

**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



07-12-23  
07-12-23  
07-12-23  
23-08-24  
23-08-24  
23-08-24  
23-08-24  
23-08-24  
23-08-24  
23-08-24  
07-12-23  
23-08-24  
23-08-24  
23-08-24  
23-08-24

## 1. CONSIDERATIONS

### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application site relates to a detached two-storey dwellinghouse located on the west side of St Martin's Approach. To the rear of the dwelling is a large garden area serving as the private amenity space for the occupiers of the existing property.

The surrounding area is residential in character generally comprising of large two-storey detached dwellinghouses.

The site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset. The site does not contain any Listed Buildings. There are no trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order within the site or on adjoining land. The site lies in Flood Zone 1 but is identified as within a Critical Drainage Area. The is located within the Ruislip Motte & Bailey Archaeological Priority Area.

### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single-storey side extension with four rooflights in the new roof slope; first floor rear extension; two-storey front extension; change in roof form and conversion of roof space into habitable accommodation; erection of a rear dormer with Juliet balcony; addition of a roof lantern; conversion of garage to habitable use; and alterations to fenestration to the front, side and rear elevations.

In response to feedback, the applicant submitted amended drawings, received 23/08/2024, which the Council resissued for consultation (as described below) and consisted of the following amendments:

- Introduced a short setback of the proposed front extension from the original northern front building line and altered the proposed roof form accordingly;
- Changed the loft balcony to a Juliet balcony;
- Removed the front portico columns and effectively removed the front porch, retaining a small sill just above the front door;

- Altered the front fenestration by replacing the porthole window, entrance strips and large first floor window with glazing matching the original dwelling in regards to size and materials;
- Provided a landscaping plan for the front yard.

During the course of the assessment, it was noted that partial demolition to the rear wall had taken place. Given the exposed nature of the rear elevation, a Preliminary Bat Survey was requested. On receipt of this Preliminary Survey, it was noted that a number of bats were roosting in the building. As such, a full Bat Survey was required, which was undertaken in May and June 2025 and the report submitted shortly afterwards. This Bat Survey was subject to a further period of consultation.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

47351/92/1508

25 ST MARTINS APPROACH RUISLIP

Erection of a single storey rear extension

**Decision:** 21-12-1992

Approved

#### Comment on Planning History

N/A

## 2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 1st March 2024

## 3. Comments on Public Consultations

### EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Under the original consultation, 5 neighbouring properties, Ruislip Residents Association and Ruislip Village Conservation Panel were consulted on 09/02/2024. A site notice was advertised on 21/02/24.

A total of 4 representations were received during the initial consultation, objecting to the proposal, with comments summarised as follows:

- i - Clear roof lantern visible above the roofline and visible from the wider streetscene;
- ii - The proposed large fenestration above the entrance door is not in keeping with the original design of the dwelling, or other houses along the street;
- iii - Decorative columns of the portico do not preserve or enhance the conservation area. Portico is not in keeping and a storm porch would be more appropriate;
- iv-Proposed design is not suitable for the style of the original dwelling and its conservation area setting;
- v- Proposed second floor balcony to the rear and resultant loss of privacy to rear garden space of neighbouring property;
- vi-Disappointment that the proposals involve the infilling of the original 'L-shaped' plan of the dwelling;
- vii- Concerns that the removal of all of the front garden area to hardstanding for car parking would negatively harm the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- viii- Loss of the flat-roofed garage and replacement with a pitched roof to the side extension would be contrary to the pattern of development;
- ix- Absence of ecological surveys to ensure that the roof is not a roost for bats.

## Planning Officer Comments

Points i-iv are addressed within the Design section of the report. Following receipt of amended drawings and further visual 3d imagery the overall design and appearance of the revised extension was considered acceptable by the Conservation Officer whom was satisfied the revised scheme would preserve and enhance the conservation area subject to conditions.

v- A Juliet balcony has been proposed rather than a terrace in which occupants could use as an amenity space. The very nature of a Juliet balcony would be similar level of overlooking as would occur from a normal window. As the glazing in front of the doors would prevent access onto the flat roof section.. A condition is also recommended that this flat roof section shall not be used as a amenity space.

vi-Whilst the extension infills an area to the front, the revised plans received has a slight step back of the extension from the front wall which which was considered acceptable. This subtle design alteration references the historic roof form of the building.

vii- Additional landscaping has been added through the amendments received.

viii- The pitched roof design is considered acceptable and appears sympathetic to the dwelling and the wider area. The existing flat roof to the garage was of no architectural or historic merit.

ix-This has been addressed during the course of the assessment and both a Preliminary Survey and full Bat Survey has now been undertaken by a suitably qualified Ecologist.

A further period of consultation took place on 30/08/2024 due to substantial design revisions undertaken by the applicant addressing a number of external and internal consultee comments. A further 10 representations were received objecting to the proposal including comments from Ruislip Residents Association. A number of comments fell outside the consultation period of 14 days however the Council has accepted these comments. The comments are summarised as follows:

- 1) Clear roof lantern will still be visible above the roofline and visible from the wider street scene and will impact general appearance;
- 2) The clear roof lantern will enable overlooking of other properties.
- 3) The large crown roof will harm the character of the area;
- 4)The proposed front porch is not in keeping with other properties;
- 5) Loss of the existing features will harm the character of the area;
- 6) Proposed design is not suitable for the style of the original dwelling and its conservation area setting;
- 7)Proposed second floor Juliet balcony to the rear will still be usable as a rear balcony and resultant loss of privacy to rear garden space of neighbouring property;
- 8) Infilling of the original 'L-shaped' plan of the dwelling will result in loss of character of the dwelling;
- 9) Concerns that the removal of all of the front garden area to hardstanding for car parking would negatively harm the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- 10) Roof design will alter the original proportions of the dwelling;
- 11) Front fenestration changes will harm the character of the dwelling;
- 12) Loss of the flat-roofed garage and replacement with a pitched roof to the side extension would be contrary to the pattern of development;
- 13) Angled front door should be retained.
- 14) The extensions to the front of a house will not be minor and will alter the overall appearance of the house and affect the character of the street. It will not be subordinate to the original dwelling.
- 15) The cumulative impacts of proposed extensions by reason of their combined and excessive scale, bulk, width, size, design and siting would result in an unsympathetic and incongruous over development of the site which would fail to read as subordinate to the host property, harming the original design and appearance of the host property and failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

