

DELEGATED LISTED BUILDING 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 Option

- 1. No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received
- 2. Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds
- 3. There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action
- 4. There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings
- 5. The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

- 6. Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards
- 7. No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received
- 8. Application has not been supported independently by a person/s
- 9. The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

- 10. Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha
- 11. Householder application in the Green Belt

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
- 13. Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use
- 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.

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

- 15. Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)
- 16. Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)
- 17. Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

- 18. ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)
- 19. PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION
- 20. OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS
- 21. CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION
- 22. CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION
- 23. APPROVAL OF DETAILS
- 24. ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval
- 25. WORKS TO TREES
- 26. OTHER (please specify)

The delegation powers schedule has been checked. Director of Residents Services can determine this application.

Case Officer

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informatives 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 DATES SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS TO THE ODPM

Item No. **Report of the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration**

Address LAND FORMING PART OF 2 ARLINGTON DRIVE RUISLIP

Development: Erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping (Application for Listed Building Consent)

LBH Ref Nos: **74323/APP/2021/2511**

Drawing Nos: Built Heritage Statement April 2021 (Ref: JCH01350 v1.)
 PL006 (Arlington Drive Street Scene)
 Design and Access Statement
 PL003
 PL001
 PL002
 PL004
 PL005
 PL006 (Proposed Rear and Right Elevations)
 Planning Statement dated June 2021
 Covering letter dated 23rd March 2021

Date Plans Received: 23/06/2021 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 23/06/2021

1. **CONSIDERATIONS**

1.1 **Site and Locality**

The application site comprises the rear garden of the Grade II Listed Building at No.2 Arlington Drive (known as Little Manor House). The site is located on the southern side of Arlington Drive and is bordered to the west by No. 8 Arlington Drive. The rear gardens of Nos. 145-161 Bury Street run along the eastern site boundary, whilst 58 and 60 Marlborough Avenue are located at the rear of the site. Nos. 7A-17 Arlington Drive are located on the opposite side of the application site. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1b (very poor) and lies within a Critical Drainage Area.

1.2 **Proposed Scheme**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping. The proposal includes the installation of a new vehicular crossover on Arlington Drive.

It is noted that the Design and Access Statement states that the existing access would be blocked up and a new access point created (refer to pages 5 and 6). However, this conflicts with the submitted drawings showing a new crossover would be installed to the front of the existing access gate along the boundary fronting Arlington Drive. For the avoidance of doubt, the following assessment is based on the submitted drawings.

A full application is being dealt with under application ref: 74323/APP/2021/2509.

1.3 **Relevant Planning History**

409/APP/2009/1010 12 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 5 rooflights, first floor rear extension with habitable roofspace and alterations to roof at side.

Decision Date: 15-07-2009 Approved

409/B/86/0269 12 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Householder development - residential extension(P)

Decision Date: 22-04-1986 Approved

71084/APP/2017/2246 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular crossovers and site landscaping

Decision Date: 25-08-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/2247 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular crossovers and site landscaping (Listed Building Consent)

Decision Date: 25-08-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/3603 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping.

Decision Date: 12-12-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/3604 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular access and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping (Application for Listed Building Consent).

Decision Date: 12-12-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/785 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive), with detached double garages, access driveway and new vehicular crossover and site landscaping

Decision Date: 28-04-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2017/786 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive), with detached double garages, access driveway and new vehicular crossover and site landscaping (Listed Building Consent)

Decision Date: 28-04-2017 Refused

71084/APP/2019/2289 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of a 4-bed detached 2-storey dwelling with associated parking and landscaping (Application for Listed Building Consent)

Decision Date: 02-09-2019 Refused

71084/APP/2019/2301 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of a detached 2-storey x 4-bed dwelling with associated parking and landscaping

Decision Date: 02-09-2019 Refused

74323/APP/2021/2509 Land Forming Part Of 2 Arlington Drive Ruislip

Erection of a detached dwelling with associated access, parking and landscaping

Decision Date:

Comment on Planning History

Several planning and listed building consent applications for the erection of dwellings within the curtilage of the application site have been submitted to the Council. All these applications have been refused and those that have been appealed have been dismissed by the Secretary of State.

