling and cannot be occupied independently.

Overall, at present the proposed scheme would not comply with the Council's relevant design policies, as listed above, however subject to amendments this could be achieved.

Amenity

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

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to dwelling alterations and extensions will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved and there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

In this instance the proposal site is located on a corner plot, whereby the side extension would have no impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of light, outlook or privacy. The proposed rear extension would project beyond the rear build line of the adjacent neighbour, no. 2, however this would not be to any significant extent given the proposed depth and that no. 2 benefits itself from an existing single storey rear projection. Accordingly, and factoring the rear extension's single storey nature, it is not considered that this aspect would result in any discernible loss of outlook for the adjacent neighbour, nor loss of light given that it would conform to the Council's light angle guidance. No side openings are proposed on the flank elevation facing no. 2, and as such no issues of overlooking are raised.

The proposed outbuilding, though larger, would replace an existing outbuilding of a similar height and siting. Given its location and the separation distances involved, it is not considered that this outbuilding would unduly impact on the light or outlook of the adjacent neighbouring property no. 2. Any potential overlooking as a result of the proposed rear window of the structure would also be mitigated by existing boundary treatments. The proposal site is bordered by a commercial petrol station to the rear, therefore there would be no other neighbouring properties impacted by this aspect.

Overall, given all the above it is considered that the proposed development would conform to the requirements of Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 with respect to neighbour amenity.

Outdoor Amenity Space:

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that, inter alia, adequate garden space is retained, while Policy DMHB 18 states that developers should provide amenity space in accordance with Table 5.3 of the Local Plan. For a four-bedroomed dwelling as proposed, a minimum 100 sqm of amenity space would be required to be retained.

Following the proposed extensions, the property would retain front and rear amenity/garden space in excess of 100 sqm and as such would comply with Policies DMHB 18 and DMHD 1.

Highways

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

London Plan (2021): Policy T6.1 (Residential Parking) requires that new residential development should not exceed the maximum parking standards as set out in Table 10.3 of the document. As proposed, for a house with four bedrooms in this location, this would equate to a maximum of 1 space. The proposed garage to the rear of the site is of the sufficient dimensions to count towards the off-street parking provision, and therefore the proposal would provide a suitable level of off-street parking in this location, without exceeding the maximum parking standards.

The site access would remain as existing. Overall, the proposal would not raise any measurable highway safety or parking concerns.

Other

Trees and Biodiversity:

As a householder development, any future application would be exempt from national biodiversity net gain requirements, however this would not override Local Policy requirements with respect to mitigation for any losses of site biodiversity.

Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all developments are expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural features of merit, and 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 trees are to be removed, proposals for replanting of new trees on-site must be provided or include contributions to offsite provision.

Policy DMEI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the design and layout of new development should retain and enhance any existing features of biodiversity value within the site. Where loss of a significant existing feature of biodiversity is unavoidable, replacement features of equivalent biodiversity value should be provided on-site.

The site does not appear to contain any trees, however there are mature hedgerows to the side and rear boundaries, and two trees between the side boundary and Long Lane. All trees within a Conservation Area have a level of statutory protection.

The proposed side extension and outbuilding would likely require the removal of parts of the existing hedgerows. These features add to the verdant character of the street scene and Conservation Area, and assist in its visual transition from the urban centre of Ickenham to more residential areas travelling down Long Lane.

Any future application should be supported by an arboricultural survey to establish the extent of hedge removal required. It is noted from the proposed plans that additional planting would be provided to the front and sides of the site, and between the outbuilding and lawn of the rear garden. It is considered that this would provide suitable mitigation for the losses incurred as a result of the development, however further landscaping and tree planting measures would also be beneficial from a visual amenity perspective to include planting at the rear boundary, so as to maintain an attractive green border between the site and petrol station, as currently exists. This would provide some visual green relief to the site given its prominent setting on a corner plot.

Planning Obligation and CIL (Mayor and LBH)

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, for all approved householder schemes with a net additional internal floor area over 100 square metres (including outbuildings). This is in addition to the Mayoral CIL charge of £60 per square metre.

Application Submission

The Council has an adopted Local Planning Validation Checklist (June 2020), which sets out in full the documents required to accompany a planning application and is available on the Council's website.

Should you require further information, please refer to the Council's website:
<https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/apply-planning-permission>.

Conclusion

As set out in the report above, there is reasonable scope to extend the application property, however prior to the submission of a planning application, amendments to the proposal should be sought. Principally, this should include:

- Revisions to the proposed rear extension, roof alterations and outbuilding in accordance with the advice given above.
- Removal of the proposed boundary treatments. A low brick wall or replacement wall similar to the existing, retaining an open frontage, would be acceptable.
- Additional landscaping measures

The proposed side extension is considered acceptable and would likely receive Officer support should a planning application be submitted for this aspect. No concerns relating to neighbour amenity or parking are envisaged.

Any future planning application should be accompanied by an arboricultural survey. Hedgerows should be maintained where possible, with consideration given to their visual amenity and contribution to the verdant character of the Conservation Area.

Please be advised that the Council require confirmation that you wish to enter into a PPA as soon as possible, in order to ensure the necessary resource are in place to meet the terms of the PPA.

Follow Up Pre-application Meeting

Thank you for entering into the Councils pre-application advice service and I trust you have found this service of assistance.

**Christopher Lamb
Planning Officer
London Borough of Hillingdon**

Planning Guarantee

For complex applications which are likely to exceed the statutory time frames, the applicant is encouraged to enter into a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) to allow for the negotiation of complex cases. Central Government encourages the use of PPAs for larger and more complex planning proposals to bring together the developer, the Local Planning Authority and key stakeholders to work in partnership throughout the planning process.

Providing a PPA helps ensure that major proposals progress through the application process in a timely fashion and result in high quality development but the service is both time consuming and costly. The charge for all planning performance agreements will ensure that adequate resources and expertise can be provided to advise on major development proposals, the charges are determined on a site by site basis.

Hillingdon are committed to ensure the best possible service provision to all of our applicants. In order to ensure this, we will not be able to facilitate negotiation which would result in an application being determined outside of statutory timeframes, unless the applicant has entered into a Planning Performance Agreement.