

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

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

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

Address: 179A FIELD END ROAD RUISLIP

Development: Erection of a two-storey rear extension to provide storage and office space to existing shop

LBH Ref Nos: **78398/APP/2025/471**

Drawing Nos: Heritage Statement
179/FER/02O
179/FER/04O
179/FER/05O
179/FER/06O
b90/uk/971715/1310046
p2c/uk/971715/1310049
Design and Access Statement.
179/FER/01O
179/FER/03O

Date Plans received: 24-03-25 **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**

Date Application valid 24-03-25

1. SUMMARY

The application site is located on the eastern side of Field End Road. It comprises an existing ground floor commercial unit with a residential unit located on the first and second floors. The application site is one of 10 commercial units that form part of a locally listed shopping parade dating back to the early 1930s. The back of the building is accessed by a narrow service road that serves a small public car park and links the roads of North View and Abbotsbury Gardens.

The application proposes a double-storey rear extension to contain office and storage space ancillary to the existing ground floor retail unit.

The proposed development would result in undue harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring residential properties. The proposal by virtue of its size, scale, fenestration, and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers at 177A, 177B, 179A, and 181A Field End Road. The proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook, sense of enclosure, and reduced privacy/sense of privacy for the neighbouring residential units.

The proximity of the two-storey rear extension to multiple neighbouring habitable room windows raises concerns over impacts to daylight and sunlight access for neighbouring habitable rooms. The application has not submitted a BRE Daylight and Sunlight Impact Assessment to confirm whether

satisfactory daylight and sunlight access would be maintained for neighbouring habitable rooms following the development.

The development would result in the loss of a mature tree on the rear of the site and potentially cause unacceptable harm to a mature tree located on a neighbouring site. No supporting arboricultural information has been submitted with the application to justify any tree works or demonstrate appropriate mitigation for any harm caused to trees.

The scheme is therefore unacceptable and recommended for refusal.

2. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Harm to Trees

The proposal would result in the loss of the mature tree located on the rear of the site, and by reason of its proximity to a neighbouring mature tree, could cause undue harm to the adjacent mature tree. The applicant has not submitted sufficient details to assess the proposal's impact on these trees of merit or mitigation to offset the harm. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

2. NON2 Impact on Neighbours Access to Daylight and Sunlight

In the absence of a sufficient BRE daylight and sunlight assessment, the application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not unduly restrict access to daylight and sunlight of neighbouring residential dwellings at 177A, 177B, and 181A Field End Road, which would harm their residential amenity. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

3. NON2 Impact on Neighbours Outlook and Amenity

The proposal by virtue of its size, scale, fenestration, and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers at 177A, 177B, 179A, and 181A Field End Road. The proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook, sense of enclosure, and reduced privacy/sense of privacy for the neighbouring residential units. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

INFORMATIVES

1. I52 Compulsory Informative (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).

I53 Compulsory Informative (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 (2021) and national guidance.

DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 3	Locally Listed Buildings
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
DMTC 2	Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas
DME 3	Office Development
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.3	(2021) Retail parking
NPPF11 -24	NPPF11 2024 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF15 -24	NPPF15 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

3. CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Site and Locality

The application site is located on the eastern side of Field End Road. It comprises an existing ground floor unit. The application site is one of 10 commercial units that form part of a locally listed shopping parade dating back to the early 1930s. The back of the building is accessed by a narrow service road that serves a small public car park and links the roads of North View and Abbotsbury Gardens.

The site lies immediately opposite the Eastcote, Morford Way Conservation Area. The shop frontage itself is more modernised, as indeed are all of the commercial frontages to this shopping parade. The street is characterised by a linear arrangement of terraced buildings, predominantly two to three storeys high, which face directly onto the pavement. The majority of buildings have retail or associated uses at ground floor level with office or residential space above.

The site lies within the Eastcote Town Centre Boundary and the primary shopping area.

3.2 Proposed Scheme

The application proposes the erection of a two-storey rear extension to provide storage and office space to existing shop.

3.3 Relevant Planning History

78129/APP/2024/2827 179 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE

Subdivision of ground floor from 1 x Class E commercial unit into 2 x Class E commercial units with associated changes to shopfront and internal alterations

Decision: 09-01-2025 Approval

78129/PRC/2024/96 179 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE

Erection of a two storey rear extension to provide storage and office space to existing shop

Decision: 19-09-2024 Objection

78398/APP/2023/3246 179A FIELD END ROAD RUISLIP

Conversion of a 5 bedroom maisonette (1st and 2nd floor) above existing commercial unit into a 1no 2 bedroom flat and a 1no 1 bedroom flat.