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent was refused by the Council on 2nd September 2019 for the erection of a detached two-storey x 4-bed dwelling with associated parking and landscaping under application refs: 71084/APP/2019/2301 & 71084/APP/2019/2289. The grounds for refusal are as follows:

1) The proposed development, by reason of its siting in a rear garden, would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use involving the loss of existing private rear garden area is unacceptable in principle and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policy H12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMH 6 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (March 2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019).

2) The proposed dwelling, by reason of its location, design, layout and loss of the existing open garden aspect of the site, would have an unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Little Manor House, contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE8, BE9, BE10 and BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMHB 1, DMHB 2 and DMHB 11 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF (February 2019).

3) In the absence of a tree report to BS5837:2012, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the trees will be unaffected by the development and has not made provision for their long term protection. As such, the proposal would be to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE19 and BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMHB 11 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019), Policies 3.5 and 5.10 of the London Plan (March 2016) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4) The proposed development, by virtue of the close proximity of the proposed driveway to the existing properties at, Little Manor House and 8 Arlington Drive,= would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupants of these properties, by reason of the noise and disturbance resulting from the use of this driveway and its visual impact. As such the proposal would fail to comply with Policies H12, BE13, BE19, BE21 and OE1 of the of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy DMH 6 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with

Modifications (March 2019) Policy and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

5) The proposal would be backland garden development which would fail to establish an active frontage with natural surveillance. By virtue of a 50 metre long access road, the entrance to the property would not be visible from the street scene. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policy DMHB 15 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent was refused by the Council on 12th December 2017 for the erection of two new semi-detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) and two new vehicular accesses and crossovers, part demolition of front boundary wall and site landscaping under application refs: 71084/APP/2017/3603 & 71084/APP/2017/3604. The grounds for refusal are as follows:

1) The proposed development, by reason of its siting (in a rear garden), design, layout, and site coverage, would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site to the level proposed, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the residential area as a whole. The proposal is, thus, detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE19 and H12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the NPPF (March 2012).

2) The proposed development, by reason of the location, design and layout of the dwellings, the loss of historic features and the loss of the existing open garden aspect of the site, would have an unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Little Manor House, contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE8, BE9, BE10 and BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF.

3) The proposed development, by reason of the proximity of the boundary wall and the flank elevation of the proposed 4 Arlington Drive to the existing dwelling (2 Arlington Drive), would result in the provision of inadequate levels of daylight/sunlight and poor/no outlook to existing habitable rooms, therefore giving rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers of 2 Arlington Drive. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4) The proposed development would result in the loss of a number of existing trees within the site and side boundary with 8 Arlington Drive, and fails to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental impact on existing landscaping and tree planting within the site. The proposal would thus be to the detriment of the visual

amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent was refused by the Council for the erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with two new vehicular crossovers and site landscaping under application ref: 71084/APP/2017/2246 & 71084/APP/2017/2247. The grounds for refusal are similar to those cited for application refs: 71084/APP/2017/3603 & 71084/APP/2017/3604, excluding reason number 4.

A Joint Appeal was lodged against the refusal of applications ref:71084/APP/2017/3603 & 71084/APP/2017/3604 and 71084/APP/2017/2246 & 71084/APP/2017/2247. The Appeals were subsequently dismissed by the Secretary of State on 12th October 2018 (refs: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615 and APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617).

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent was refused by the Council for the erection of two new detached two-storey houses (4 and 6 Arlington Drive) with detached double garages, access driveway and new vehicular crossover and site landscaping under application refs: 71084/APP/2017/785 & 71084/APP/2017/786. The grounds for refusal are as follows:

1)The proposed development, by reason of its siting (in a rear garden), design, layout, and site coverage, would result in a cramped development of the site, which is visually incongruous (given the setting) and would fail to harmonise with the existing local and historic context of the surrounding area. The principle of intensifying the residential use of the site to the level proposed, as well as the proposed loss of existing private rear garden area would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the residential area as a whole. The proposal is, thus, detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE19 and H12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), guidance within The London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016) and the NPPF (March 2012).