16) Comments were received from the public, including a senior ecologist, regarding the potential for bats/bat roosts to be located on the site which the works would harm and noting an absence of an ecological survey of the site.

Planning Officer Comments: Generally points 1-6, 8, 10-15 are reflected and assessed in the design section of the report with further individual points added below.

Point 1 and 2) - Roof lantern was considered acceptable and was not considered harmful to the conservation area - conditions have been attached to secure the finer detail of this feature

Point 3) - The roof form has been altered and reduce in scale from the original submission. The 3d imagery demonstrate that the roof form would not be harmful in immediate site context.

Point 4) -The porch design was amended to reflect the conservation officer requirements who was satisfied with the revised detail.

Point 5 and 6) - this is addressed in the design section

Point 7 - A condition is attached ensuring the roof is not used for an amenity space; this is further assessed within the amenity section

Point 8)- Whilst the extension infills an area to the front. the revised plans received has a slight step back of the extension from the front wall which which was considered acceptable. This subtle design alteration references the historic roof form of the building

Point 9) - Additional landscaping has been added through the amendments received.

Point 10) - The amended roof design has adopted design changes to ensure the house retains its character

Point 11) - The fenestration is more in keeping with the immediate character

Point 12) -The existing flat roof to the garage was of no architectural or historic merit. The replacement pitched roof design is considered acceptable and appears sympathetic to the dwelling and the wider area. The pitched roof design is considered acceptable and appears sympathetic to the dwelling and the wider area.

Point 13) - No concerns were raised by the Conservation Officer regarding the angle of the front door

Points 14 and 15) - this is addressed in the design section

Point 16) - this is addressed within the ecology section of the report. This has been addressed during the course of the assessment and both a Preliminary Survey and full Bat Survey has now been undertaken by a suitably qualified Ecologist.

A final consultation took place on 23th July 2025 following receipt of a Bat Survey.

A further six objections were received which raised similar concerns as highlighted above.

- i) The extension would damage the conservation area; loss of too much character with only a small portion of the original house remaining.
- ii) cupola dome completely out of context.
- iii) The double doors and balcony area on the proposed 2nd floor not in keeping with the style of the neighbouring properties and reduces privacy in gardens of adjacent properties - more suitable to be a standard velux type window built into the slope of the roof as other houses in the area.
- iv)The proposal would be detrimental to the Manor Farm Heritage Site.
- v) Demolition started without planning permission received.
- vi) Contravention of legislation which requires Preliminary Bat Survey to be provided.

Planning Officer Comments

Points i-iv) addressed in the design section of the report.

Point v) Officers have inspected the property on several occasions and noted that there is partial

demolition carried out to the rear wall. Partial demolition to a dwelling can be undertaken without the need for planning permission. The applicant has ceased further works on their property until the current application has been determined and the relevant conditions discharged.

Point vi) Following the sighting of Bats roosting in the property, a full Bat Survey has been undertaken. This was subject to the most recent consultation.

#### Ruislip Residents Association

Looking at Google Street View (April 2024) it appears some building works had commenced. Given the location of the site and known prevalence of bats in the area my understanding is that an ecological or bat survey should have been submitted. It will be appreciated if officers request the applicant to submit both surveys before a final decision is made on this application. The plans are very concerning given it is within RVCA. The proposals involve extending the building in all directions and effectively demolishing most of the original Arts and Crafts building except for the existing front projection on the northern side and part of the northern side elevation. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that "alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused". Adding such a large two storey front elevation to the building would not preserve or enhance the street scene and it will not appear subordinate to the existing building. The proposed cupola on the roof will be an ugly addition to the front elevation, totally out of keeping with street scene and detrimental to the RVCA. The proposed new first floor windows at the front are also out of character! RRA believe these proposals should be refused because - The extensions to the front of a house will not be minor and will alter the overall appearance of the house and affect the character of the street - the cumulative impacts of proposed extensions by reason of their combined and excessive scale, bulk, width, size, design and siting would result in an unsympathetic and incongruous over development of the site which would fail to read as subordinate to the host property, harming the original design and appearance of the host property and failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Further comments were received from the Ruislip Residents Association following the re-consultation on the Bat Survey.

On behalf of Ruislip Residents' Association, (RRA), I wish to add further comments to those submitted on 3rd December 2024 opposing this application. Section 2 of the Design and Access statement (D&AS) says "25 St Martins Approach, is .. located within Character Area 1 of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area,

St Martins Approach is characterised by detached homes of varying design. The eastern side and northern section of the road are not within the conservation area but still form an important part of the street's character". However, The D&AS does not state that the eastern side is within an Area of Special Local Character: Moat Drive. Section 4 of the D&AS says "Due to the belt of trees along the boundary of the rear garden there is limited views to the rear elevation of the property". Appendix A - Google Earth Aerial image shows the trees. Anyone who stands to the South West of the South West corner of the site shown in red dots (off the map) can see the building of the rear of no. 25 from the north side of the Grade 11 listed Manor Farm House within the heritage site located behind at the rear of the houses on the west side of St Martins Approach.

