

# 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

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

**Address:** 21 PAMELA GARDENS EASTCOTE PINNER

**Development:** Erection of a wraparound dormer to rear and sides, installation of 1 front roof light and removal of chimney to create habitable roof space.

**LBH Ref Nos:** 6831/APP/2025/1858

**Drawing Nos:** 21PG-301-02H - proposed plans  
Block Plan  
Location Plan  
FIRE SAFETY STRATEGY

**Date Plans received:** 08-07-25                      **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

**Date Application valid** 01-10-25

## 1. CONSIDERATIONS

### 1.1 Site and Locality

The application property (the site) comprises a large detached art deco style house on the northern side of Pamela Gardens, Eastcote. The property is set on a spacious plot with hardstanding at the front with parking for cars and a large rear garden benefiting from mature landscaping.

The wider area comprises similar sized houses on spacious plots albeit of varying design. The site is located within the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area.

### 1.2 Proposed Scheme

Erection of a wraparound dormer to rear and sides, installation of 1 front roof light and removal of chimney to create habitable roof space.

### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

6831/APP/2024/1785

21 PAMELA GARDENS EASTCOTE PINNER

Erection of a single storey extension to the front, rear and side. Conversion of integral garage to habitable accommodation.

**Decision:** 11-10-2024

Approved

6831/APP/2013/2924

21 PAMELA GARDENS EASTCOTE PINNER

Part two storey, part single storey, part first floor rear extension, first floor side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use involving alterations to front elevation (Resubmission)

**Decision:** 02-12-2013

Refused

6831/APP/2013/1344

21 PAMELA GARDENS EASTCOTE PINNER

Part two storey, part single storey, part first floor rear extension, first floor side extension and conversion of garage to habitable use involving alterations to front elevation

**Decision:** 11-07-2013

Withdrawn

### **Comment on Planning History**

The relevant planning history is listed above.

## **2. Advertisement and Site Notice**

**2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:** 5th November 2025

## **3. Comments on Public Consultations**

13 neighbouring properties, Eastcote Residents Association and internal consultees were consulted by letter dated 07-10-25. Consultation expired on 28-10-25. Plans assessed: 21PG-301-02H.

10 Objections were received and 2 comments were received which stated:

EXTERNAL:

Eastcote Residents:

- The building is of significant architectural merit, with a striking Art Moderne style and a high degree of original, intact features.
- The shallow hipped roof with deep boarded eaves is an integral part of the building's character and contributes positively to the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area.
- The curved wall features and Art Deco windows are distinctive elements that would be harmed by the proposed dormer.
- The dormer is misleadingly described as a rear or rear wrap-around dormer; however, the drawings indicate it would be visible from all sides, including the front.
- The amended design does not reduce or mitigate the harm caused by the dormer.
- The proposed dormer is bulky, incongruous, and harmful to the host building and wider street scene.
- Dormers accepted elsewhere in the Conservation Area do not set a precedent that would justify altering this uniquely designed property.
- The dormer windows do not match the existing horizontal, banded Art Deco windows, contrary to the Heritage Statement.
- The application drawings do not reference the recently approved scheme (Ref: 6831/APP/2024/1785).
- Question raised as to whether the "existing" drawings must reflect the pre-approved building form, as the previous permission has not been built.
- The Heritage Statement incorrectly references policies from the Harrow Unitary Development Plan, which do not apply to Hillingdon and were deleted in 2007.

Planning Officer Comments (Material Considerations)

- Architectural significance and contribution to Conservation Area:

This is a material planning consideration. The building's Art Moderne character and contribution to the Conservation Area must be preserved or enhanced under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed

Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

· Impact of the proposed dormer on character and appearance:

Material consideration. Bulk, form, visibility, and design compatibility with the host property and street scene are key assessment criteria.

· Visibility of the dormer from public viewpoints:

Material consideration. Visibility from the front and wider public realm strengthens the degree of harm to the Conservation Area.

· Comparison to other dormers in the Conservation Area:

Material consideration. However, precedents elsewhere do not justify harm to a specific building with unique architectural significance.

· Design compatibility of the proposed windows with Art Deco windows:

Material consideration. Inappropriate fenestration can result in heritage harm.

· Omission of reference to recently approved scheme (2024/1785):

Material consideration. Applications must be assessed against the existing built form on site, not extant permissions that have not yet been implemented.

· Query regarding "existing" drawings:

Technical planning matter. Existing plans must reflect the building as it physically stands; unimplemented permissions cannot be treated as existing.

· Incorrect reference to Harrow UDP policies:

Material consideration. This is a old policy and if the Heritage Statement contains factual errors, and incorrect policy references reduce the weight that can be given to its conclusions.