2) The proposed dwellings, by reason of their location, design, layout and loss of the existing open garden aspect of the site, would have an unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Little Manor House, contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE8, BE9, BE10 and BE13 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and the NPPF.

3) The proposed 1.8m high brick boundary wall sub-dividing the site, by reason of its siting in proximity to the existing dwelling (2 Arlington Drive), would result in the provision of inadequate levels of daylight/sunlight and poor/no outlook to existing habitable rooms, therefore giving rise to a substandard form of living accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers of 2 Arlington Drive. The proposal is thus contrary to Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance - Housing (March 2016) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

4) The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing street tree to facilitate the proposed driveway and fails to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental impact on existing landscaping and tree planting within the site. The proposal would thus be to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

EXTERNAL CONSULTATION:

16 neighbouring properties were consulted on 12th July 2021. A site notice was displayed on a nearby lamp post on 23rd July 2021, and a press notice was published on 21st July 2021. The consultation period expired on 13th August 2021. Eight objections were received from separate addresses and their comments are summarised as follows:

- Out of keeping with the local area
- Incongruous to the street scene
- The garden is an important part of the Little Manor House (a Grade II Listed Building)
- The applicant is allowing Little Manor House to deteriorate
- Erecting a building so close to a Grade II Listed Building will adversely impact it
- Conflicts with the requirement to conserve and enhance the Grade II listed building at 2 Arlington Drive
- Unclear whether the proposal would result in the loss of trees
- The development would require the removal of established trees
- Concerns about flooding
- Parking implications on Arlington Drive
- An example of unwelcomed tandem development in a backland residential area
- Potential disturbance and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties
- If approved, the development could set a precedent for future developments adjacent to historic assets
- Archaeological surveys should be undertaken given the historic nature of the site
- The contribution to the supply of housing would not outweigh harm to the historic site
- Noise and disturbance during the construction period

A ward Councillor has submitted the following comments: "I would like to register my concerns about this application, which as it stands, would result in overdevelopment in a site context and unacceptable loss of neighbouring residential amenity."

Eastcote Conservation Panel and Eastcote Residents' Association: "The proposed dwelling is within the curtilage of a Grade II Listed Building. There have been many applications for development on this land. All refused. The most concerning matter is the fact that many trees have been cut down before the current application was made. It must be noted that this was carried out to overcome one of the objections of the Planning Inspectorate, who stated that these trees were a very important part of the listed site and of the street scene. The application does not have a tree survey, which should be called for to protect the remaining trees on the site. An Ecology Survey should also be sought as

the Listed Building, Little Manor Farm House is of an age to be conducive to bat roosts as are some of the older trees. It is noted that there is a well situated within the garden of the farmhouse, this means there must be an underground water supply. This area sits within a Critical Drainage Area, therefore steps to include a SUDS to cope with surface water is needed. In conclusion, the proposal will be detrimental to the siting of the Farmhouse and to the street scene. The lack of reports for the trees and ecology also acknowledgement of the possibility of surface water flooding with a suitable remedy should be sought."

Ruislip Village Conservation Panel has raised an objection to the planning application and they have provided the following comments.

"Scale: The plans provided do not show a scale. There are no measurements of the height of Little Manor Farm and the proposed building. The plans give the impression that the length of the site along Arlington Drive is longer than in reality. To judge the difference in height between the properties further information would be required on this point.

Boundary Wall: The existing northwest boundary wall provides an interesting break in the street scene. The latest proposals are inconsistent regarding the proposed access. In some places it is implied that the current gate will be moved to a new position and the current (historical) wall made good. Whereas the Footprint Layout indicates the access is at the location of existing entrance. If this application were to be approved, it would be preferable not to move the access location along this wall.

