

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL Select 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

The Eastcote Village Conservation Area comprises of the original historic village core and surrounding early houses. Cheney Street is a later addition to the conservation area boundary and contributes to the historic understanding of the development of the village and former farmland in the early 20th century. Generally, this part of the conservation area is suburban, defined by a garden suburb character with many properties constructed in a tradition manner with some Arts and Crafts influence.

Directly opposite No.24 is the Grade II Listed Cheney Farmhouse and the north is No.26 a locally listed building.

The site lies within the Eastcote Village Conservation Area, a designation which protects trees with a stem diameter of 75mm when measured at 1.5 metres above ground level. According to the aerial photographs trees, or other vegetation, has been cleared from the back garden since 2015. The 2019 photograph indicates that some trees may still be present on, or close to, the site.

Land levels appear relatively flat although there is a drop from the north to the south.

There are no other policy or heritage constraints on the site.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey extension to the rear.

1.3 Relevant Planning History

38635/APP/2023/209	24 CHENEY STREET EASTCOTE
Erection of a single storey outbuilding	
Decision: 07-07-2023	Approved
38635/APP/2021/4198	24 CHENEY STREET EASTCOTE
rear internal swimming pool	
Decision: 26-11-2021	No Further Action(P)
38635/APP/2021/4116	24 CHENEY STREET EASTCOTE
Erection of a single storey outbuilding for use as a domestic indoor swimming pool	
Decision: 26-11-2021	No Further Action(P)
38635/APP/2021/3787	24 CHENEY STREET EASTCOTE
Construction of a single storey outbuilding for use as a domestic indoor swimming pool.	
Decision: 09-08-2022	Refused
38635/APP/2015/3313	24 CHENEY STREET EASTCOTE
Two storey side/rear extension and conversion of integral garage to habitable use involving alterations to front elevation and removal of chimney to rear	
Decision: 04-12-2015	Refused

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 6th March 2024

3. Comments on Public Consultations

Eight neighbouring properties, and Eastcote Residents Association were consulted on 01-02-2024.

13 letters of objection were received and can be summarised below:

1. Front, rear and side is covered by paving and needs to be seen in conjunction with a building to cover the swimming pool to the rear;
2. Concern with commercial usage;
3. Property appears to be used as an Air BnB
4. Cumulative impact, overall footprint and excessive bulk fail to harmonise with Conservation Area and the extension is out of keeping;
5. Extension will result in overlooking and loss of privacy;
6. Cumulative impact;
7. Eight bedrooms is excessive and concern with property being used as a hotel;
8. Increased congestion and traffic

Officer Comments:

The above comments are noted and will be discussed in greater detail below.

Eastcote Residents Association

The last, approved application was for an outbuilding over a swimming pool in the rear garden (application ending 209). This is one of two existing buildings that are not shown in the current drawings, the 2nd being a large portacabin which is sited close to the back fence, separating the Eastfields gardens. I am told that this latter structure now has a wall round it, thus taking up even more space and creating an even more dominant feature. In addition, apparently there are now works in progress to build a third outbuilding. An historic ariel view is attached which shows a number of items on the site, which will almost certainly only have increased, on the basis of the information above.

Overall, these structures already cover quite a proportion of the rear garden and seriously impact on determining whether the proposed two-storey extension can be allowed. All must be shown on the application drawings.

A photo taken today from an Eastfields garden is also attached showing even more of the garden is taken up by partly built structures.

Also to be considered is the fact that the garden has been concreted over leaving very little real amenity space, which will be further eroded by the addition of an extension with a footprint of c74 square metres. What used to be a garden with many trees and green and cultivated areas has already been all but lost.

The site plan for the above-mentioned approved swimming pool structure showed it as being some 5 metres from the current rear wall of the house. Assuming it was built and sited to the approved plans, it appears the current two storey extension will therefore be just about 1 metre from it. When

the first application for the swimming pool enclosure, sited then at 3 metres from the house, was refused (application ending 3787), the Officer's report included the Conservation Officers view that 'the proximity of the proposed building would be unacceptably close to the main building and there would be serious concerns in relation to the gap being infilled, at a later date'. This proximity was part of the reason for the then refusal. Surely, this view is equally applicable here?

At the first floor level of the proposed extension, overlooking of the Eastfields gardens and houses becomes more of a concern. In particular, the fact that the Eastfields gardens do not have any great depth must be considered. Mutual overlooking between 24 and 26 Cheney Street also seems likely.

The proposed layout gives real rise for concern regarding the possibility of this property being an HMO rather than a dwelling for single family occupancy. We appear to be looking at 4 rooms already detailed as bedrooms + 3 ensembles and 2 bathrooms. The bedrooms are configured in such a way on the drawing that we could almost be looking at bed-sitting room type layouts. In addition, there are other rooms on the ground floor - one where the use is not shown + two, respectively shown as a reception and a dining room which could easily be repurposed as there is also a large living room and kitchen shown.