The RRA trust that Conservation Officers will be considering the impacts of the proposed application carefully with respect to its location both within the RVCA with the Heritage site at the rear, and the Area of Special Local Character: Moat Drive directly opposite. The application form for

this planning application answered "no" to "has the work already been started without consent". In December 2024 the RRA thought that works had only begun at the front of the property. However, works on demolishing parts of the rear of the property had begun some months before the application was validated. Evidence of these works are visible from the back near the side of Manor Farm House, and when looking through the front living room window of no 25 from the street. It is extremely concerning that demolition took place without planning permission, building control or anyone reporting it to Enforcement for investigation. In RRA's previous comments submitted we asked officers to request the applicant to submit ecological and bat surveys before a final decision is made on this application". It is concerning that the Bat survey (July 2025) submitted does not make it clear that the building work started before the Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA), and as bats were roosting in the house during works then it is likely they have been disturbed, and a roost has been destroyed as surveys weren't done before the works. There are concerns that a contravention of legislation has occurred. The mitigation of just including two bat boxes does not consider what could have been there previously - for instance a maternity roost of common pipistrelles. In future it would seem more appropriate if LBH insist on Ecology surveys being submitted by a qualified ecologist at the time planning applications are submitted. The RRA trust you will take these comments into account in addition to those submitted

Ruislip, Northwood & Eastcote Local History Society

The Ruislip, Northwood & Eastcote Local History Society is very concerned about this application. The proposed development will result in the loss of a house in the Arts and Craft style which is in keeping with neighbouring properties. The various extensions amount to almost a new house which has destroyed the attractive original features such as the front door set at a side angle. The new arrangement of the windows will not be in keeping with the houses on either side. The addition of a cupola dome to the new roof will be inappropriate and look out of place in the road. The property is located within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area where all the other houses have mainly retained their Arts and Crafts features. This proposed development will be detrimental to the character of the conservation area and the street scene. The house backs on to the Manor Farm site, which is of major historical importance. The house can be seen from the site especially in winter when the trees are bare so it is important that no inappropriate development obstructs this view. This development will represent a loss of character and be unsympathetic to both a conservation area and an important local heritage site and we request that it be refused. (I hope these comments will still be considered even though the deadline has passed but I have been away on holiday.)

A comment has also been received from a Ward Councillor who raised concerns regarding the proposed works being wholly at odds with the character of the existing street scene.

#### INTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Conservation Officer: The Conservation Officer originally objected to the scheme based upon the harmful impact to the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and the wider Conservation Area.

Following revisions to the scheme made by the applicant, the Conservation Officer, re-reviewed the proposal and now noted that, on balance, they would not object to the proposal on the basis that:

-The setback of the works was improved which will reflect the historic character and create a shadow line;

-A substantial improvement was made to the fenestration;

-Matching roof tile, brick, brick bond and eaves detail would need to be conditioned;

-Improved front landscaping was proposed.

The Conservation Officer concluded that 'Overall we believe that the proposed works would not cause harm to the designated assets of the conservation area, nor the setting of the scheduled ancient monument or listed farmhouse. Therefore we would not object to the proposals. External brick colour, size, bond pattern, mortar mix and finish to match existing. Rooftiles, eaves and rainwater goods to match existing. Copula rooflight details at 1:20 scale and finish subject to approval. Hard and soft landscaping subject to approval. These are to ensure the preservation of the character of the conservation area. '

Urban Design Officer: The Urban Design Officer provided feedback on the proposal, and was supportive of the amended scheme.

Highways Officer: As the established parking provision is to remain on the frontage, there is no objection or further comment on this application.

Historic England, Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service: States they did not consider it necessary to be notified and did not provide further comment on the application.

Head of Environmental Planning Specialists:

No objections to the proposed development subject to the following:

The bat survey report (July 2025) identifies bat roosts at the south western part of the building and the existing eastern elevation. The survey report doesn't relate the building works to the bat roosts but based on the 'existing' and 'proposed' arrangements, both roosts are likely to be lost or at least adversely impacted.

Adverse impacts to bats will need to be considered fully through the application and implementation of a Natural England bat licence.

Planning authorities also need to give consideration to the impacts on protected species when making a decision and need to make a reasonable determination on whether a bat licence would be forthcoming. The licence effectively allows for impacts to bats but only once consideration of three derogation tests as set out in the Habitat Regulations 2017 have been considered. These tests need to be commensurate with the scale and nature of impact on the protected species.

For this development, the impact on bats is considered low given the limited roosting potential i.e. two identified roosts. Notwithstanding that, there will be adverse impacts and consequently the Planning Authority needs to be satisfied that the weighting for the development is sufficient to justify the relative low impacts to bats and no alternatives are available, i.e. redesign to avoid impacts to roosts.

, the favourable conservation of the species, is likely to be satisfied through the application of appropriate measures to reduce harm through method statements and then to ensure the favourable status of the species through targeted mitigation such as replacements bat boxes. These would be detailed further through the licensing process.

If the Local Planning Authority is minded to grant approval, the following condition is necessary:

No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, or vegetation clearance) until a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence for bats has been obtained from Natural England.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of the licence, including any mitigation and compensation measures detailed therein.

To minimise the impacts to protected species.

#### 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
PT1.HE1	(2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
NPPF12 -23	NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
NPPF16 -23	NPPF16 23 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

#### 5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

IMPACT ON STREET SCENE:

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Chapter 16 of the NPPF (2024) set out the method for assessing the impact of development proposals on heritage assets. 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.

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. The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings should also be actively managed.

