

# 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



### 1.3 Relevant Planning History

78143/APP/2024/2129

49 ASPEN GROVE EASTCOTE

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 3 front roof lights. Erection of a single storey rear extension. (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

**Decision:** 09-09-2024

Approved

78143/APP/2023/3398

49 ASPEN GROVE EASTCOTE

Erection of single storey extension to side and rear, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, and 2 front roof lights.

**Decision:** 16-01-2024

Refused

78143/APP/2023/2061

49 ASPEN GROVE EASTCOTE

Erection of a double storey extension to the side and rear of the dwelling with amendments to fenestration.

**Decision:** 04-09-2023

Refused

78143/APP/2023/2038

49 ASPEN GROVE EASTCOTE

Erection of a single storey rear extension. Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 front dormers (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)

**Decision:** 13-09-2023

Refused

#### Comment on Planning History

There has been several applications submitted for extensions to the side and rear of property in recent years. The most recent applications in 2023 78143/APP/2023/2061 Erection of a double storey extension to the side and rear of the dwelling with amendments to fenestration. Refused for the following reasons:

##### 1. Character and appearance

The proposed development, by reason of its scale, height, width, depth, roof form and design, would result in an excessive, bulky, incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive form of development that would substantially harm the form, proportion and appearance of the existing dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) , Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

##### 2. Parking and highway safety

The proposed development fails to demonstrate that the site could safely accommodate an adequate level of off-street car parking provision to comply with the adopted car parking standards set out in Appendix C Table 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). The proposed development would result in an increase in parking pressure on local streets, which would cause inconsiderate and illegal parking to the detriment of the safety and

convenience of existing residents and roads users. The proposal would therefore cause harm to highway safety, contrary to Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

A follow up application 78143/APP/2023/3398 for the Erection of single storey extension to side and rear, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, and 2 front roof lights.

This application was refused on the following grounds

#### 1. Character and Appearance

The proposed development, by reason of its cumulative size, scale, bulk and massing and design, would result in an excessive, bulky, incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive form of development that would substantially harm the form, proportion and appearance of the existing dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135b of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

#### 2. Parking and Highway Safety

The proposed development fails to demonstrate that the site could safely accommodate an adequate level of off-street car parking provision to comply with the adopted car parking standards set out in Appendix C Table 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). The proposed development would result in an increase in parking pressure on local streets, which would cause inconsiderate and illegal parking to the detriment of the safety and convenience of existing residents and roads users. The proposal would therefore cause harm to highway safety, contrary to Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

#### 3. Failure to provide adequate private amenity

The proposed development, by virtue of its failure to maintain an adequate provision of private external amenity space, would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the host property. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies DMHB 18 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Paragraph 135f of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

## 2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: 12th March 2025

## 3. Comments on Public Consultations

### CONSULTATION

11 neighbours and Northwood Hills Residents Association were consulted by letter dated 07-02-25. 4 letters of objection were received. The matters raised are summarised as follows:

- Overdevelopment
- Traffic and Parking
- Limited garden space retained

- Loss of light
- Property devaluation
- Noise and disruption during the construction period
- Potential HMO

Officer comments:

The concerns raised in respect to neighbouring residential amenities, reduction in the size of the rear garden, parking and highway safety are discussed in the main body of this report.

The concern raised about the property values is not a planning consideration.

Noise and disruption during the construction period would be considered an accepted and temporary part of the development process.

There is no indication of the property being used as a HMO which in certain circumstances would require planning permission. The application is being assessed as a householder development.

**LBH CONSULTEES:**

Conservation and design:

- The proposed scheme would constitute as overdevelopment and as such is not supported by design officers.
- The rear massing will be visually prominent from view along the road. It needs to be determined where the owner will park if the development goes ahead.
- The front window lights are also considered to be out of proportion to the roof scape.

**Background**

The site is located within a residential catchment in Eastcote. The address is to remain in a single tenure but with extension and the creation of a habitable area within a redesigned roof-space together with the provision of a double garage to the side.

**Parking Provision - Loft Space Conversion**

Local Plan: Part 2 - Policy DMT 6 requires that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the council's adopted parking standards unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

However, these standards are not directly applicable to residential properties which are to be extended with (or without) an increase in the number of habitable rooms on the strict proviso that the address is not converted to multiple housing units and remains in single tenure. This is further reflected within the council's parking standard for 'dwellings with curtilage' which equates to a maximum of 2 on-plot spaces and is not dependant on the number of bedrooms. Hence there is no specific requirement to provide additional on-plot parking provisions for this proposal. Notwithstanding the above, a double garage located to the side of the dwelling is proposed.