Trees: It has been previously acknowledged that there are trees on the site visible from the public realm that contribute to the character and appearance of the area. There are also young trees in the grass verge in front of the application site. A major concern is that the plans confirm that trees along the boundary with 8 Arlington Drive have already been removed since the last application was refused in direct conflict with point 11 of the Appeal Report dated 12/10/18 that stated: "The Appeal A development would entail the removal of a number of trees on the street frontage of the site and its boundary with No. 8. The affected trees are largely conifers, with some self-sown native species. While not in themselves meriting individual protection, as a group they make a positive contribution to the open and green character and appearance of the area. Their loss and replacement with open areas of hardstanding for parking or with built form would exacerbate the harm I have identified above".

No tree survey has been submitted to quantify or qualify further tree removal. The precise location of the access drive, and the impact of removing a portion of the historic boundary wall and associated trees to be removed have not been clearly specified.

The new house will be squashed across the site that will mean that it will not be possible to re-plant trees / hedges along the side boundary with no 8 Arlington Drive. We are concerned that important landscape components have already been removed before plans were submitted, and that these proposals will further deplete important landscape components that contribute to the appearance and character of the area.

Boundary, Landscaping, Cycle & Bin Stores: The plans do not state the kind of boundary - brick wall, fence, hedge - is intended to divide the new house from Little Manor Farm, nor to give any indication of its height.

Cycle storage is mentioned in the planning proposals, but the size or location of bin stores and cycle storage are not indicated. Is there space for all this along with the parking provision? A landscape plan to include location of the bin, cycle stores and soft landscaping should be provided before a judgement of these proposals can be considered.

Other surveys: Given that Little Manor Farm is the type of building that would house bat roosts, and because of the amount of tree cover on the site that could provide bat roosts. It is surprising that no Bat Survey has been submitted. Similarly, the site is within a CDA. A drainage survey should be submitted to fully consider this application.

Conclusion: The many reasons for appeal dismissal in Appeal Report dated 12/1018 apply to these latest planning proposals, in particular point 22 :

"The Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. It also states that the extent of setting is not fixed, and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. In this case, while the suburban development around the listed building has reduced the extent of open land about it, nonetheless the large garden area survives as a relict of its former open, rural setting in a farmyard with farmlands beyond. Part of the special interest and significance also therefore resides in this garden setting"

A new house on this the site will have detrimental impact on the street scene and character of the area and will overshadow the listed building. These latest proposals would still conflict with the requirement to conserve and enhance the Grade II listed building at 2 Arlington Drive (Little Manor Farm) - a designated heritage asset, and still negatively impact the setting of the listed building and fail to conserve its significance by being sympathetic to its form and scale."

Ruislip Residents Association: No comments received.

INTERNAL CONSULTEES:

Council's Highways Officer: The application has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are satisfied that the proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any measurable highway safety concerns, in accordance with Local Plan: Part 2 Development Plan Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 & DMT 6 and Policies T4, T5 and T6 of the London Plan (2021). The Highways Officer's comments are incorporated into the main body of the report (refer to the section titled 'Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety').

The Council's Conservation Officer has objected to the planning application and has provided the following consultation response.

"Listed Building

Little Manor House is a Grade II listed, timber framed building, dating from the 16th century, however it may have earlier origins. It is highly likely the building was originally constructed as a medieval hall house with the central bay relating to such origins. The building has benefitted from few alterations over the centuries including the front elevation refaced in 18th century brickwork and addition of the northern bay in the 19th century. Overtime the building became a farmhouse, and early OS maps depict an enclosed farmyard, with structures located to the east of Little Manor House.

The building is two-storeys in height, with a central range and gabled cross-wings at the ends. The roof is finished in plain clay tiles, and tall compound chimney stacks are evident externally. The majority of windows are small paned casements however one 18th century sash window is evident. The external brick skin has been finished in a white paint which defines the external appearance of the building. Later mock Tudor timber detailing appears to have been added to the property. Internally some timber framing is exposed,

and the early wall paintings are evident on the upper floors. The original plan form of the building has been retained.