Other comments:

1. Harm to the Conservation Area - The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area, contrary to conservation principles.
2. Unique Art Moderne / Art Deco Character - No. 21 is one of only three Art Moderne houses on the road and the only detached example, making it an architecturally significant heritage asset whose original features should be preserved.
3. Bulky, Dominant and Incongruous Dormer - The wraparound dormer is seen as excessively large, visually intrusive, and not subordinate to the sweeping curved roof form.
4. Visibility From All Elevations - Despite being described as a rear dormer, it would be clearly visible from the front, sides, rear, and from public viewpoints due to the property's detached and prominent siting.
5. Detrimental Impact on Roofline - The dormer would disrupt the existing shallow hipped roof, making the property appear like a 3-storey building and altering the unique roof profile.
6. Conflict With Conservation Area Guidelines - The proposals conflict with the estate's Management Plan, particularly stipulations against side dormers and visible front rooflights.
7. Loss of Historic Roof Features - The removal of the chimney is unacceptable as it is an original feature contributing to the traditional roofscape.
8. Inappropriate Materials and Design - Dormer materials and windows do not match the existing Art Deco detailing, including the distinctive horizontal banded glazing.
9. Visual Impact on Street and Views Between Houses - The scheme reduces open views between dwellings, blocking views of ancient trees and parkland, including Eastcote House Gardens.
10. Overlooking, Loss of Light, and Residential Amenity Concerns - Objections raised regarding increased overlooking into neighbouring gardens and possible reduction of natural light.
11. Setting Precedent for Further Harmful Changes - Approval could encourage more intrusive dormers, leading to cumulative harm and erosion of the Conservation Area's character.
12. Scaffolding and Construction Impact - Scaffolding was erected on a neighbour's land without permission; concerns remain over when it will be removed.
13. Misleading or Inaccurate Application Documents -

- Existing plans do not show already approved extensions (2024/1785), making the submission unclear.
  - The Heritage Statement incorrectly references the London Borough of Harrow UDP, which is irrelevant and outdated.
14. Front Rooflight Not in Keeping - Objection to a rooflight on the front elevation, which is not characteristic of the area and previously not permitted elsewhere.
  15. Impact on Eastcote House Gardens - The development would harm views from or towards this heritage landscape.
  16. General Preference for Alternative, More Sympathetic Loft Design - Some neighbours state they do not oppose a loft conversion in principle but object to this specific design.

#### Planning Officer Comments

1. Harm to Conservation Area - Material consideration. Central to assessing proposals in designated areas and will be assessed below
2. Unique Architectural Character - Material consideration. The special interest of the host building will be assessed.
3. Bulk, Scale and Dominance of Dormer - Material consideration. Key design and heritage assessment issue.
4. Public Visibility - Material consideration. Visibility increases the extent of potential harm and will be assessed
5. Impact on Roofline and Overall Form - Material consideration. Roof alterations in conservation areas must be sympathetic.
6. Conflict With Conservation Area Guidelines - Material consideration. Local character appraisals and management plans carry weight.
7. Loss of Chimney - Material consideration. Removal of original features can harm heritage significance.
8. Use of Inappropriate Materials/Design - Material consideration. Design quality and heritage compatibility required.
9. Impact on Street Views and Gaps Between Buildings - Material consideration. Important in conservation areas where open gaps contribute to character.
10. Overlooking/Light Concerns - Material consideration. Relates to neighbour amenity.
11. Setting Undesirable Precedent - Not strictly a material consideration, but cumulative harm to the Conservation Area is material.
12. Scaffolding on Neighbour's Land - Not a planning consideration. This is a civil matter.
13. Misleading or Incorrect Documentation - Material consideration. Accuracy is required; errors reduce the weight given to the Heritage Statement.
14. Front Rooflight - Material consideration. Impacts the appearance of the conservation area.
15. Impact on Eastcote House Gardens (heritage setting) - Material consideration. Impact on setting of heritage assets must be assessed.
16. Preference for Alternative Designs - Partially material. The acceptability of a design is relevant; personal preferences are not.

#### INTERNAL:

##### Conservation comments:

- The rear dormer, which projects visibly onto the side roof slope, disrupts the established roofline and silhouette of the building.
- Its design, scale, and prominence are inconsistent with the original Art Deco architectural style.
- The alteration harms the integrity and appearance of the front elevation when viewed from the public realm and neighbouring properties.
- The proposal would undermine the cohesive character and historic significance of this group of

three notable Art Deco houses within the Conservation Area.

· Any alterations should respect the architectural form of the building and the wider Conservation Area to maintain the visual harmony of this distinctive Art Deco ensemble.

Officer comments:

The above has been noted and will be used to determine the application.

#### 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 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

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 and the car parking provision.

Character and Appearance:

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

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) advises that all development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design. It should take into account aspects including the scale of the development considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and established street patterns; building lines and streetscape rhythm and landscaping. 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 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) states that the Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment and to prevent the loss of significance or harm to the character, appearance and setting of heritage assets (Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Areas of Special Local Character).

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

With regard to roof extensions, Policy DMHD 1 requires:

- i) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line;
- ii) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;
- iii) raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported;
- iv) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling; and v) in Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Local Character and on Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, roof extensions should take the form of traditional 'dormer' windows, on the rear elevation, to harmonise with the existing building. The highest point of the dormer should be kept well within the back roof slope, away from the ridge, eaves or valleys, whilst each window should match the proportions, size and glazing pattern of the first-floor windows.