Decision: 02-02-2024 Approval

78129/PRC/2023/125 179 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE

Conversion of existing flat into two self contained flats and erection of two-storey rear extension to create 2 self-contained flats

Decision: 16-05-2024 Withdrawn (P)

6588/APP/2020/4028 177 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER

Change of use from financial services (Use Class E) to 2 x 1 bedroom self contained flats (Use Class C3) with alterations to existing opening and installation of new openings

Decision: 10-02-2021 Approval

78129/APP/2023/1968 177-179 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE

Proposed alteration of shop front from 1 shop (former HSBC bank) to 2 separate shop fronts including new entrance and amendments to fenestration.

Decision: 16-02-2024 Approval

Comment on Planning History

The relevant planning history is listed above.

78129/PRC/2024/96 was a pre-application for the scheme. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) identified that the principle of the proposed development was accepted but identified objections with the proposal due to a lack of clear detailed information provided under the pre-application, issues with the proposed design with regards to detailing, concern over potential harm to neighbouring residential properties which was not specifically identifiable with the information provided, and concern over the impact on the mature tree located on the site.

The LPA objected to the proposed pre-application scheme.

4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: Not applicable

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

5. Comments on Public Consult

EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

29 neighbouring properties and the Eastcote Residents Association were consulted by letter on 01-04-25.

The consultation period expired on 24-04-2025.

Three objections were received. Their comments are summarised as follows:

1. Loss of daylight and sunlight access for neighbouring residential properties.
2. Overbearing impact and oppressive structure impacting adjacent properties.
3. Loss of a mature tree.
4. Contrary to the policies of the Local Plan and the London Plan.

Planning Officer comment: The above issues are addressed in the report below.

INTERNAL CONSULTATION:

Access Officer:

No objection. The following informative is recommended should approval be granted: The Equality Act 2010 aims to safeguard individuals accessing goods, facilities, and services from discrimination based on a 'protected characteristic', including disability. In accordance with the Act, service providers must enhance access to and within their premises, especially when reasonable adjustments are feasible and straightforward to implement. The Act mandates that service providers proactively identify and eliminate barriers hindering disabled people.

Conservation Officer:

The core of the street frontage is two storeys and is in a metroland character. To the rear, the buildings in the row have been extended at various times. The adjacent site seems to have been extended to the rear in the inter-war period. However, later extensions have happened within the group. The proposed design is modest and in keeping with the general character of the area. The window details are appropriate, and we welcome the brick detailing. Therefore, we would not object to the proposals. External materials and finishes would be subject to approval and should be secured by condition.

Highways:

As the proposal would be ancillary to the existing retail unit and is small in scale, no concerns are raised. The realignment of the site envelope, allowing the containment of two car parking spaces (inclusive of one EVCP and one cycle space), is welcomed.

6. 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 3	Locally Listed Buildings
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking
DMTC 2	Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas
DME 3	Office Development

DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMCI 7	Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T4	(2021) Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.3	(2021) Retail parking
NPPF11 -24	NPPF11 2024 - Making effective use of land
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
NPPF15 -24	NPPF15 2024 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

In addition: Development Plan:

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The London Plan (2021)
The West London Waste Plan (2015)
The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)

Material Considerations:

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) states that 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; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

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

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals should not adversely impact the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

Paragraph 5.38 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states:

'The Council will aim to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents and it will resist proposals where there is an unreasonable level of overlooking between habitable rooms of adjacent residential properties, schools or onto private open spaces. A minimum of 21 metres separation distance between windows of habitable rooms will be required to maintain levels of privacy and to prevent the possibility of overlooking. In some locations where there is a significant difference in ground levels between dwellings, a greater separation distance may be necessary.'

Paragraph 5.40 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

'For the purposes of this policy, outlook is defined as the visual amenity enjoyed by occupants when looking out of their windows or from their garden. 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.'

Paragraph 5.41 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states:

'The Council will aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight and sunlight and unacceptable overshadowing caused by new development on habitable rooms, amenity space and public open space. The Council will also seek to ensure that the design of new development optimises the levels of daylight and sunlight. The Council will expect the impact of the development to be assessed following the methodology set out in the most recent version of the Building Research Establishments (BRE) "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice."