Site and Setting

Historic access to the house was originally, directly off Bury Street, however this was then moved to Old Howletts Lane to the north. Following the suburbanisation of the area, Arlington Road provided access to the building and site, resulting in the unique orientation of the property today. The front elevation faces north-east towards Bury Street with the rear elevation facing south-west onto what is the private rear garden associated to the house.

Annex 2: Glossary within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) states that 'Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence but also from its setting.' The heritage value of the Listed Building is duly recognised by its notable historic and architectural interest however, its setting and surroundings also contribute to its significance and how it is experienced. This can be influenced by a number of natural and/or human factors.

The setting of the listed building is not solely defined by its immediate visual context. Albeit somewhat hidden amongst suburbia, Little Manor House forms part of a pleasant group of traditionally constructed historic buildings, located along the central section of Bury Street. The buildings are located to the east and south-east of the site and collectively have a strong historic connection. The buildings are all Grade II listed buildings, and the group comprises of The Plough, Woodman Farm, The Berries, Bury Street Farm and Little Manor House.

The central portion of Bury Street was historically known as Silver Street Green, and the small group of timber-framed buildings were the first forms of development, within the once vast, open rural environment. Whilst the onslaught of suburban housing has somewhat diminished the visual relationship between the buildings, collectively they are relics and local landmark buildings of Ruislip's rural origins, informing and enhancing their historic interest as designated heritage assets.

As existing Little Manor House is surrounded by suburban housing, predominantly comprising of detached and semi-detached houses dating from the mid-20th century. The development of the area has eroded its former historic open rural character and negatively contributes to the setting of the building. However, the retained open rear garden associated to Little Manor House provides the much needed buffer between the historic building and surrounding suburbia.

Little Manor House forms part of the history of the area and is a good example of a traditional building of its time. The spacious, verdant nature of the site serves as a reminder of the area's rural origins and the historic use of the surrounding land and house. It positively contributes to the visual character of the area, providing a sense of openness and is an integral part of the listed building's setting.

It is not disputed that settings change overtime however historic uses contribute to the heritage asset's significance. The rear garden related to the historic function of the building and site as a farmyard as is evidence on historic OS maps. It is evident that the rear garden clearly relates to the function of the listed building as a residential dwelling, therefore forming part of its setting.

As existing, there appear to be a number of ancillary detached structures/buildings within

the curtilage of the listed building. To the south-east there is a garage and shed-like structure. Recently a new structure appears to have been erected to the west of the main house. According to our records permission for such structure, within the curtilage of the listed building, has not been given. It is recommended this matter is sent to the Planning Enforcement team to investigate.

To the west of the main house, a well exists on site. The well and above ground structure appears to be still extant and relates to the historic function of the land as a farmyard contributing to building's significance. The well is considered to be curtilage listed.

The historic brick wall which defines the boundary of the site along Arlington Road is also considered to be curtilage listed as part of Little Manor House.

Contrary to the conclusion made by the Heritage Consultant, the setting of the listed building is made up of its spacious, open and verdant garden environs, curtilage listed structures and its historic relationship with nearby listed buildings, contributing to its significance.

The site has been subject to a number of previous applications and appeals (Appeal Decisions ref: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615, APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617)

Assessment - Impact and harm

The proposed development would erect a new dwelling within the curtilage of the Grade II listed building. The nature of the proposal would fundamentally be a garden grabbing development, which would unacceptably harm the setting and significance of the listed building.

The land in question positively contributes to the setting of the site and the relates to the functionality of the residential dwelling as existing and historically. It would uncharacteristically subdivide the historic curtilage of the site, permanently severing its relationship with the listed building. The historic relationship between the land and listed building was also duly highlighted under paragraph 26, by the Appeal's Inspector within the Appeal Decisions.

Suburban housing would essentially encroach closer to Little Manor House, exacerbating the harm already caused by the surrounding 20th century housing development. The cumulative impact of incremental changes to the heritage asset's setting would need to be considered, as per paragraph 28 with Historic England's Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning:2, Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (GPA 2, July 2015).

The development would significantly diminish the site's existing sense of openness, harming the visual character of the area and historic interest of the listed building and site. As noted under point 4.8. the existing garden area is an essential buffer, allowing the historic building to be truly appreciated and a historic landmark building.