It is noted that the property has already been extended. The refusal of the application, ending 3313, in 2015, included the Conservation Officer describing this old extension as being of 'a poor design', given 'the juxtaposition of the three-sectioned valley style pitch roof to the rear with the main hipped roof to front of the dwelling.'

No roof design drawing has been provided currently, but the rear elevation drawing suggests that this poor design feature is being kept in what looks to be an effectively extended form.

As well as the apparent misrepresentation of the current site layout, we wonder if information is also missing. For example, should general drainage and SuDs issues be addressed? What about soft landscaping? We also note that the D&A section on the LBH website only contains 1 header page.

In sum, this application leads to an over-dominant property, due to the bulk and size it creates. It also exacerbates an already over-developed site, both in terms of potential occupancy numbers and in relation to the over use of the land at the rear. Poor design features will be exacerbated. With what is already in situ, this addition further creates a site that is entirely out of keeping with the preservation requirements of a conservation area which in turn impacts on neighbours and the general surroundings.

We ask that this application be refused.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
LLP D1	(2021) London's form character and capacity for growth
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and locality the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden and car parking provision.

Character and Appearance:

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

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. It should also not have an adversary impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

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. It also required that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Policy DMHB 2 states that proposals to alter, extend, or change the use of a statutorily Listed Building will only be permitted if they are considered to retain its significance and value and are appropriate in terms of the fabric, historic integrity, spatial quality and layout of the building. Any additions or alterations to a Listed Building should be sympathetic in terms of scale, proportion, detailed design, materials and workmanship.

Policy DMHB 3 states that there is a general presumption in favour of the retention of buildings, structures and features included in the Local List. The Council will take into account the effect of a proposal on the building's significance and the scale of any harm of loss when considering planning applications, including those for major alterations and extensions. Proposals will be permitted where they retain the significance, appearance, character or setting of a Locally Listed Building.

DMHB 4 also advises new development within or on the fringes of conservation areas will be expected to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness.

With regards to rear extensions, Policy DMHD 1 states that:

- 1) single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth or 3.6 metres where the plot width is 5 metres or more;
- 2) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- 3) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level;
- 4) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet;
- 5) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;
- 6) two storey extensions should not extend into an area provided by a 45-degree line of sight drawn from the centre of the nearest ground or first floor habitable room window of an adjacent property and should not contain windows or other openings that overlook other houses at a distance of less than 21 metres;
- 7) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house;
- 8) pitched roofs on extensions should be of a similar pitch and materials to that of the original roof and subordinate to it in design. Large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported; and
- 9) full width two storey rear extensions are not considered acceptable in designated areas or as extensions to Listed Buildings or Locally Listed Buildings.

The existing dwelling has been historically extended to the northern side and rear at two storey level, and has a substantial width of 15.8m. The existing two-storey rear addition at the dwelling is set away from the southern edge of the original recessed rear wall by 3.9m. The proposed two-storey extension to the rear would span across the entire width, including across the remaining existing rear wall. From the original rear wall, the proposed two-storey rear extension would measure a depth of approximately 6.85m, a width of 15.8m and the proposed roof line with the three pitched roofs mirrored.

The proposed two-storey rear extension, when viewed cumulatively with the existing extensions, would appear wholly unacceptable, bulky and disproportionate to the host dwelling. The resultant depth, and the blank facade of the side wall spanning approximately 13.5m deep would not be acceptable and would be visually imposing on the existing building and the wider area. The existing

elevation to the rear including the three-sectioned pitch roof present juxtaposition of with the main hipped roof to the front of the dwelling and constitutes poor design, and on that basis, the further expansion of this, would exacerbate this design and result in a roof form with an inappropriate, incongruous and obtrusive design, which would be totally out of keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and the appearance of the Conservation Area.

Planning permission was approved on 07-07-2023 for the erection of a single storey outbuilding. Following a site-visit, the outbuilding is currently under construction. The outbuilding is located centrally within the rear garden, and in accordance with the approved plans, should be constructed of glazing. The proposed two-storey rear extension would be sited only 1.2m from the outbuilding under construction. The proposed extension, at such close proximity to the outbuilding would be completely unacceptable, and would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding Conservation Area. When viewed cumulatively, the 1.2m gap would not be sufficient to break up the mass of the outbuilding and extension and the proposal would result in a significant volume development, with serious concerns of a future application to infill the minimal gap.

It is clear from the site visit, that an additional timber outbuilding has been erected within the rear garden. This outbuilding is not part of this planning application. A further two-storey rear extension would further develop the site, resulting in built form occupying a substantial portion of the site area. The site itself has already benefitted from a number of inappropriate, harmful alterations, including the entire site being paved over, eroding the former green garden suburb aesthetic, which is evident on surrounding sites. The proposal would result in an uncharacteristic built form within the rear garden of the site. It would be an incongruous addition to the conservation area, failing to relate to character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The Eastcote Village Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset. Pursuant to s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the LPA has a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The proposal would neither enhance or preserve the character of the conservation area, but would result in harm which has been identified by the heritage officer as being less than substantial.

