

Planning Statement

Arlington Drive, Ruislip HA4 7RL



Contents

1. Introduction
2. Site and Surrounding Area
3. Planning History
4. The Proposed Development
5. Planning Policy Context
6. Planning Considerations
7. Conclusion

1. Introduction

1.1 This planning statement has been prepared in support of a full planning application submitted to the London Borough of Hillingdon for the erection of a detached dwelling within the curtilage of 2 Arlington Drive.

1.2 Planning permission is sought for the following development:

“Erection of detached dwelling with associated parking and landscaping”

1.3 This Statement should be read in conjunction with the accompanying plans and drawings submitted as part of the application together with the following documents, which have been prepared to address the full range of material planning considerations:

- Design & Access Statement
- Heritage Statement

2. Site and Surrounding Area

2.1 The site is located within the curtilage of the Grade II listed Little Manor House. The site is immediately bound by Arlington Drive to the north-west. To the south-west is 8 Arlington Drive, a mid-twentieth century residential property which has recently been extended. To the south-east of the site is a large part of the garden of Little Manor House, and to the north-east further garden and the listed building itself. The site is made up of grass and several mature trees, notably at the northwestern boundary. The topography of the Site is flat and sits at the same level as surrounding residential land.

2.2 Little Manor House is a timber framed building, which has largely been refaced with brick and painted white. There are some areas where the timber framing is externally visible, most notably on the first floor of the south-west elevation which faces the site. The building has a gabled roof, which is covered with plain tiles. The building is two storeys in height, except for a small north-eastern extension which is of one storey and attic.

2.3 The surrounding area is residential in character, with Arlington Drive being characterised by single and two storey detached dwellings constructed during the post-war period. These buildings are set back from the highway and predominantly constructed in brick and plain clay tile.

2.4 The site is located in an area that is at low risk of flooding.

2.5 The Site lies approximately 1km north of Ruislip town centre, which has a wide range of shopping and eating facilities and is circa 2km north of Ruislip underground station, which provides frequent access into Uxbridge and Central London. The H13 bus service, which has stops along Bury Street to the north of the site in either direction within 200m of the site, provides a regular bus service into Ruislip. The site has a PTAL rating of 1b.

3. Planning History

3.1 The relevant planning history for the site is summarised below:

Application ref: 71084/APP/2019/2301: Erection of a detached 2-storey x 4 bed dwelling with associated parking and landscaping. Refused 2 September 2019.

Application ref: 71084/APP/2019/2289: Erection of a detached 2-storey x 4 bed dwelling with associated parking and landscaping (application for Listed Building Consent). Refused 2 September 2019.

Application ref: APP71084/APP/2017/3603: Erection of two new semi-detached two storey houses and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping. Application refused 12th December 2017 and appeal (ref APP/R5510/Y/18/3198386) dismissed 12th October 2018.

Application ref: APP71084/APP/2017/3604: Erection of two new semi-detached two storey houses and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping (Listed Building Consent). Application refused 12th December 2017 and appeal (ref APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389) dismissed 12th October 2018.

Application ref: APP71084/APP/2017/2246: Erection of two new semi-detached two storey houses and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping. Application refused 25th August 2017 and appeal (ref APP/R5510/Y/18/3196615) dismissed 12th October 2018.

Application ref: APP71084/APP/2017/2247: Erection of two new semi-detached two storey houses and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping (Listed Building Consent). Application refused 25th August 2017 and appeal (ref APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617) dismissed 12th October 2018.

In summary, there has been two separate groups of planning applications. The first set of applications concerned the proposed development of a pair of semi-detached properties fronting Arlington Drive that were refused permission in 2017. The second set of applications was for a detached dwelling at the rear of the curtilage of Little Manor House, in the form of backland development.

4 The Proposed Development

4.1 It is proposed to sub-divide the rear curtilage of the property in order to allow for the construction of a 4 bedroom detached dwelling. A new vehicular access will be formed onto Arlington Drive to serve the proposed dwelling.