#### **4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan**

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

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
DMEI 4	Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP G2	(2021) London's Green Belt
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF13 -24	NPPF13 2024 - Protecting Green Belt land
NPPF2 -24	NPPF2 2024 - Achieving sustainable development

## 5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the impact on the Green belt, the design and impact on the character and appearance of the existing property, the impact upon the street scene and locality, the impact upon the green belt, the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reduction in size of the rear garden, parking/highway safety, flood risk/drainage and archaeology.

### IMPACT ON GREEN BELT:

Paragraph 145 of the NPPF (2024) sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in 'very special circumstances'.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF (2024) continues, stating: "When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations."

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF (2024) states that the construction of new buildings are considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this include : c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;

Policy G2 of the London Plan (2021) Part A states - The Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development.

Policy DMEI 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states - B) Extensions and redevelopment on sites in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will be permitted only where the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, and the purposes of including land within it, than the existing development.

The application site is within a developed residential location, albeit within designated green belt land. Whilst the proposal is considered to be disproportionate in relation to the scale of the existing dwelling, it is not considered to impact on the open character of the green belt which is more evident in the nearby open spaces.

This assessment approach, as proposed, is supported by Policy G2 of the London Plan (2021), and Policy DMEI 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020). The impact on the designated greenbelt is therefore considered to be acceptable.

## IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA

Paragraph 135b of the NPPF (2024) states - Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that: Development proposals should: D1) enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (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 adverse 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 requires that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

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

- ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- iii) flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level;
- v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;

viii) pitched roofs on extensions should be of a similar pitch and materials to that of the original roof and subordinate to it in design. Large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported.

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

- i) side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property;
- ii) extensions to corner plots should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded;
- iii) garages should reflect the size guidelines set out in Appendix C Parking standards;
- iv) two storey side extensions should be set in a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary, but more if on a wider than average plot, in order to maintain adequate visual separation and views between houses;
- v) two storey side extensions to detached and semi-detached properties should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation;

With regard to Roof Extensions, Policy DMHD 1 states that:

- 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;
- v) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling.

The proposal is for a 3.3m wide part single and part two storey side extension with a small rear element above the previously approved flat roofed rear extension. The site has already had approvals for a loft conversion and a single storey rear extension to 4m deep.

The proposed side extension is set to be flush with the front building line with the two storey element being set back 1m from the front and would be 3.3metres in width, it would connect with a single storey rear extension that extends 4metres beyond the rear elevation. The side extension would therefore have a length of 9.35metres (including the single storey rear element). Although, this is compliant with DMHD1 whereby the front elevation of the side extension is set back; given the design of the host dwelling and the addition of this element would constitute as overdevelopment; disrupting the consistent development pattern of the other homes which all have identical architectural design. Furthermore, should this proposal be approved, the development of this side element would eradicate the space to the side of the property which has been designed to ensure that the plot maintains openness in the area, especially seeing as the property is located in a way that the development can be seen from a public vantage point.

The side extension adjacent to the host dwelling would be characterised by a gabled roof that extends 8.2metres in height. The height to the eaves would be 5.2metres at two storey level and would project a depth of 9.2m in total. The gabled roof would project beyond the rear elevation by 70cm over part of the side/rear extension. Whilst the roof pitch matches that of the main gabled roof to the front and side, to the rear it would have a hipped element which would create an awkward visual relationship with the main roof. The combination of this element with the rear dormer further exasperates the scale and bulk of the development. The overall scale and size of the development would fail to appear subordinate to the existing dwelling and the site as a whole. This still creates a discordant addition due to the width and bulk of the side extension which is exacerbated by the overall height and massing of the roof profile. The finishing roof form and height provides an awkward and jarring relationship with the existing building that would be overwhelmed by the extent

and massing of the side/rear extension.

The length of the side extension would also appear highly visible due to the prominent position and proximity to the street. Given that the side element would be flush with the front building line, and despite the two storey side element having a set-back; due to the bulk, height and massing of the extension, the development would detract from the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling and appear insubordinate to it.