Policy DMHB 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies

(January 2020) stipulates that states that Conservation Areas 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. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. In order to achieve this, the Council will:

- A) Require proposals for new development, including any signage or advertisement, to be of a high quality contextual design. Proposals should exploit opportunities to restore any lost features and/or introduce new ones that would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- B) Resist the loss of buildings, historic street patterns, important views, landscape and open spaces or other features that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; any such loss will need to be supported with a robust justification.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) requires all development to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design, either complementing or improving the character and appearance of the area. Policy DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) seeks to protect and improve the public realm, including streets.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) 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 DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that well designed alterations and extensions, using quality materials, should be of a scale and form in keeping with the house, and sympathetic to existing character, proportions, and floor plan. All proposed extensions should appear subordinate to the existing house, with appropriately selected windows, materials and detailing. The policy goes into detail for specific types of householder extensions and the relevant criteria to be considered.

The site is located within Ruislip Village Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset. In accordance with s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, special regard must be given to desirability of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area during the course this planning assessment.

It is also noted that there are a number of listed buildings and structures within the immediate area and as such, special regard must also be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings in accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act)

## Site Context

The significance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area derives, in part, from properties of a similar date, set in ample, green gardens forming part of a homogenously planned layout. The mature hedges that form the boundary treatment along the street elevations strongly contribute to the significance of the area and are a strong characteristic feature of the street scene.

The application property contributes both individually and as part of the planned, Metroland, inter-war estate. The application dwelling is positioned on a relatively small plot, with a large rear garden extending to the west and a front garden which contributes to the verdant appearance of the street scene.

The Ruislip Village Conservation Area Appraisal (2010) notes that the Conservation Area is defined by residential character with a mixture of housing stock including privately owned dwellings and purpose built flats.

The application site is situated within Character Area 1 (as identified within the Appraisal) which is derived from key structures and groups of buildings including Manor Farm buildings, St Martin's Church and the adjacent smaller scale building to the north of the High Street. These historic buildings date back to Medieval period. Limited reference is made with the CA appraisal to the interwar suburban housing (1920s-1930s) which also contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area. These include properties along St Martins Approach which has a variation of architectural styles including a blend of suburban neo-Georgian and Art & Crafts influences.

The application property is one such property which is of Arts & Crafts influence. The property is constructed with a red brick finish with a steep hipped tiled roof and central chimney stack and timber casement windows with minimal bay projections. Its overall design is simplistic, carefully proportioned with softened details around the windows and eaves.

To the south, No. 23 St Martin's Approach is a larger property in the neo-Georgian suburban style, distinguished by its symmetrical facade, central doorway and low-pitched hipped roof, giving it a formal and ordered character. To the north, No. 27 St Martin's Approach is of a similar scale and likewise reflects neo-Georgian suburban influences, with a balanced composition and classical restraint.

To the rear of the site is the scheduled ancient monument of the motte and bailey castle. Similarly, the property is relatively close to the Listed Manor Farmhouse. Again as with the motte and bailey the setting of the farmhouse was changed dramatically in the 20th century. Due to the distance and separation, it is not considered any harm would be caused to the setting of these listed buildings.

### Proposal Works

The proposal seeks to erect a number of additions and alterations, to include the erection of a single-storey side extension with four rooflights in the new roof slope; a first floor rear extension; a two-storey front extension; change in the roof form and conversion of the roof space into habitable accommodation; the erection of a rear dormer with Juliet balcony; the addition of a roof lantern; the conversion of garage to habitable use; and alterations to fenestration to the front, side and rear elevations.

During the course of the application, amendments have been received which reduced the scale of the proposed works and ensured that the references to the historic design of the building were preserved.

The proposed extensions would result in the infilling of the 'L-shaped' form of the original dwellinghouse however the front extension and side extension have been amended to be setback from the original northern building line of the dwelling. This setback maintains a reference to the historic roof form of the property.

The previously proposed neo-classical front elevation has been removed from the amended proposal including removal of the proposed large portico and pillars. The new integrated front entrance porch is considered to be a substantial improvement and while it varies from the previous angled front entrance, would overall not detract from the picturesque Arts & Crafts character of the area.

Whilst there are significant changes proposed to the front, these changes would not be considered harmful to the existing dwelling and would preserve the wider conservation area.

The proposed extensions have been sensitively designed to respect this character, ensuring that the dwelling continues to sit comfortably between its neo-Georgian neighbours while contributing positively to the coherent interwar suburban setting.

The front extensions maintain the predominant use of red solid brickwork and tiled hipped roof forms which are defining features of the Arts & Crafts style. The proportions of the roof pitches have been carried through, ensuring the new elements appear visually integrated within the facade.

The new fenestration has been designed to reflect the existing rhythm and the proportions would be acceptable to the existing house. Whilst the Arts and Crafts style often embraces slight asymmetry, the proposal maintains a careful balance between the original dwelling and the new elements. The loss of the angled entrance arrangement would not cause harm to the original design. Sufficient historic reference to the building is maintained as a whole.

The Conservation Officer has reviewed the alterations as a whole and noted the amended extensions would reflect the historic character of the surrounding area and would create a shadow line on the frontage, breaking up the bulk of the dwelling as viewed from the streetscape. By setting the new massing back slightly, the proposal avoids creating an overbearing appearance when viewed from the street.

Changes to the front also include a glazed cupola dome. Whilst this element is a unique feature within the roof, it would be set in from the side sufficiently and adds visual interest without dominating the roof slope. This unique feature has been carefully reviewed by the Conservation Officer who has made the following comment:

'It noted the introduction of the cupola light to the ridge above the main hall. A rooflight in this position and to the design shown is not typical of the character of the area. It would contrast with the buildings character although it would not appear disproportionate nor overly diminish the traditional characteristics of the tiled roofs nor its framing by the chimneys. Though the design and form would differ from the existing, it would not appear visually harmful provided that the detailing was of a high quality to reflect the detailing of the existing building.'