4.2 The dwelling is proposed to be constructed in a multi brindle brick with rustic brown plain clay tiles. This will be supported by the proposed use of high quality materials including zinc clad dormer windows, grey framed aluminium windows.

5 Planning Policy Context

5.1 In accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.2 The development plan for LB Hillingdon currently comprises the London Plan 2021, the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020). The relevant policies from the development plan are set out below.

London Plan 2021 (March 2021) (LP 2021)

The following policies of the London Plan 2021 are considered relevant to the proposed development:

D3: Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

D6: Housing quality and standards

D7: Accessible housing

H2: Small sites

HC1: Heritage conservation and growth

G6: Biodiversity and access to nature

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) (HLP Part 1)

The following policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 are considered relevant to the proposed development:

HE1: Heritage

BE1: Built Environment

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020) (HLP Part 2)

The following policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 are considered relevant to the proposed development:

DMH 6: Garden and Backland development

DMHB 1: Heritage Assets

DMHB 11: Design of New Development

DMHB 14: Trees and Landscaping

DMHB 16: Housing Standards

DMHB 17: Residential Density

DMHB 18: Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMEI 2: Reducing Carbon Emissions

DMT 1: Managing Transport Impacts

DMT 2: Highways impacts

DMT 5: Pedestrians and Cyclists

DMT 6: Vehicle Parking

- 5.3 The development also needs to be considered in the context of the advice provided within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The relevance of this planning policy framework to the proposed development is set out below.

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

The NPPF provides an overarching framework for the production of local policy documents and the determination of planning applications.

The NPPF act as guidance for local planning authorities and decision takers, both in drawing up plans and making decisions about planning applications. At the heart of this document is a presumption in favour of sustainable development running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For decision-taking, this means:

- c. "Approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d. Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date, granting planning permission unless:

- i. The application of policies in this framework that protects areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. Any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole.” (Paragraph 11)

The government expects the planning system to deliver homes, business, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment.

With regards to housing, Paragraph 59 of the NPPF identifies measures to “... boost significantly the supply of housing...” and Paragraph 11 further elaborates on this, stating that housing applications should be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development which, as set out above, run through both plan-making and decision taking.

Section 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment relates to the conservation of heritage assets in the production of local plans and decision taking. It emphasises that heritage assets are ‘an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance’.

For proposals that have the potential to affect the significance of a heritage asset, paragraph 189 requires applicants to identify and describe the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected, including any contribution made by their significance. This is supported by paragraph 190, which requires LPAs to take this assessment into account when considering applications.

The NPPF emphasises that ‘great weight’ should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, irrespective of whether any potential impact equates to total loss, substantial harm or less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets.

Paragraph 195 states that where a development will result in substantial harm to, or total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, permission should be refused, unless this harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits, or a number of criteria are met. Where less than substantial harm is identified paragraph

196 requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.

The government published its National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) notes in March 2014 and has provided regular updates to these. The NPPG supports the NPPF and provides high-level guidance with regard to specific planning issues and processes. Where applicable, the NPPG notes are referenced within this document.

6 Planning Considerations

6.1 This section of the report sets out the relevant material planning considerations and how the proposed development addresses these considerations. The following planning considerations are identified:

1. Principle of Development
2. Design, including impact upon the character and appearance of the area and the heritage asset
3. Residential amenity
4. Highways
5. Bio-diversity
6. Planning History
7. Public Benefits

Principle of Development

Policy context

- 6.2 Policy H2 of the LP 2021 (Small sites) advises that boroughs should proactively support well designed new homes on small sites with a main objective of the plan being to significantly increase the contribution of small sites (less than 0.25ha) to meeting London's housing needs. Table 4.2 of this plan provides minimum 10-year targets from 2019/20 – 2028/29 that boroughs are to meet for net housing completions on small sites. The figure for LB Hillingdon is 2,950 dwellings. In addition to increasing the contribution of small sites to meeting London's housing needs this is also considered to help diversify the type and mix of housing supply and to support small housebuilders and those wishing to bring forward custom and self-build housing.
- 6.3 The supporting text to this policy in Para 4.2.1 states that for London to deliver more of the housing it needs, small sites must make a substantially greater contribution to new supply across the city and increasing the rate of housing delivery from small sites

is a strategic priority that will require positive and practical planning by boroughs both in terms of planning decisions and plan making.