There are no examples of such developments on Aspen Grove, therefore the proposed development would not reflect the character and appearance of the area and would introduce a form of development that would be harmful to the architectural composition of the existing building and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area.

The proposed rear dormer would have 30cm side set-ins from the gable ends, would be set down 45cm from the ridge. The rear dormer occupies the majority of the rear roof slope and would be highly visible from the street scene and rear gardens of surrounding properties. While it is acknowledged that there is a CLD approval on file 78143/APP/2024/2129, this dormer from a householder perspective, this would not be acceptable due to the scale and bulk of the dormer in combination with the side extension would dominate the rear elevation resulting in insubordinate and incongruous additions that visually detract from the street scene and would exceed 2/3rd of the original roof profile. It is therefore considered that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building. Again, there are no examples of such dormers on Aspen Grove and the introduction of such a development would be harmful to the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

It is noted that the existing dwelling has a floor area of 96sq.metres (measured externally) with a rectangular footprint measuring 48sq.metres. The extension measures 87metres on the ground floor and rear dormer would provide an additional bedroom. This represents a significant enlargement which is considered to be disproportionate in scale to the host dwelling.

Although the exterior materials proposed to match the existing materials, this would not outweigh the harm identified in the preceding paragraphs and the harm this development would have on the host dwelling and the wider context of the site.

Consequently, for the above reasons, it is considered that the cumulative effect of the development would be disproportionate, insubordinate and harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and as a result of the bulk and mass would harm the visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The development therefore conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) , Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135b of the NPPF (2023).

#### IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY:

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states Part D7) that development proposals should deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space. The supporting text for this policy states that the

Council will expect new development proposals to carefully consider layout and massing in order to ensure development does not result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon 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: i) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved; and, ii) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Being set away from the neighbour No.48 and being separated by the host dwelling which is set back relative to the neighbour, the proposed development would not infringe upon the neighbours nearest rear windows. Due to this relationship, the proposed development would not result in a loss of light, outlook or sense of enclosure for the occupiers at No.48.

There is a ground floor window in the side (east) elevation of the proposed side extension, and this could have been obscure glazed and secured by condition, if this application had been recommended for approval.

The dormer windows would provide oblique views to the neighbouring gardens and would face towards the nursing home to the rear at some distance. As such, the proposal would not give rise to a loss of privacy or overlooking issues for the adjacent and neighbouring occupiers.

There are no proposed gable end windows indicated and in the event of planning permission being granted, a condition would have been recommended to restrict any further window openings in the interests of preserving neighbourhood privacy.

No adverse issues are considered to arise in terms of neighbour amenity with regards to overlooking or loss of privacy, loss of outlook, overbearing impact or material loss of daylight and sunlight. However, this does not outweigh the harm identified above in respect to the impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area and the lack of maintenance of the open space in relation to the host dwelling and the wider context.

#### EXTERNAL AMENITY SPACE PROVISION:

Paragraph 135f of the NPPF (2023) states - Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure an adequate garden. For guidance purposes, Policy DMHB 18 and Table 5.3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) requires four-bedroom plus houses to be provided with at least 100 square metres of private amenity space.

As outlined by the agent themselves, the development would result in a significant shortfall and loss of private amenity space in terms of the Local Plan's minimum requirement of 100sq.m private amenity space for a 4+ bedroom dwelling. It is therefore considered that an insufficient amount of rear garden space would be retained to meet the needs of the host dwelling.

The development would fail to provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers in conflict with Policies DMHB 18 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

## PARKING AND HIGHWAY SAFETY:

Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) require the Council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that all development is in accordance with the car parking standards set out in Appendix C, Table 1 unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

It is noted that the application erroneously states that no changes to parking are proposed. The property benefits from 2no on-site parking spaces to the side of the dwelling. As noted by the highway authority, whilst the plans show two cars parked in the garage, the size of the garage would be substandard for such provision and could only accommodate the parking of one car.

The number of bedrooms within the dwelling would increase from 3no bedrooms to 5bedrooms and there would be a net loss of 1no parking space. Aspen Grove is a planned development with limited capacity for on-street parking and as a result of the development, insufficient parking provision would be retained within the site to serve the dwelling.

The site lies within a PTAL area of 1a which is the lowest level of sustainability and in this location, occupiers are heavily reliant on the private car. The provision of 1no parking space in this location would fail to accord with the Council's adopted parking standards. The inadequate on-site parking is likely to also give rise to inconsiderate and illegal parking to the detriment of the safety and convenience of existing residents and roads users. Thus, having a harmful impact on highway safety.