As such, to further ensure the overall design quality, the finer details of this glazed cupola dome would be secured by condition. This would ensure that the detail of this feature are further scrutinised by the Conservation Team and the finished feature is of suitable quality and appearance.

Within the front garden, it is proposed to increase the level of hard surfacing to the front, resultant in a loss of some existing area of front garden. Officers have surveyed the frontages along St Martins Approach and it is noted that most of the properties have a substantial amount of hard surfacing within the front garden. Amendments received have increased the level of landscaping with approximately 22.5sqm of landscaped front yard now to be retained. This is equivalent to 27.4% of the existing approximately 82sqm landscaped front yard. On this basis, the proposed landscaping is considered to be in accordance with Policy DMHD 1.

#### Rear extensions

To the rear of the property, the proposal includes the infilling of a recessed section at first floor level along the northern side. The extension would measure 1m in depth and 3.1m in width, creating a

continuous rear wall at this level. The Conservation Officer has not raised any concerns regarding the extensions proposed to the rear.

At present, the rear elevation comprises a disjointed arrangement of part two-storey and part single-storey extensions, with the existing two-storey element projecting above the eaves in a manner that appears overly complex and visually awkward. This arrangement detracts from the architectural character of the dwelling.

The proposed works would remove this awkward two-storey projection and reinstate a consistent eaves line, thereby introducing a greater sense of proportion and balance to the property. The addition of a rear dormer window would be modest in scale and clearly subservient to the main roof form, being set in from the ridge, eaves, and flank walls so that the original roof remains the dominant feature.

Concerns have been raised through the public consultation regarding the dormer fenestration and the inclusion of a Juliet balcony. However, the design remains restrained, and the larger window openings would not undermine the character of the host property or the wider conservation area given their discreet location on the rear elevation. Moreover, by its very nature, a Juliet balcony does not provide usable external amenity space, as the glazed balustrade would prevent occupation of the roof immediately outside the window. This matter is addressed in further detail within the amenity section of the report.

#### Impact on the setting of the nearby listed properties/structure

As noted, the site is within close proximity of a number of statutory listed structures. To the rear lies an ancient monument of the motte and bailey castle which is statutory listed and protected. The Conservation Officer has reviewed the development in the context of these nearby listed structures and is satisfied that the proposed works would not impact on the setting of the scheduled monuments and structures. This is generally buried although some raised areas of banks can be observed when walking within its grounds. The site and context have changed dramatically since its construction in the medieval period and in particular since the development of the Metroland extensions to London in the 20th century. Consultation was also carried out with the Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service who responded with no comments to make. On the basis of the positioning of the extensions, it is clear that there is sufficient separation from the proposed development and the nearby designated structures. Officers therefore have concluded that there would be no adverse impact on the setting of the nearby heritage assets.

#### Summary

In accordance with S66 and S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), Special regard has been given to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area as well as the setting of nearby listed buildings during the course this planning assessment.

The location of the proposal ensures that the setting of the nearby Listed Structures and buildings are protected. The building works would be a sufficient distance from these protected buildings to not cause any harm.

The proposed extensions respond positively to the architectural character of the existing Arts & Crafts house. By using matching materials, replicating roof pitches and adopting a subservient massing, the design ensures that the style of original dwelling remains the visually dominant feature. The fenestration and roofline ensures that the new extensions would integrate with the host

building while preserving its original character.

Overall, the amended design remains both sympathetic and proportionate to the original design and ensures that the scheme does not lead to any harm to the conservation area. The revised design would on balance both preserve and enhance the conservation area. Individually and cumulatively, the proposed extensions and landscaping works comply with the overarching aims of Policies HC1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), and Policies DMHB 4, DMHB 11, and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

#### NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY:

Policy D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach of The London Plan (2021) states that developments should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy, and amenity.

Policy D6 Housing quality and standards of The London Plan (2021) states the site layout, orientation, and design of dwellings should provide privacy and adequate daylight for residents.

Policy DMHB 11 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact the amenity, daylight, and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Policy DMHD 1 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved.

The application site has neighbours to either side; that is, No. 23 St Martin's Approach, a detached dwelling to the south, with No. 27 St Martin's Approach, a detached neighbouring property to the north.

The proposed two-storey front extension would not project forward of the principal front elevation of the nearest neighbouring property at No. 23. In this regard, the proposed front extension is not considered to result in an un-neighbourly form of development in terms of loss of privacy, overlooking or over-dominance.

The single-storey side extension is not considered to result in a sense of enclosure or loss of privacy to the neighbouring property at No. 23, given that it would effectively convert the existing garage to habitable accommodation and follow the built line of No. 23's garage, extending only a limited amount further forward (joining up with the proposed two-storey front extension) than their existing built form along this shared boundary.

Neither the front extension nor southern side extension would be readily visible to No. 27 and therefore would not impact their residential amenity. The proposed rear first floor infill extension, approximately 1m in depth, is proposed along the shared boundary however due to the infill nature and small scale of the works, it is considered this will not notably alter the existing sense of bulk or daylight access of No. 27. The works also propose to fill an existing flank stairwell window, marginally improving the sense of privacy of No.27.

The proposed second floor balcony has been amended from the original proposal to a Juliet balcony. While the Juliet balcony would afford oblique views of the rear gardens of neighbouring properties, the extent of overlooking would be no greater than that afforded by rear facing windows.