Analysis

- 6.4 The site falls within the definition of a small site. It lies within an established residential area and is not allocated for any specific land use and it is therefore considered that the principle of the intensification of the residential use of this site is acceptable in principle, whilst supporting the strategic priority of the LP 2021 of increasing the rate of housing delivery from small sites.

Design

Policy context

- 6.5 Policy D3 of the LP 2021 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) requires that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach to optimise the capacity of sites. Development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness to the layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Development should respond to the existing character of a place, utilise the heritage assets and architectural features to contribute towards the local character and be of high quality with high sustainability standards.
- 6.6 Policy HC1 of the LP 2021 (Heritage conservation and growth) states that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve the significance by being sympathetic to the assets significance and appreciation with their surroundings. Development proposals should avoid harm and identify enhancement opportunities by integrating heritage considerations early on in the design process.
- 6.7 Policy D6 of the LP 2021 (Housing quality and standards) requires new housing to be of high quality design that meets qualitative space standards (Ref Tables 3.1/3.2).
- 6.8 Policy D7 of the LP 2021 (Accessible housing) requires all housing to be built to Building Regs requirement M4(2).
- 6.9 Policy HE 1 of the HLP Part 1 (Heritage) seeks to conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape.

- 6.10 Policy BE 1 of the HLP Part 1 advises that new development, in addition to achieving a high quality of design, should enhance the local distinctiveness of the area, contribute to community cohesion and sense of place and make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, scale and materials and seek to protect the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential properties. Specifically, the policy advises that development should not result in the inappropriate development of gardens and green spaces that erode the character and biodiversity of suburban areas and increase flood risk.
- 6.11 Policy DMH 6 of the HLP Part 2 (Garden and backland development) states that there is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable where the neighbouring residential amenity is maintained, vehicular access does not have an adverse impact on neighbours and features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat are retained or re-provided.
- 6.12 DMHB 11 of the HLP Part 2 (Design of new development) requires all development to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design, including harmonising with the local context for example through the scale of development, building plot size and width, building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm and architectural composition, ensuring the use of high quality materials, protecting features of positive value within and adjacent to the site, including the safeguarding of heritage assets and their settings and considering landscaping and tree planting to protect enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.
- 6.13 DMHB 1 of the HLP Part 2 (Heritage assets) advises that the council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment. Development that has an effect on heritage assets will only be supported where it sustains and enhances the significance of the heritage asset, will not lead to a loss of significance or harm to the asset unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide public benefit that would outweigh the harm or loss in accordance with the NPPF, and makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area. In addition, the proposal should relate appropriately in terms of sizing, style, scale, massing, height, design and materials, whilst buildings and structures within the curtilage of the heritage asset should not compromise its setting.
- 6.14 DMHB 16 of the HLP Part 2 requires all housing developments to have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment and sets out internal space standards that are to be met (table 5.1).

- 6.15 DMHB 17 of the HLP Part 2 (Residential Density) require new development to take account of a residential density matrix and meet habitable room standards.
- 6.16 DMHB 18 of the HLP Part 2 (Private outdoor amenity space requires a 4-bed dwelling to have a minimum outdoor amenity space of 100 m².