Paragraph 115 of the NPPF (2024) states - Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would unacceptably exacerbate the demand for street parking and cause harm to highway safety, in conflict with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Paragraph 115 of the NPPF (2023).

## FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE:

Policy DMEI 10 part E) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that proposals that would fail to make adequate provision for the control and reduction of surface water run-off rates will be refused.

According to the Council's GIS, the site lies in a Critical Drainage Area (CDA). Therefore, the surface water from the site entering the sewers should be minimised. If this application had been recommended for approval, an informative would be attached with the following guidance:

- Water run off from any roof or hard paving associated with the development should be directed to a soakaway, or tank or made permeable. This includes any work to front gardens not part of the planning application, must be permeable or be collected and directed to a permeable area, or it would need an additional permission.
- A water butt should be incorporated.

- No drainage to support the extension should be connected to any existing surface water network, other than as an overflow.

Subject to the above informative, it is considered that the proposal would not significantly increase the risk of surface water flooding at the site or elsewhere in compliance with Policy DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

#### ARCHAEOLOGY:

Whilst the site located within an Archaeological Priority Area (APA), the Borough does not have an APA tier system. In such cases, Historic England (Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service) advises that they should not be consulted on householder applications unless its within 50m of a scheduled monument.

The application is not located within 50m of a scheduled monument. Furthermore, the proposed extension would primarily cover an area of existing hardstanding, with the host property set within an established housing estate. It is therefore considered that the proposal is unlikely to cause harm to any archaeological remains, in accordance with Policy DMHB 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

#### COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL):

Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states: A) To ensure development is sustainable, planning permission will only be granted for development that clearly demonstrates there will be sufficient infrastructure of all types to support it. Infrastructure requirements will be predominantly addressed through the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The development would add over 100sq.m of residential floor area and would therefore be CIL liable. An informative has been added.

In this regard, the development accords with the aims of Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020), the NPPF (2023) and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010).

#### CONCLUSION:

Although, the documents submitted by the agent are acknowledged and taken into consideration, upon analysis and assessment, it can be concluded by the officers that this development would result in overdevelopment and bulk to the host dwelling; impacting not just the site, but the wider character of the street. As such this application is recommended for refusal.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

**REFUSAL** for the following reasons:

### 1. NON2 Character and appearance

The proposed development, by reason of its cumulative size, scale, bulk and massing and design, would result in an excessive, bulky, incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive form of development that would substantially harm the form, proportion and appearance of the existing

dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area whilst also harming the openness of the site. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135b of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

## 2. NON2 Parking and highway safety

The proposed development fails to demonstrate that the site could safely accommodate an adequate level of off-street car parking provision to comply with the adopted car parking standards set out in Appendix C Table 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). The proposed development would result in an increase in parking pressure on local streets, which would cause inconsiderate and illegal parking to the detriment of the safety and convenience of existing residents and roads users. The proposal would therefore cause harm to highway safety, contrary to Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

## 3. NON2 Private amenity space

The proposed development, by virtue of its failure to maintain an adequate provision of private external amenity space, would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the host property. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies DMHB 18 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Paragraph 135f of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

## 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. On this decision notice policies from the Council's Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies appear first, then relevant Local Plan Part 2 (2020), then London Plan Policies (2021). Hillingdon's Full Council adopted the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies on 8 November 2012 and the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 on 16 January 2020.
3. In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service.

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

4. This is a reminder that Under the terms of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and

Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), should an application for appeal be allowed, the proposed development would be deemed as 'chargeable development' and therefore liable to pay the London Borough of Hillingdon Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This would be calculated in accordance with the London Borough of Hillingdon CIL Charging Schedule 2014 and the Mayor of London's CIL Charging Schedule 2012. For more information on CIL matters please visit the planning portal page at: [www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil)

## Standard Informatives

1. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
2. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance..

### Part 1 Polices

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

### Part 2 Polices:

DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
DMEI 4	Development on the Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 18	Private Outdoor Amenity Space
DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP G2	(2021) London's Green Belt
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF13 -24	NPPF13 2024 - Protecting Green Belt land
NPPF2 -24	NPPF2 2024 - Achieving sustainable development

**Contact Officer:**

Sharon Singh

**Telephone No:**