The proposed development seeks to construct a full-width wraparound dormer spanning the entire rear roof slope and projecting noticeably onto the side roof plane. The dormer occupies a substantial proportion of the original roofscape, adding considerable bulk and compromising the building's distinctive hipped roof profile.

A wrap around dormer with the width of 6m and height of 1.9m and a depth of 2.9m is proposed which would result in an overspill and the formation of side dormers. The proposal involves extensive alterations to the roof profile which involve an increase to its width and make it appear discordant and at odds. The Local Plan states that dormers should not be overly large, and 'box-like' dormers to the side of the property or in protected areas will be unacceptable. As a general rule, dormers should not be more than two-thirds the width of the roof face of the property. They should be centrally positioned, set down below the ridge of the roof, and set up from the eaves.

Whilst they would be set in above the eaves by 1m and down from the ridge by 0.5m, they would fail to appear subordinate to the main house and would be of a significant bulk and massing, covering more than two-thirds of the width of the roof face on each side. These would be located close to the property's frontage and prominent on the street and appear at odds, especially given

the roof style on the dormers.

In design terms, the dormer fails to draw from, or respond to, the architectural language of the host dwelling. The fenestration is of a standard domestic appearance with no reference to the building's characteristic horizontal emphasis or curved detailing. Its scale and positioning result in an unbalanced roof profile that disrupts the carefully proportioned elevations.

The design, width, bulk, and massing of the dormers mean that they would significantly alter the roof form when viewed from the street, and overall, it is considered that they would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The property is an art deco and in a conservation area whereby it is paramount that properties are designed of a good quality and standard and preserved. Given this, the visual harm caused by the wrap around dormer on the property and the scale and massing of the side dormers cannot be accepted.

It is also recognised that the roof element would appear prominent even with the set back from the facade. The overall prominence of the roof within the street scene, the proposal would erode the building's architectural integrity and failing to preserve its overall contribution to the Conservation Area. The loss of the original hipped roof form, combined with the introduction of an oversized and unsympathetic roof addition, would materially harm the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset. This harm is assessed as less than substantial but carries significant weight, and no public benefits have been identified that would outweigh it.

The dormer overspill to the sides causes overbearing issues as the gap is a paramount feature of the properties in the area. The visual harm is considered sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission.

Therefore, the proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, scale, bulk, height, and design of the dormer, would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance, and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Furthermore, it would result in an incongruous and cramped appearance, which would erode the prevailing gap between dwellinghouses and harm the character and appearance of the original dwellinghouse and street scene and the conservation area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and DMHB 4.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) states that developments should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy, and amenity. Policy D6 states the site layout, orientation, and design of dwellings should provide privacy and adequate daylight for residents.

Policy DMHD 1 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to dwelling alterations and extensions will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved and there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers. Policy DMHB 11 seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact the amenity, daylight, and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

With regards to the impact on the neighbouring property at No.23 (East), there will be no overlooking, as no side windows are proposed or loss of sunlight/daylight as this property.

With regards to No.19, given the separation distance from the boundary and the fact that no side windows are proposed on the dormers, it would be on balance raise no concerns with regards to loss of sunlight/daylight or visual outlook.

The proposal is, therefore, acceptable and the neighbourhood amenity is not a reason for refusal and complies with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020).

#### Outdoor amenity Space

Policy D6 of The London Plan (2021) requires a minimum of five sq. m. of private outdoor space for one- to two-person dwellings and an extra one sq. m. for each additional occupant.

Policy DMHD 1 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part Two Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that, vi) adequate garden space is retained, while Policy DMHB 18 states that developers should provide amenity space in accordance with Table 5.3 of the local plan. Table 5.3 requires developments to provide between 40 and 100 sq. m. of private outdoor amenity space, dependent on the number of bedrooms within the property. It should be well-located, well-designed, and usable for the private enjoyment of the occupier.

The rear garden would retain adequate levels of private amenity space following the development.

The proposed development would comply with Policy D6 of The London Plan (2021) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 18, and Table 5.3 of Hillingdon Council's Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020).

#### Highways and Parking:

The parking provision would remain unaffected by the proposal.

#### Conclusion:

The application is recommended for refusal.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

### **REFUSAL for the following reasons:**

#### 1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed wraparound dormer, by reason of its excessive size, scale, bulk, height, and design would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance, and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposed development, by reason of the wrap around dormer and overspill to the side, its proximity to the neighbouring properties and the reduction of the prevailing gap space, would result in a form of development that would cause less than substantial harm to the conservation area without any notable public benefit. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policies DMHB 4, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part

Two (2020).

## 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.

DMHB Design of New Development  
11

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB Streets and Public Realm  
12

DMHB Private Outdoor Amenity Space  
18

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

## 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 Policies**

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

**Part 2 Policies:**

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 4 Conservation Areas

DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 6 Vehicle Parking

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

**Contact Officer:**

Sharon Singh

**Telephone No:**