Analysis

- 6.17 The application site forms part of the garden curtilage of the Grade II listed Little Manor House. The emphasis of the planning policy detailed above is that the development should not lead to harm to the heritage asset, notably in this case through compromising its setting, unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide public benefit that would outweigh the harm or loss in accordance with para 196 of the NPPF.
- 6.18 The immediate setting of the Little Manor House is made up of the garden plot which surrounds it, and from here the asset can be most readily appreciated and understood. The garden includes the application site and, therefore, the site is part of the immediate setting of the asset. However, it is not considered that the immediate setting and the site allows for any understanding of the asset as a former rural building, as the layout of the plot is clearly that of a residential garden, and also due to the surrounding residential development, which has grown up around the asset in the twentieth century.
- 6.19 Furthermore, the historic mapping establishes that the boundaries of the garden of this property have changed substantially in the last 200 years. The 1864 OS map shows the site as being physically separate from the Little Manor House and it is marked as covered in trees. On the 1913 OS map, a small part of the site is within the garden plot of the building, with the other larger part of the site forming a part of a field to the south-east of the asset. It is only when the development has taken place along Arlington Drive in the 1950s but first shown on the OS map in 1961 that the boundaries of the current plot of Little Manor House are seen.
- 6.20 Whilst the garden remains as a small patch of land to the rear of the building, the contribution that this makes to the overall significance of the listed building is therefore limited, with values derived from the built fabric of the asset making a much greater contribution.
- 6.21 The wider setting of the asset is made up of those buildings in proximity to the listed building, which are largely 1930s-1950s in date. These have removed the agricultural understanding of the building and it is considered that no appreciation of this remains

and therefore there is limited understanding of the asset within its historical agricultural setting.

- 6.22 The proposals are for a house which will clearly be subservient to Little Manor House. The height of the building, in addition to the overall scale, will ensure that it does not draw attention from the listed building. The proposed dwelling will be oriented towards the road, unlike Little Manor House, and so will have a clear visual separation from the listed building, tying in with neighbouring properties in the street scene. The proposals have been designed to blend into the street scene and to avoid standing out and detracting from Little Manor House.
- 6.23 In summary, the proposed development will remove a part of the current garden of the Little Manor House, and this will have some degree of impact on the asset's significance. However, as noted above, this area of land was not historically part of the immediate setting of the asset, with the boundaries of the grounds of Little Manor House having changed substantially in the last 200 years so that the setting of the building within its historic, former rural context, has already been lost.
- 6.24 The site does, however, contribute to the aesthetics of the listed building and provides spatial separation between the heritage asset and the surrounding built development. The proposed development has been designed to retain this separation through being located as far to the south-west of the listed building as possible whilst retaining a substantial rear garden to the listed building.
- 6.25 It is therefore considered that the proposed development will result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the building, with this harm being minor. The significance of the asset is principally derived from its architectural and historic special interest, embodied within its built fabric, and as such the impact on the overall significance of the asset through removing this part of the garden will be limited.
- 6.26 In terms of the design of the proposed dwelling itself, this draws on the character of Little Manor House and the surrounding development. The front elevation has a part hipped, part gabled roof to fit in with the street scene. The use of a main front gable is characteristic of properties on Arlington Drive, in particular it is evident within the row of houses immediately to the south-west of the appeal site. However, whereas with these properties the ridge height increases beyond the front gable, with the proposed dwelling this front gable forms the ridge height with a lower hipped roof projecting from this gable towards Little Manor House.
- 6.27 This design limits the height of the proposed dwelling to ensure that it remains subservient to Little Manor House whilst exhibiting design characteristics that are

consistent with the architectural form of properties fronting Arlington Drive. The street scene submitted with the application identifies how the height of the proposed dwelling facilitates a link in building heights between Little Manor House and 8 Arlington Drive.