The Council recognises that some degree of overlooking of rear gardens is inevitable within urban/suburban environments and does not consider that the oblique views afforded from the Juliet balcony would result in an unreasonable degree of overlooking over adjacent neighbours and would not afford a material loss of privacy to neighbouring dwelling's rear garden spaces. In the event of an approval, a condition would be applied restricting the use of the area located outside the Juliet balcony (providing a lightwell) to be used as any form of balcony or accessible space.

It is considered there would be no impact on the residential amenity or daylight of opposing properties across St Martins Approach or on Manor Farm to the rear of the site due to the separation distances between these neighbouring properties and the proposed works.

With respect to neighbouring residential amenity, the proposed works are acceptable to Policies D3 and D6 of The London Plan and Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two Development Management Policies (2020).

## ECOLOGY

Policy DMEI 7 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two (2020) states that development proposed near to a site considered to have features of ecological or geological value, applicants must submit appropriate surveys and assessments to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have unacceptable effects. The development must provide a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of the site or feature of ecological value.

Bats are a protected species under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Any harm to bats including damage or destruction to breeding sites or resting places is unlawful.

The site is located approximately 100m from a Nature Conservation Site of Grade I Importance to the north as well as backing onto Metropolitan Open Land with a variety of woodland/mature trees. The application originally was not submitted with an ecological survey and it is noted according to the National Biodiversity Network Atlas there is no record of any bats within a 2km radius of the site and a record of only 50 bats (of 5 species) within a 5km radius of the site.

Following partial demolition of the rear wall of the property partially opening up the building to the elements, the LPA required a preliminary bat survey, undertaken in March 2025. This confirmed two common pipistrelles (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) roosting between a timber joist and brick wall at ground-floor level.

A subsequent full survey, undertaken during May-June 2025 in accordance with best practice, comprised three visits. One soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) was observed emerging on the first visit; no bats were recorded on the second and third visits. Bat droppings were also identified within the east ground-floor room.

The survey concluded that the property supports one common pipistrelle day roost and one soprano pipistrelle day roost. The boundary habitats have some value for foraging and commuting, but the site as a whole is of low suitability, with higher quality habitat present in the wider landscape.

The report identified that:

- Construction works could disturb, injure or kill bats if uncontrolled.
- Artificial lighting during construction and occupation could indirectly affect bats, potentially altering foraging and commuting patterns.

Accordingly, a Natural England mitigation licence will be required before further works can take place. Mitigation measures are expected to include supervised removal of roofing materials under an ecological watching brief, and the provision of replacement roost features. The applicant's survey recommends two bat boxes (one on the building and one within the garden), but final details will be determined by Natural England through the licensing process.

The Bat Survey has been internally received by the Council's Environmental Specialist Manager who has raised no objections to the findings within the report. As there are bats present within the property, a full license would need to be secured from Natural England before any further construction works can be undertaken at the site. The Officer noted that the bat boxes referenced in the report may be subject to change during the licensing process which is outside the remit. As such given the number of bat boxes could be changed within the licensing process, it would not be reasonable to attach a condition for these, but to condition a licence to be secured.

The Officer highlights the need for considering the impact on the protected species and make reasonable determination on whether a license can be secured from Natural England. The Officer has acknowledged that for this development the impact on bats is considered low given the limited roosting potential i.e. two identified roosts.

The 3 derogation tests within the Habitat Regulations 2017 have been considered by the LPA.

Habitats Regulations derogation tests:

In considering the three tests under the Habitats Regulations 2017:

1. Imperative reasons of overriding public interest - The building is currently partially open to the elements, raising health and safety and structural concerns. Allowing completion of the works would secure the building, prevent further deterioration, and enable reoccupation as a family home. This represents a clear public interest which outweighs the low-level impact on bats.

2. No satisfactory alternative - Given the location of the identified roosts, there are no feasible alternatives to the proposed works that would avoid impacting bats.

3. Favourable conservation status maintained - The Bat Survey demonstrates that with appropriate mitigation (supervised works, provision of compensatory bat roost features, and light-sensitive design), the favourable conservation status of local bat populations can be maintained. Final mitigation requirements would be secured through the Natural England licensing process.

Conclusion

Officers are satisfied that the ecological surveys and proposed mitigation demonstrate compliance with Policy DMEI 7 of the Local Plan. Subject to condition whereby a license is secured by Natural England prior to commencement, the development is considered acceptable in ecological terms.

## ACHAEOLOGICAL PRIORITY AREA

Policy DMHB 7 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two (2020) states that the Council, as advised by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service, will ensure that sites of archaeological interest within or, where appropriate, outside, designated areas are not disturbed.

The local planning authority contacted the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service for

consultation on the application due to the location of the site within the Ruislip Motte & Bailey Archaeological Priority Area. GLAAS confirmed they did not consider it necessary to be notified of the application and provided no further comment.

Considering the small scale of shallow land disturbance which would be required to complete the proposed works, it is considered there would be no harm to the heritage asset and the Council is satisfied that the development would be in accordance with Policy DMHB 7 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two (2020).

## HIGHWAYS AND PARKING

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals must comply with the parking standards outlined in Appendix C Table 1 in order to facilitate sustainable development and address issues relating to congestion and amenity.

The application site has one driveway with an offsite parking area historically for at least two vehicles. The proposed extensions would not impact on car parking provision but provide more space to allow for manoeuvring. The Highway's Officer was consulted on the scheme and is satisfied that sufficient parking would be retained onsite. The level of parking on site is in line with the maximum amount expected for a residential dwelling and as such, would comply with Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (November 2012).

## QUALITY OF ACCOMODATION AND PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE

The proposal would provide a suitable standard of accommodation for future occupants with sufficient outlook, daylight sunlight provided for each room. All the proposed habitable rooms would maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy D6 of the London Plan (March 2021).