Pre-application 78129/PRC/2024/96 identified potential concerns regarding undue harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings due to the proposal. The pre-application concluded that additional detailed information, including detailed proposed drawings, details on neighbouring dwelling layouts/windows, and a sunlight and daylight assessment, would be required to assess the impact on neighbouring amenities.

Based on the submitted information, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed extension would be L-shaped at the first floor level and would be located approximately 9.7m from one of the flats within 179 Field End Road. The window within this flat would be the only habitable window within the kitchen/lounge and concerns are raised regarding the level of light and outlook this room would receive. Only a small top portion of the window would be visible from the rear elevation, with the majority obstructed by the wall built for the proposed first-floor extension.

177-179, 177B, and 177A Field End Road are located north of the application site. This neighbouring site consists of the original building and a two-storey rear extension. The application documents claim this rear extension is currently vacant and does not contain any habitable windows. However, the planning officer has identified that this is incorrect based on their site visit.

The planning officer confirmed from their site visit that the original building contains a commercial unit (dentistry) on the ground floor (No.177-179) and a residential flat (No.177B) above. The rear two-storey extension originally contained two units on the ground floor, which obtained consent to be converted into residential units under 6588/APP/2020/4028. However, the ground floor unit has been amalgamated with the front ground floor unit. The first floor unit (No.177A) has been converted into a residential flat although it was unclear whether the unit was currently occupied at the time of the site visit.

The proposed two-storey rear extension would directly impact the outlook from three of the four habitable rooms serving No.177A. The extension would range from being 6.74 to 3.2m away from the southern face of No.177A. This would be significantly less than the expected standard of 21m of depth for outlook and would harm the sense of openness and spaciousness from the habitable rooms of the adjacent unit, and would increase their sense of enclosure. It would also cause harm to the privacy of No.177A due to overlooking from the north-facing first-floor window in the proposed extension into the habitable rooms of No.177A. The proximity of the proposed extension to the neighbouring habitable windows also raises concerns over access to daylight and sunlight for the habitable rooms of No.177A. The applicant has not provided a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment, which was identified as necessary under 78129/PRC/2024/96. Therefore the application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not lead to an unacceptable loss of light or unacceptable overshadowing to No.177A.

The ground-floor unit at 177-179 Field End Road is commercial and does not rely on southern outlook over the rear of the application site. The proposal would also be contained within the extent of the applicant's site and therefore would not unduly hamper access to the adjacent site. Therefore, the proposal would not unduly harm the commercial operations of 177-179 Field End Road.

The extension would impact the outlook from the front first-floor residential unit at 177B Field End Road. The extension would intrude within the 45-degree field of view from the first floor rear habitable window of the flat, resulting in a narrow corridor of only 3.2m in depth for outlook from the window. This would harm the sense of openness and spaciousness of the habitable room, increasing their sense of enclosure. It also raises concerns over access to daylight and sunlight in the habitable room. The applicant has not provided a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment, which was identified as necessary under 78129/PRC/2024/96. Therefore, the application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not lead to an unacceptable loss of light or unacceptable overshadowing to No.177B.

The extension would impact the outlook from the existing front first-floor residential unit above 179A Field End Road. The extension would restrict the extent of outlook from the rear bedroom window to 9.6m in depth. This would harm the sense of openness and spaciousness from the habitable room for future occupiers of the existing unit.

The extension would impact the outlook from the front first-floor residential unit at 181A Field End Road located to the south of the application site. The extension would intrude within the 45-degree field of view from the first floor rear habitable window of the flat. This would harm the sense of openness and spaciousness from the habitable room, and would increase their sense of enclosure. This also raises concerns over access to daylight and sunlight for the habitable room of the neighbouring residential unit. The applicant has not provided a BRE daylight and sunlight assessment, which was identified as necessary under 78129/PRC/2024/96. Therefore, the application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not lead to an unacceptable loss of light or unacceptable overshadowing to No.181A.

While there are examples of two-storey rear extensions in the parade, such as at 177-179, 177B, and 177A Field End Road and at 187, 187A, and 187B Field End Road, these extensions are historical in nature and were erected prior to the Council's digital planning records. Further, these extensions, being the first erected (particularly the neighbouring extension at 177-179, 177B, and 177A Field End Road), would have limited the harm to neighbouring residential amenities. As the proposal intends to construct a two-storey extension directly adjacent to the existing two-storey extension at 177-179, 177B, and 177A Field End Road, this would cumulatively create significantly harmful adverse effects on the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings, as described above, which is not acceptable.

The proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential units. The development would unduly harm the quality of outlook from multiple neighbouring residential dwellings. It would unacceptably increase their sense of enclosure, harm the privacy of a neighbouring dwelling, and potentially result in substandard daylight and sunlight access for multiple neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), and Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.2 Impact on Street Scene

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the tests for dealing with heritage assets in planning decisions. S72 of this Act relates to Conservation Areas and requires Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to 'the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2024) states that decisions should ensure that developments:

- 'a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);
- d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;
- e) optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- f) 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; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.'

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF (2024) states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) require development proposals to be of high quality and to enhance the local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local

distinctiveness.

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 BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) states, 'The Council will require all new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods, where people enjoy living and working and that serve the long-term needs of all residents. All new developments should achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations, extensions and the public realm which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area, contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place.'

Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) seeks to conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape, which includes locally recognised historic features, such as Areas of Special Local Character and Locally Listed Buildings.

Policy DMHB 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council will expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment.

Policy DMHB 3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that proposals will be permitted where they retain the significance, appearance, character or setting of a Locally Listed Building.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states: 'All development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including: i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development, height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures; building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns; building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure; architectural composition and quality of detailing; local topography, views both from and to the site; and impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment.'

The application site is a locally listed building; however, the key heritage values of the building are derived from the front streetscape appearance and character, with the rear of the building not being visible from the high street and being of lesser visual significance and importance.

The application proposes erecting an L-shaped 9.5m deep two-storey rear extension ranging from 4.3m to 7.9m in width. The extension would be approximately 5.6m high to match the existing rear facade of the building and would have glazing facing internally to the site and the rear access street. The extension would be constructed out of unspecified bricks and would have a flat roof.

The proposed extension would be in keeping with the size of other extensions in the area. It would not be visible from the primary street frontage of the site, and thereby would not impact the character or appearance of the locally listed building as viewed from the street frontage.

The Council Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the proposal and has not identified any harm to the heritage asset, subject to the inclusion of a condition requiring finalised external materials and finishes to be provided to the Council for review and approval prior to the development commencing. They note that adjacent sites have also been extended to the rear, and

therefore the proposal would not be out of keeping with the area's character.

Given the proposal would be in keeping with the existing building and surrounding development and no harm has been identified to the heritage asset, the proposal therefore complies with the NPPF (2024), Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 3, and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety

Policies DMT 1, DMT 2, and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that development proposals will be required to meet the transport needs of the development and address its transport impacts in a sustainable manner. Development proposals must ensure that safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided to the Council's standards, and development proposals must ensure that safe and efficient vehicular access to the highway network is provided to the Council's standards.

The Council's Highways Team has reviewed the application and confirmed they have no objection to the proposal, which retains two carparking spaces and makes acceptable provision for electric vehicle charging. The proposal would not discernibly exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any measurable highway safety concerns.

The proposal complies with the aims of Policies DMT 1, DMT 2, and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

7.4 Carparking & Layout

See above.

7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations

ACCESS:

The Council's Access Officer has reviewed the application and raised no accessibility concerns. However, the applicant should be made aware of their obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The Act seeks to protect people accessing goods, facilities and services from discrimination on the basis of a 'protected characteristic', which includes those with a disability. As part of the Act, service providers are obliged to improve access to and within the structure of their building, particularly in situations where reasonable adjustment can be incorporated with relative ease. The Act states that service providers should think ahead and take steps to address barriers that impede disabled people. Any future full planning application should therefore consider alterations to make the building more accessible to older and disabled people.

7.6 Other Issues

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The NPPF (2024) definition of main town centre uses is:

'Retail development (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres); leisure, entertainment and more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, nightclubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres and bingo halls); offices; and arts, culture and tourism development (including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities).'

Policy DME 3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

'C) Proposals for smaller scale new office floorspace within designated town centres, including proposals within mixed use schemes, will be supported where:

- i) the mixed use element of the scheme meets the requirements of policies related to town centre development in this Plan; and
- ii) the scale of provision is appropriate to the role and function of the town centre.'

Policy DMTC 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

'A) In primary shopping areas, the Council will support the ground floor use of premises for retail, financial and professional activities and restaurants, cafes, pubs and bars provided that:

- i) a minimum of 70% of the frontage is retained in Use Class A1;
- ii) Use Class A5 hot food takeaways are limited to a maximum of 15% of the frontage;
- iii) the proposed use will not result a separation of more than 12 metres between A1 retail uses; and
- iv) the proposed use does not result in a concentration of non retail uses which could be considered to cause harm to the vitality and viability of the town centre.'