- 6.28 In addition, the dwelling is sited so that it is in broad alignment with the consistent building line of dwellings along the southern side of Arlington Drive whilst the plot width is consistent with those adjacent dwellings so that it sits comfortably within the streetscene. The proposed dwelling conforms with the qualitative space standards prescribed in the London Plan 2021 and is designed to accord with Building Regulations requirement Part M4(2).
- 6.29 The dwelling is proposed to be constructed in a multi brindle brick with rustic brown plain clay tiles. This will be supported by the proposed use of high quality materials including zinc clad dormer windows, grey framed aluminium windows. This will allow the dwelling to assimilate with the immediate surroundings, particularly the built form fronting Arlington Drive, but without replicating the vernacular. This will help demonstrate that the new dwelling is unique and reflects a 21st-century design.
- 6.30 The proposed dwelling has a substantial rear curtilage, which has a width of 18 metres and a maximum depth of 36 metres. Whilst this garden area is slightly shorter than the adjacent properties on Arlington Drive, it is not untypical of the size of rear gardens in the neighbourhood. Significantly, it also allows for the retention of a substantial curtilage to Little Manor House. The rear garden has been curved in its alignment to ensure that the curtilage to Little Manor House retains a strong spatial relationship with the heritage asset.
- 6.31 The proposed dwelling will therefore be of a high quality design that will enhance local context and the quality of the built environment by delivering a building that responds positively to local character and distinctiveness in terms of its layout, plot size, orientation, scale, architectural composition and detailing whilst paying due regard to the existing street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Residential Amenity

Policy Context

- 6.32 Policy D3 of the LP 2021 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) states that the design and development should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context.

- 6.33 DMHB 11 of the HLP Part 2 (Design of new development) requires that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties.

Analysis

- 6.34 Little Manor House has rooms to habitable rooms that face south-west towards the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwelling is set back 18 metres from this house and does not have any windows to habitable rooms facing towards Little Manor House above the ground floor. This distance is also sufficient to ensure that the outlook from Little Manor House is not harmed and there is no material loss of sunlight and daylight to habitable rooms. The proposed development will not therefore adversely impact upon the amenity or daylight and sunlight of Little Manor House.
- 6.35 The proposed dwelling lies adjacent to 8 Arlington Drive. There are no windows to habitable rooms on the flank elevation of this property. The proposed dwelling is positioned so that it is recessed slightly from the front elevation and does not project significantly beyond the rear elevation of this adjacent property. As such, the proposed dwelling will not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of 8 Arlington Drive.

Highways

Policy Context

- 6.36 Policy T6.1 of the LP 2021 (Residential parking) sets out maximum parking standards as referred to in Table 10.3. This table requires a maximum of 1.5 parking spaces to be provided for dwellings with 3+ beds in outer London with a PTAL rating of 0-1, although boroughs can consider standards that allow for higher levels of provision where this would support additional family housing.

DMT 1 of the HLP Part 2 (Managing Transport Impacts) requires development proposals to be accessible by public transport, walking and cycling to nearby services and facilities. The development should provide equal access for all people with adequate delivery, servicing and drop-off arrangements.

DMT 2 of the HLP Part 2 (Highways Impacts) requires development to provide safe and efficient vehicle access to the highway network

DMT 5 of the HLP Part 2 (Pedestrians and Cyclists) requires development proposals to ensure that safe, direct and inclusive access for pedestrians and cyclists is provided on the site connecting it to the wider network.

DMT 6 of the HLP Part 2 (Vehicle Parking) states that development proposals must comply with the parking standards set out in Appendix C Table 1. This table requires a 3 bed dwelling with a curtilage to be provided with 2 spaces.

Analysis

- 6.37 The development is served by public transport along Bury Street just to the east of Arlington Drive via the H13 service. There are bus stops in both directions along Bury Street within 200m of the site, so that the site is well served by public transport. In addition, this bus service links to Ruislip underground station therefore providing convenient access into central London and Uxbridge.
- 6.38 The proposed development makes provision for two car parking spaces within the site that meet the minimum dimensions of a standard car parking bay of 2.4m x 4.8m, with sufficient space to turn the vehicle within the site so that it is possible to enter and exit the site in a forward gear. The proposed development therefore complies with the relevant parking standards. There are no waiting restrictions on Arlington Drive, with on-street parking available in between residential drives, so that the site has adequate servicing arrangement.