The existing external amenity space for the property would not be impacted upon. The property would continue to be served by sufficient garden which would meet the standards set out in Table 5.3 (Private Amenity Space Standards) of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (2020). The proposal, therefore, would not undermine the provision of external amenity space, thereby complying with Policies DMHB 18 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

## CONCLUSION

The proposal is considered to comply with the Development Plan and no material considerations indicate that a contrary decision should be taken. Consequently, the application is recommended for approval subject to the conditions

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

**APPROVAL subject to the following:**

1. HO1 Time Limit

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the

date of this permission.

**REASON**

To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

**2. HO2 Accordance with approved**

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans,

- 1186 (SP) 01 - Site Location Plan
- 1186 (BP) 02, rev: A - Proposed Block Plan
- 1186 (P-) 200, rev: C - Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- 1186 (P-) 201, rev: B - Proposed First Floor Plan
- 1186 (P-) 202, rev: B - Proposed Attic Floor Plan
- 1186 (P-) 203, rev: B - Proposed Roof Floor Plan
- 1186 (P-) 204, rev: F - Proposed East Elevation
- 1186 (P-) 205 - Proposed West Elevation
- 1186 (P-) 206 rev: C - Proposed North Elevation
- 1186 (P-) 207 rev: C - Proposed South Elevation
- 1186 (P-) 208 rev: D - Street Elevations
- 1186 (P-) 209, rev: B - Proposed Landscape Plan
- 1186 (P-) 210 rev: B - Proposed Landscape Elevation

and shall thereafter be retained/maintained for as long as the development remains in existence.

**REASON**

To ensure the development complies with the provisions of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020), and the London Plan (2021).

**3. HO4 Materials**

The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted, including the external brick colour, size, bond pattern, mortar mix and finish, and roof tiles, eaves and rainwater goods, shall match those used in the existing building and shall thereafter be retained as such.

**REASON**

To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to ensure that the proposed development does not have an adverse effect upon the appearance of the existing building in accordance with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020)

**4. NONSC Fenestration - Copula, Windows and Doors (Details)**

No development above ground level shall occur until fenestration details of the proposed copula rooflight, doors and windows at 1:20 scale including the proposed finish has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained for the lifetime of the development.

**REASON**

To ensure that the proposed development will preserve and enhance the visual amenities and character of the dwelling and conservation area in compliance with Policies DMHB 4 and Policy

DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021).

## 5. NONSC Rooflights (Details)

The proposed rooflights on the single storey side extension and main roof (excluding the copula roof lantern subject to condition 4) must be conservation style rooflights. No development above ground level shall occur until details of the proposed rooflights at 1:20 scale including the proposed finish has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained for the lifetime of the development.

### REASON

To ensure that the proposed development will preserve and enhance the visual amenities and character of the dwelling and conservation area in compliance with Policies DMHB 4 and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021).

## 6. RES9 Landscaping (car parking & refuse/cycle storage) (Details)

The dwelling shall not be occupied until a landscape scheme for the front garden has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and subsequently implemented. The scheme shall include: -

### 1. Details of Soft Landscaping

- 1.a Planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100),
- 1.b Written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken,
- 1.c Schedule of plants giving species, plant sizes, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate. These species must include native fruit and flowering vegetation.

### 2. Details of Landscape Maintenance

- 2.a Landscape Maintenance Schedule for a minimum period of 5 years.
- 2.b Proposals for the replacement of any tree, shrub, or area of surfing/seeding within the landscaping scheme which dies or in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority becomes seriously damaged or diseased.

### 3. Schedule for Implementation

Thereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.

### REASON

To ensure that the proposed development will preserve and enhance the visual amenities of the locality and provide adequate facilities in compliance with policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14, DME1 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) and Policy G5 of the London Plan (2021).

## 7. NONSC Bat License

No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, or vegetation clearance) until a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence for bats has been obtained from Natural England. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the terms and

conditions of the licence, including any mitigation and compensation measures detailed therein.

#### REASON

To minimise the impacts to protected species in compliance with Policy DMEI 7 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two (2020).

#### 8. HO5 No additional windows or doors

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be constructed in the walls or roof slopes of the development hereby approved.

#### REASON

To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).

#### 9. HO6 Obscure Glazing

The first floor side elevation window facing No. 27 St Martins Approach shall be glazed with permanently obscured glass to at least scale 4 on the Pilkington scale and be non-opening below a height of 1.8 metres taken from internal finished floor level for so long as the development remains in existence.

#### REASON

To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).

#### 10. HH- Prevention of Balconies / Roof Gardens RPD4

The lightwell area situated outside the Juliet balcony (as annotated on the proposed loft plan drawing number 1186 (P-) 202, rev: B) hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area. No access shall be permitted to the lightwell area, except for the purposes of maintenance.

Furthermore, all roofs areas of any part of the extensions hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

#### REASON

To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).

### INFORMATIVES

1. 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.
2. The Council will recover from the applicant the cost of highway and footway repairs, including damage to grass verges.

Care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge or footpaths during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to the public footway. Any damage will require to be made good to the satisfaction of the Council and at the applicant's expense.

For further information and advice contact - Highways Maintenance Operations, Central Depot - Block K, Harlington Road Depot, 128 Harlington Road, Hillingdon, Middlesex, UB3 3EU (Tel: 01895 277524).

For Private Roads: Care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge of footpaths on private roads during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to a private road and where possible alternative routes should be taken to avoid private roads. The applicant may be required to make good any damage caused.

3. Nuisance from demolition and construction works is subject to control under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other related legislation. In particular, you should ensure that the following are complied with:-

A. Demolition and construction works which are audible at the site boundary shall only be carried out between the hours of 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08.00 hours and 13.00 hours on Saturday. No works shall be carried out on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

B. All noise generated during such works shall be controlled in compliance with British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228:2009.