The inevitable prominence of the proposed two-storey dwelling would be dominant in comparison to the listed building, particularly in terms of the width of the dwelling.

Due to the orientation of Little Manor House, the rear elevation would face onto the side elevation of the proposed dwelling. This would create an odd relationship between the two built forms, and an enclosing impact on the listed building, particularly within the remaining

garden area.

The upper floor windows along the east elevation of the proposed property would directly overlook the rear garden associated to the listed building and rear elevation. There would be significant concerns in terms of the lack of distance between the proposed dwelling and rear elevation of the existing listed building. - please see paragraph 5.38 within Hillingdon's Local Plan: Part 2 (HLPP2, January 2020).

The development would have no relationship with the original building, ignoring the fact that the land in question is located within the existing curtilage of the listed building.

The proposal aims to retain a reasonable garden area for the original building. However, there is no guarantee that the site boundaries/plot areas as defined would remain in the future.

Design of proposed development:

The form of the proposed building would loosely relate to the surrounding 20th century housing. However, the overall design and materiality would fail to remain in keeping. The box dormer would be considered a poor design element, which diminishes the principle of the low-rise roof form.

The proposed buff/white brickwork, grey roof tiles and grey windows would not be considered in keeping. No other building along Arlington Road is constructed in a white/buff brick, predominantly natural brick with red/brown tones are evident. The proposed building would have a stark and incongruous contrasting appearance along the street scene.

Boundary treatment:

The proposed boundary treatment, close boarded fence, between Little Manor House and the development site would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the heritage asset's setting and surroundings. The fence would be located in close proximity to the listed building, further suburbanising its immediate context.

The submitted information appears to propose no works to the curtilage listed wall. In any instance, any works to the wall, including alterations, new opening and/or new gates would require Listed Building Consent. If this application is to be approved, prior to the commencement of any development, a condition and structural survey of the wall would need to be carried out, alongside detailed methodology as to how the wall shall be safeguarded during works.

Archaeology:

Remnants of the historic farmyard may be evident below ground, and therefore development of the wider site may have archaeological implications. It is important such features are appropriately recorded, and where possible preserved as it provides evidence of past human activity associated to this site and the listed building, contributing to its significance. Archaeological investigations may be required and/or a watching brief is advised if this application is to be approved.

Harm:

The proposed development would be considered detrimentally harmful to the setting and

significance of the Listed Building and character and appearance of the wider street scene.

In isolation the development would result in less than substantial harm. However, as per comments under point 5.3. and paragraph 28 within Historic England's GPA 2 (July 2015) the cumulative impact of development on the setting of the listed building would also be relevant in this case.

The development would exacerbate the harm already caused by the existing 20th century housing. It would erase the spaciousness of the site and sever the historic curtilage of the listed building, harming its setting and significance.

The proposal would be of no heritage benefit and I am not convinced that the public benefits (if any) would outweigh the harm caused. There is no evidence to suggest that such housing provision must be accommodated on this site or in this specific location. A less sensitive site within the borough could achieve the same provision, without causing any harm to the historic built environment, and this could be evidenced by the use of a sequential test.

In determining this application duties under sections 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 would need to be applied by the decision maker. From a historic environment perspective, the development would fail to adequately preserve the setting of the listed buildings.

Conclusion: Objection - Harm to the setting of the listed building."

Planning Officer Response: This application will only assess the impact on the listed building and its setting. Please refer to Officer Report for application ref: 74323/APP/2021/2509 in respect to the other planning considerations.

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 2 Listed Buildings

LPP HC1 (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

NPPF16 NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issue relates to the impact the proposed dwellings would have on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed at No. 2 Arlington Drive (known as Little Manor House).

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF (2021) states that 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). Paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021) states that were a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

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.

Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning permission will not be granted for proposals which are considered detrimental to the setting of a Listed Building. This is reinforced by Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) which states that the Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment, and that planning permission will not be granted for proposals which are considered detrimental to the setting of a Listed Building.