Bio-diversity

Policy Context

- 6.39 Policy G6 of the LP 2021 (Biodiversity and access to nature) requires that development proposals should manage impacts upon biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain.
- 6.40 Policy DMH 6 of the HLP Part 2 (Garden and backland development) states that there is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable where the neighbouring residential amenity is maintained, vehicular access does not have an adverse impact on neighbours and features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat are retained or re-provided.

Analysis

- 6.41 The development will result in the loss of amenity grassland and a single tree will be lost in order to provide the access into the site. However, amenity grassland is of relatively low bio-diversity value whilst the tree to be lost is a conifer tree and so not a native species. In addition, there are a number of conifer trees along this boundary, so that the collective impact of these trees along the streetscene will be retained. The proposed development includes a green roof and the applicant intends to introduce a planting scheme, provide hedgehog friendly fencing and introduce bird and bat boxes within the rear curtilage where feasible.

Planning History

- 6.42 The planning history of the site detailed in Section 3 identifies that planning permission and listed building consent have previously been refused for two groups of planning applications proposing the subdivision of this curtilage to allow for a residential development. This has concerned a proposed backland development for a detached dwelling with the other circumstances proposing the development of a pair of semi-detached dwellings fronting Arlington Drive, for which a planning appeal was dismissed.
- 6.43 The proposed development is significantly different from the previous planning applications. Notably, two of the previous planning applications proposed the erection of a pair of dwellings fronting Arlington Drive, and this concerned a much larger structure that took up a much larger part of the garden of Little Manor House whilst the third application proposed a dwelling within the very rear section of the garden to Little Manor House that required an extensive access drive adjacent to 8 Arlington Drive.
- 6.44 The backland development is a very different circumstance to the proposed development with the applications for the erection of a pair of dwellings fronting Arlington Drive more relevant to this application. It is considered worthwhile assessing the inspectors appeal decision letter and the reasons why the appeals were dismissed.
- 6.45 Firstly, the Inspector felt that the insertion of two houses would significantly reduce the openness of the appeal site and the area around Little Manor House, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area.
- 6.46 Secondly, the Inspector considered that the removal of a number of trees along the street frontage of the site in order to create two access points would detract from the opening green character and appearance of the area.
- 6.47 Thirdly, the Inspector considered that the development would result in a loss of sunlight, daylight and outlook from the rooms to the garden of Little Manor House with the large build structure forming an overly dominant element in views from Little Manor House thereby harming the living conditions of the occupiers of Little Manor House.
- 6.48 Fourthly, the Inspector concluded that infilling a significant part of the garden would diminish the open setting and the ability to appreciate the historic rural origins and function of the building. The Inspector stated that the large garden area survives as a

relic of its former open, rural setting in a farmyard with farmlands beyond so that the proposed developments would not preserve the special interest of the building, which would harm its significance. In addition, one of the appeals would result in the loss of a surviving well within the site, which would also harm its significance.

6.49 Even though one of the appeal developments provided for a greater area of open space to the curtilage of Little Manor House, this was considered to be an awkwardly shaped space left over to the rear of the site with no particularly strong spatial visual relationship with listed building.

6.50 The Inspector concluded that the proposed appeal proposals would amount to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. In weighing up this harm against the public benefits of the proposal, the Inspector acknowledged the contribution to the supply of housing to be made by the appeal but considered this to be very minor and was not sufficient to overcome the harm to the special interest and significance of the designated heritage asset.

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 Policy DMH 6 of the HLP Part 2 states that there is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable where the neighbouring residential amenity is maintained, vehicular access does not have an adverse impact on neighbours and features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat are retained or re-provided.