In accordance with paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) 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. There are no identified public benefits of the proposal that would outweigh the identified less than substantial harms.

Taking the above into account, the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding conservation area. It would fail to either preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area, and there are no public benefits that would outweigh the identified less than substantial harm. The proposal would therefore be contrary Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 16 of the NPPF (2023) and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Neighbouring Amenity Impact:

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. The supporting text for this policy states that the Council will expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook. Paragraph A1.34 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that "outbuildings should respect neighbouring properties and should not result in the excessive loss of residential amenity, privacy, outlook and overshadowing/sunlight."

No. 26 Cheney Street is located to the north of the site and comprises a detached two storey dwelling, the neighbouring property is a locally listed building. Due to the staggered building line, the application site sits significantly in front of No. 26. The proposed two-storey rear extension located approximately 1.7m from the boundary. It would be located approximately 3m from the front elevation windows at No. 26. Due to the substantial scale, depth, height and design in such close proximity to the neighbouring property and habitable windows, it is considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of light, loss of outlook and overbearing impact.

No. 22 Cheney Street is located to the south of the site and comprises a detached two storey dwelling. The proposed two-storey rear extension would be located 6m from the shared boundary and approximately 9.2m from the neighbouring flank wall. However, given the sheer bulk, siting and height of the extension, it would be readily visible and result in a loss of outlook and overbearing harm to the neighbouring property at No. 22.

It is acknowledged that concerns are raised in terms of the residential impact on properties along Eastfields, particularly No. 23 and No. 25. Whilst the concerns are noted, the proposed rear extension would be located 17.8m from the rear boundary and 26.5m to the rear habitable windows. It would be considered that sufficient separation distance would exist to protect the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Given its excessive size, scale and bulk, together with its siting and height, it is considered that the proposed two-storey rear extension would appear visually intrusive and dominating, subsequently harming the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers at No. 22 and No. 26 Cheney Street. The proposal would be contrary to policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020).

Impact on Protected Trees:

Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

- A) All development will be expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural features or merit.
- B) Development proposals will be required to provide a landscape scheme that includes hard and soft landscaping appropriate to the character of the area, which supports and enhances biodiversity and amenity particularly in areas deficient in green infrastructure.
- C) Where space for ground level planting is limited, such as high rise buildings, the inclusion of living walls and roofs will be expected where feasible.
- D) 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.

Where trees are to be removed, proposals for replanting of new trees on-site must be provided or

include contributions to offsite provision.

The application site is located in a Conservation Area. Given the scale of the proposed development, additional information is required in order to assess the possible impact on neighbouring trees. No such information has been provided. .

Therefore in the absence of a tree survey and report to BS5837:2021 standards, the proposal runs contrary to Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion:

The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two-storey rear extension would add excessive scale, width and bulk to an already substantially extended dwellinghouse. The proposed two-storey rear extensions, in conjunction with existing two storey side and rear extensions at the dwellinghouse would result in an unbalanced and visually incongruous addition that would be disproportionate to the existing dwelling. As such it would fail to respect the architectural composition and character of the original dwellinghouse; whilst neither preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the wider Eastcote Village Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 16 of the NPPF (2023) and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

2. NONSC Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two-storey rear extensions together with the outbuildings in the rear garden would result in the significant loss of the spaciousness of the application site, which contributes positively to the appearance of the streetscene. Furthermore, the proposed development would result in the total loss of the existing rear elevation and exacerbate a poor roof design that incorporates a juxtaposition of the main hipped roof and valley style pitched roof to rear. The exacerbation of this poor design would result in an enlarged roof form to rear with an incongruous, contrived, awkward and obtrusive appearance, which would be totally out of keeping with the the character and appearance of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the wider Eastcote Village Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 16 of the NPPF (2023) and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

3. NONSC Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed two-storey rear extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, design and proximity, would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers at Nos 22 and 26 Cheney Street by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

4. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

In the absence of a tree report and arboricultural implications assessment (to BS5837:2012), the proposal has failed to demonstrate that protected trees will be unaffected by the development proposals. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies D3 and G7 of the London Plan (2021), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 14 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

INFORMATIVES

1. In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

a) We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

Standard Informatives

1. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
2. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon 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..

Part 1 Polices

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Polices:

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMEI 9	Management of Flood Risk
LPP SI12	(2021) Flood risk management
LPP SI13	(2021) Sustainable drainage
LLP D1	(2021) London's form character and capacity for growth
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards

Contact Officer: Niamh McMenamin **Telephone No:** 01895 250230