As noted by the Conservation Officer, Little Manor House is a Grade II listed, timber framed building, dating from the 16th century, however it may have earlier origins. It is highly likely the building was originally constructed as a medieval hall house with the central bay relating to such origins. The building has benefitted from few alterations over the centuries including the front elevation refaced in 18th century brickwork and addition of the northern bay in the 19th century. Overtime the building became a farmhouse, and early OS maps depict an enclosed farmyard, with structures located to the east of Little Manor House.

The Conservation Officer has commented that the spacious, verdant nature of the site serves as a reminder of the area's rural origins and the historic use of the surrounding land and house. It positively contributes to the visual character of the area, providing a sense of openness and is an integral part of the listed building's setting. It is not disputed that settings change overtime, however, historic uses contribute to the heritage asset's significance. The rear garden related to the historic function of the building and site as a farmyard as is evidence on historic OS maps. It is evident that the rear garden clearly relates to the function of the listed building as a residential dwelling, therefore forming part of its setting.

The Conservation Officer's stance about the rear garden forming part of the setting of the Listed Building is shared by the Inspector in the dismissed Appeal Decision dated 12th October 2018. As highlighted by the following extracts.

"22. The Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. It also states that the extent of setting is not fixed, and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. In this case, while the suburban development around the listed building has reduced the extent of open land about it, nonetheless the large garden area survives as a relict of its former open, rural setting in a farmyard with farmlands beyond. Part of the special interest and significance also therefore resides in this garden setting.

23. The appeal proposals would, by infilling a significant part of the garden, diminish this open setting and harm the ability to appreciate the historic rural origins and function of the building. They would thereby fail to preserve the special interest of the building and would harm its significance." (Appeal refs: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615 and APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617)

Whilst the number of dwellings being proposed has been reduced since the dismissed Appeal Decision, it is considered that the current proposal has not overcome the issues raised by the Inspector in respect to the erosion of the open setting of the site and harm to the special interest and significance of the listed building at No.2 Arlington Drive. The land in question positively contributes to the setting of the site and the relates to the functionality of the residential dwelling as existing and historically. The Conservation Officer has commented that the current proposal would uncharacteristically subdivide the historic curtilage of the site, permanently severing its relationship with the listed building. The historic relationship between the land and listed building was also duly highlighted under paragraph 26 of the dismissed Appeal Decision. The Inspector states that:

"26. At the time of my visit the appeal site had been divided from the area around of No. 2 by a temporary fence of plastic netting, but there was no evidence that it had previously been separated from it. In any event, national Planning Practice Guidance is clear that as setting is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced, it may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage. It may also include land which has a historic relationship with the listed building, which is so in this case. Therefore, the harm caused to the special interest and significance of the listed building by virtue of the harm to its setting cannot be set aside due to the status of the appeal site as a separately owned unit." (Appeal refs: APP/R5510/W/18/3198386, APP/R5510/Y/18/3198389, APP/R5510/W/18/3196615 and APP/R5510/Y/18/3196617)

Although the submitted drawings show that no works are proposed to the curtilage listed wall, the Council's Highways Officer has commented that sections of the wall would need to be demolished in order to achieve satisfactory visibility splays. The proposal would therefore result in the loss of historic fabric to detriment of the significance of the listed building.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would cause harm to the special interest and significance of the Grade II Listed Building at No.2 Arlington Drive and its setting. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2021).

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the location, design and layout of the proposed dwelling, the loss of sections of the historic boundary wall and the loss of the existing open garden aspect of the site, would have an unacceptable impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II Listed Building at number 2 Arlington Drive (known as Little Manor House), thus causing harm to its special interest and significance. The proposal would therefore conflict with the Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1 and DMHB 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two- Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (March 2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021).

INFORMATIVES

- 1** The decision to REFUSE Listed Building Consent 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 Listed Building Consent 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 2 Listed Buildings

LPP HC (2021) Heritage conservation and growth

NPPF16 NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

Contact Officer: Nesha Burnham

Telephone No: 01895 250230