7.2 It is considered that the proposed development fully accords with this policy. In particular, the proposed development allows for the erection of a dwelling fronting onto Arlington Drive that will sit comfortably within the street scene and maintain local character, whilst retaining adequate amenity space to the host dwelling and maintaining biodiversity. The development will not cause harm to the residential amenity through loss of sunlight and daylight or by overlooking or loss of outlook, the access will not have any adverse impact on neighbours and will predominantly allow for the retention of existing trees whilst also introducing bio-diversity enhancements.

7.3 In terms of the impact of the setting of the heritage asset, the Heritage Report that has been prepared by the RPS Group has provided a high level of detail on the historic context of the site through historic mapping and this demonstrates that in 1864 the site was historically covered in trees and physically separate from the Little Manor

House and it is only once development has taken place along Arlington Drive in the 1950s that the boundaries of the current plot to Little Manor House are seen.

- 7.4 Furthermore, the wider setting of the asset is made up of those buildings in proximity to the listed building, which are largely 1930's-1950's in date. These have removed the agricultural understanding of the building so that little appreciation of this remains and therefore there is limited understanding of the asset within its historical agricultural setting. Whilst the garden remains as a small patch of land to the rear of the building, the contribution that this makes to the overall significance of the listed building is limited, with values devised from the build fabric of the asset making a much greater contribution.
- 7.5 However, it is accepted that the proposed development will remove a part of the current garden of Little Manor house, and that this will have some degree of impact on the significance on the heritage asset. The proposed development has been carefully considered to ensure that this impact is minimised. In particular, a large area of garden for Little Manor House will be retained that is significantly more extensive than proposed with previous applications, with the curved shape of the plot retaining a much greater connection between Little Manor House and the proposed remaining garden than in previous schemes. This will also allow for the retention of the Well located within the curtilage.
- 7.6 The proposals are for a house which will clearly be subservient to Little Manor House. The height of the building, in addition to the overall scale, will ensure that it does not draw attention from the listed building. The proposed dwelling will be oriented towards the road, unlike Little Manor House, and so will have a clear visual separation from the listed building, tying in with neighbouring properties in the street scene. The proposals have been designed to blend into the street scene and to avoid standing out and detracting from Little Manor House.
- 7.7 The Heritage assessment concludes that the proposed development will result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the building, with this harm being minor. Para 196 of the NPPF states that where development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage assets, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The main public benefit of the proposal is considered to be the provision of an additional housing unit created by the development.
- 7.8 In determining the previous applications for this site, the Inspector considered that the contribution to the supply of housing to be made by the appeal elements would be a very minor one, to which limited weight was accorded. However, since that

appeal, it is considered that there has been a material change in planning circumstances that accentuates the significance of the delivery of housing from small sites such as the appeal site.

- 7.9 Specifically, a main objective of the recently adopted London Plan 2021 is to significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meeting London's housing needs. This is a distinct change in focus within the strategic plan for London with the Plan providing minimum targets that boroughs are to meet for net housing completions on small sites. The figure for LB Hillingdon is set at 2,950 dwellings from 2019/20 – 2028/29, which is a considerable target against which each individual dwelling will make an important contribution. The delivery of a dwelling from this development, will therefore make a relevant contribution towards achieving this target.
- 7.10 As well as the contribution that small sites will make to meeting London's housing needs this development will also support small housebuilders and those wishing to bring forward custom and self-build housing. This is an important consideration following the COVID-19 pandemic and the economic harm that this has inflicted on the economy. As the country emerges from the restrictions imposed by the Pandemic, small construction projects such as this development will play an important role in generating new employment opportunities.
- 7.11 Together, these public benefits are considered to outweigh the limited harm to the heritage asset generated by the development, thereby satisfying para 196 of the NPPF and policy DMHB 1 of the HLP Part 2. As such, the proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the development plan. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) states that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. There are not considered to be any material considerations to suggest this planning application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan and it is therefore considered that planning permission should be granted.