The proposed development is for the erection of a two-storey rear extension to provide storage space at ground floor level and office space at first floor level for the existing commercial use of the unit. The site is located within the Eastcote Town Centre and a primary shopping area. There would be no change of use and the frontage of the building would remain as existing.

The applicant has applied for the extension as ancillary to the existing ground floor shop; however, the proposed office/storage extension is not connected internally to the front commercial unit. This raises concerns that the rear unit would have had the potential for independent unconsented use, such as a second commercial unit or a residential unit. As such, if the proposal had been recommended for approval, a condition would have been attached requiring the rear extension to remain ancillary to the front commercial unit for the lifetime of the development.

The use of the proposed extension therefore complies with Policies DME 3 and DMTC 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) and the use of the space complies with the main town centre uses specified within the NPPF glossary (2024). The principle of development is acceptable.

TREES:

Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should ensure that, wherever possible, existing trees of value are retained. If planning permission is granted that necessitates the removal of trees, there should be adequate replacement based on the existing value of the benefits of the trees removed, determined by, for example, i-tree or CAVAT or another appropriate valuation system. The planting of additional trees should generally be included in new developments, particularly for large-canopied species, which provide a wider range of benefits because of the larger surface area of their canopy.

Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all developments will be expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity, or other natural features of merit.

Under the previous pre-application 78129/PRC/2024/96 for the site, it was identified that a tree protection plan and arboricultural impact assessment would be required to assess the impact of the proposal on surrounding trees. No such information has been provided with the proposal.

During the planning officer's site visit, they identified that a large mature tree of potentially considerable value was located on the rear of the site, as visible in the site photos. The planning officer considers that this tree would need to be removed to facilitate the development. Loss of the tree would cause significant harm to the landscaped character and values of the area, and is not supported.

It is also likely that a neighbouring mature tree on the rear of 181 Field End Road would be affected by the development due to its proximity to the proposed works. This could result in harm to the health and quality of the tree. The applicant has not provided any supporting arboricultural information to confirm that no undue harm to the adjacent tree would occur.

In the absence of any supporting arboricultural information and due to the proximity of the proposed development to the rear mature trees which would necessitate removal of one tree and potentially cause significant harm to another, the proposal fails to accord with Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020).

SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE:

Policy DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that applications for all new build developments (not conversions, change of use, or refurbishment) are required to include a drainage assessment demonstrating that appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) have been incorporated in accordance with The London Plan Hierarchy (Policy 5.13: Sustainable drainage).

The application site is located within a Critical Drainage Area; however, as the development would occur above existing hardstanding and is of a minor scale of the development, it is not considered necessary to require a Sustainable Water Management Scheme for the proposal.

As such, the application is considered to be in accordance with Policy DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (2020).

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY:

Policy DMCI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that 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 proposal involves the erection of less than 100 sq. m. of gross internal floor area and therefore is not CIL liable.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN:

Biodiversity net gain is a way of creating and improving biodiversity by requiring development to have a positive impact ('net gain') on biodiversity.

In England, biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021). This statutory framework is referred to as 'biodiversity net gain' in Planning Practice Guidance to distinguish it from other or more general biodiversity gains.

Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat.

There are exemptions and the BNG planning condition does not apply to planning permission for development that is below a de minimis threshold, i.e.:

- does not impact an onsite priority habitat; and
- the development impacts less than 25 sq. m. of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero; and
- the development impacts less than 5m in length of onsite linear habitat

One exemption is development below a de minimis threshold. This exemption applies to development that does not impact a priority habitat and impacts less than 25 sq. m. (e.g. 5m x 5m) of non-priority onsite habitat (such as modified grassland) or 5m for non-priority onsite linear habitats (such as native hedgerows).

As the development is to occur over existing hardstanding, the development would not exceed the de minimis threshold and is considered to be BNG exempt.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons in this report, the proposed development would conflict with national, regional, and local planning policies and guidance.

It is therefore recommended that the application be refused.

8. Reference Documents

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

The London Plan (2021)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012)

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020)

Hillingdon Local Plan Accessible Hillingdon Supplementary Planning Document (2017)

Contact Officer: Mitchell Heaven **Telephone No:** 01895 250230