C. Dust emissions shall be controlled in compliance with the Mayor of London's Best Practice Guidance 'The Control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition.

D. No bonfires that create dark smoke or nuisance to local residents.

You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Protection Unit ([www.hillingdon.gov.uk/noise](http://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/noise) Tel. 01895 250155) or to seek prior approval under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act if you anticipate any difficulty in carrying out construction other than within the normal working hours set out in (A) above, and by means that would minimise disturbance to adjoining premises.

4. You are advised that if any part of the development hereby permitted encroaches by either its roof, walls, eaves, gutters, or foundations, then a new planning application may have to be submitted. The validity of this planning permission may be challengeable by third parties if the development results in any form of encroachment onto land outside the applicant's control for which the appropriate Notice under Article 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 has not been served.
5. The decision to GRANT 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.

- DMHB 1 Heritage Assets
- DMHB 4 Conservation Areas
- DMHB 11 Design of New Development
- DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space
- DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
- DMT 6 Vehicle Parking
- LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design
- LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth
- NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places  
-23
- NPPF16 23 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  
-23

## Standard Informatives

1. The decision to GRANT 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 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 GRANT 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
- PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

### Part 2 Polices:

- DMHB 1 Heritage Assets
- DMHB 4 Conservation Areas
- DMHB 11 Design of New Development
- DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space
- DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
NPPF12 -23	NPPF12 23 - Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
NPPF16 -23	NPPF16 23 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

3. You are advised this permission is based on the dimensions provided on the approved drawings as numbered above. The development hereby approved must be constructed precisely in accordance with the approved drawings. Any deviation from these drawings requires the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
4. You are advised that if any part of the development hereby permitted encroaches by either its roof, walls, eaves, gutters, or foundations, then a new planning application will have to be submitted. The validity of this planning permission may be challengeable by third parties if the development results in any form of encroachment onto land outside the applicant's control that is considered to cause harm to local amenity.
5. Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the relevant provisions of the Building Regulations, the Building Acts and other related legislation. These cover such works as - the demolition of existing buildings, the erection of a new building or structure, the extension or alteration to a building, change of use of buildings, installation of services, underpinning works, and fire safety/means of escape works. Notice of intention to demolish existing buildings must be given to the Council's Building Control Service at least 6 weeks before work starts. A completed application form together with detailed plans must be submitted for approval before any building work is commenced. For further information and advice, contact - Building Control, 3N/01 Civic Centre, Uxbridge (Telephone 01895 558170).
6. You have been granted planning permission to build a residential extension. When undertaking demolition and/or building work, please be considerate to your neighbours and do not undertake work in the early morning or late at night or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. Furthermore, please ensure that all vehicles associated with the construction of the development hereby approved are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage of mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway. You are advised that the Council does have formal powers to control noise and nuisance under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other relevant legislation. For further information and advice, please contact - Environmental Protection Unit, 4W/04, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW (Tel. 01895 250190).
7. The Party Wall Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify, and obtain formal agreement from, any adjoining owner, where the building owner purposes to:
  - carry out work to an existing party wall;
  - build on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
  - in some circumstances, carry out groundworks within 6 metres of an adjoining building.
 Notification and agreements under this Act are the responsibility of the building owner and are quite separate from Building Regulations, or Planning Controls. The Building Control Service will assume that an applicant has obtained any necessary agreements with the adjoining owner, and nothing said or implied by the Council should be taken as removing the necessity for the building owner to comply fully with the Party Wall Act. Further information and advice is to be found in 'The Party Walls etc. Act - 1996 - Explanatory Booklet' published by the

Department for Communities and Local Government.

8. Your attention is drawn to the fact that the planning permission does not override property rights and any ancient rights of light that may exist. This permission does not empower you to enter onto land not in your ownership without the specific consent of the owner. If you require further information or advice, you should consult a solicitor.
9. Nuisance from demolition and construction works is subject to control under The Control of Pollution Act 1974, the Clean Air Acts and other related legislation. In particular, you should ensure that the following are complied with: -

A) Demolition and construction works should only be carried out between the hours of 08.00 hours and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08.00 hours and 13.00 hours on Saturday. No works shall be carried out on Sundays Bank and Public Holidays.

B) All noise generated during such works should be controlled in compliance with British Standard Code of Practice BS 5228: 1984.

C) The elimination of the release of dust or odours that could create a public health nuisance.

D) No bonfires that create dark smoke or nuisance to local residents.

You are advised to consult the Council's Environmental Protection Unit, 3S/02, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW (Tel.01895 277401) or to seek prior approval under Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act if you anticipate any difficulty in carrying out construction other than within the normal working hours set out in (A) above, and by means that would minimise disturbance to adjoining premises.

10. You are advised that care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to avoid spillage of mud, soil or related building materials onto the pavement or public highway. You are further advised that failure to take appropriate steps to avoid spillage or adequately clear it away could result in action being taken under the Highways Act.
11. To promote the development of sustainable building design and construction methods, you are encouraged to investigate the use of renewable energy resources which do not produce any extra carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, including solar, geothermal and fuel cell systems, and use of high quality insulation.
12. You are advised that care should be taken during the building works hereby approved to ensure no damage occurs to the verge or footpaths during construction. Vehicles delivering materials to this development shall not override or cause damage to the public footway. Any damage will require to be made good to the satisfaction of the Council and at the applicant's expense. For further information and advice contact - Highways Maintenance Operations, Central Depot - Block K, Harlington Road Depot, 128 Harlington Road, Hillingdon, Middlesex, UB3 3EU (Tel: 01895 277524).

**Contact Officer:**

Eoin Concannon

**Telephone No:**

01895 250230