

Report of the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces

Address ICKENHAM MANOR HOUSE LONG LANE ICKENHAM

Development: Demolition of 2 garages and the erection of building to accommodate a double garage and studio, adjacent to existing barn

LBH Ref Nos: 32002/APP/2013/2732

Drawing Nos: Existing Site Plan (un-numbered)
Proposed Site Plan (un-numbered)
Existing & Proposed Floor Plan (un-numbered)
Proposed Roof Plan (un-numbered)
Proposed Ground Floor Plan (un-numbered)
Proposed Elevations (un-numbered)
Planning, Design, Access & Heritage Statement

Date Plans Received: 19/09/2013 **Date(s) of Amendment(s):**

Date Application Valid: 20/09/2013

DEFERRED ON 10th December 2013 FOR SITE VISIT ON

A site visit has been confirmed for the 17th of January 2014.

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

Ickenham Manor is a large detached grade I listed house located within Ickenham Conservation Area and is located within the Green Belt. The development site is also located within a proposed (within the Hillingdon Local Plan emerging Site Designations Proposal Map) Archaeological Priority Area and is located within a few metres of the Ickenham Manor Moat Scheduled Ancient Monument.

The property is reached from Long Lane to the west, via a long driveway, which is also used to reach Long Lane Farm to the south west of the site. The property is a 15th Century Tudor Manor House.

The existing garages are set to the south west of the Manor House and are met before you reach the house, if one arrives in the grounds of the manor from the entrance track that is located to the west of the site. The new building would partly occupy the footprint of a long demolished building that is understood to have served an agricultural function when the Manor House operated as a farm house, a function the Manor House no longer fulfils.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

The application seeks to demolish two small concrete construction garages and to erect a new building that would link onto the side on an existing wooden frame barn to accommodate a double garage and a work studio with its own enclosed outdoor space set to the side (south) of the new building.

The new garage and studio would occupy a footprint of approximately 81 square metres, be 5.6m deep and 14.75 metre long, finished with a dual pitch roof rising to a ridge height of 4.71 metre.

The new structure and the existing barn taken together would be over 20m in length.

The flank south elevation of the studio would be largely glazed, the front elevation (east facing) would contain 3 windows and a door and the rear the rear elevation a further 2 small windows. The studio would contain a toilet and hand basin plus a fireplace in the main room. The building would be clad in horizontal timber boards, above a red brick base, with steel framed windows and the roof tiled in interlocking pantiles to match those on the existing barn.

The application was subject to extensive pre-application advice with the local planning authority with Officers advising upon a smaller footprint outbuilding than is currently submitted.

1.3 Relevant Planning History Comment on Planning History

None relevant to this application.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date:- 30th October 2013

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date:- Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

EXTERNAL:

A site notice was displayed. The application was advertised in the local newspaper. Two adjoining land owners were consulted in writing as were the Ickenham Residents Association.

No responses were received from neighbours or other residents.

ENGLISH HERITAGE: Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS)

The application lies within a proposed Archaeological Priority Area reflecting the archaeological interest relating to the medieval moated manor at Manor Farm. The application site lies on the platform of a small medieval moat which encloses a grade I listed medieval/post-medieval manor house and is attached to a larger scheduled moat. The development would therefore affect an undesignated heritage asset of significance equivalent to a scheduled monument to which the NPPF policies applying to designated assets should be applied (NPPF 139). No archaeological assessment or evaluation has been submitted with this application nor are there sufficient details of foundations. Further information is necessary to establish the impact of development and appropriate mitigation, which should aim to minimise disturbance to significant remains through sympathetic foundation design (e.g. raft). I therefore recommend that the following further studies should be undertaken to inform this application:

Desk-based assessment

Desk-based assessment produces a report to inform planning decisions. It uses existing information to identify the likely effects of the development on the significance of heritage assets, including considering the potential for new discoveries and effects on the setting of nearby assets. An assessment may lead on to further evaluation and/or mitigation measures.

Evaluation

An archaeological field evaluation involves exploratory fieldwork to determine if significant remains are present on a site and if so to define their character, extent, quality and preservation. Field evaluation may involve one or more techniques depending on the nature of the site and its archaeological potential. It will normally include excavation of trial trenches. A field evaluation report will usually be used to inform a planning decision (pre-determination evaluation) but can also be required by condition to refine a mitigation strategy after permission has been granted.

Preservation in-situ

Where archaeological remains are to be preserved in-situ within a development there will normally be a requirement to provide details of how this will be achieved. Typically this would involve a design and methods statement for groundworks. Where particularly important or vulnerable features are to be preserved there may also be a requirement to monitor their condition and take remedial action in the event of decay.

The nature and scope of assessment and evaluation should be agreed with GLAAS and carried out by a developer appointed archaeological practice before any decision on the planning application is taken. The consultant's report will need to establish the significance of the site and the impact of the proposed development. Once the archaeological impact of the proposal has been defined a recommendation will be made by GLAAS.

The NPPF accords great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets and also non-designated heritage assets of equivalent interest. Heritage assets of local or regional significance may also be considered worthy of conservation.

If archaeological safeguards do prove necessary, these could involve design measures to preserve remains in situ or where that is not feasible archaeological investigation prior to development. If planning permission is to be refused without the provision of a satisfactory archaeological assessment/evaluation then we recommend that the failure of the applicant to provide an adequate archaeological assessment be cited as a reason for refusal.

ICKENHAM RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION:

This proposal calls for the demolition of 2 old garages and replacing them with a studio on the existing footprint.

Since this should be regarded as an 'outbuilding', we would ask you, as in the past - should you be minded to consider approval - to apply a condition that the sanitary facilities shown would only be relevant for the new studio, however, the proposed new outbuilding

would/could never be converted or extended to residential accommodation at any future stage, and will only be used as ancillary to the main house in accordance with HDAS guidelines, section 9.4, in order to avoid any future undesirable fragmentation of the curtilage or the creation of a separate residential use in accordance with Policy B13 of the UDP.

There is also the question of building on Green Belt Land, which we would normally object to, but since it will be on an existing footprint, and bearing in mind the recent 'Swakeleys House' decision, we cannot see any planning reasons for objection.

(Officer Comment: In relation to the Ickenham Residents Associations comments in respect of Swakeleys House, it needs to be borne in mind that each application must be considered on its own individual circumstances, in this respect officers are of the view that there is little, if any, similarity in the circumstances between these two applications for the following reasons:

(i) Swakeleys House is Grade 1 listed and is currently disused. A significant part of the justification for the approval of this planning permission was that it would secure significant repair work to the interior of the Grade 1 listed property. This is not the case with this application.

(ii) At Swakeleys House there was a detailed and robust justification concerning the difference in footprints and volumes between existing buildings currently on site and the proposed buildings. The development resulted in an overall reduction in built form from that currently on site. This application involves a substantial increase in the built form on site.

INTERNAL

CONSERVATION TEAM

Ickenham Manor is grade I listed and dates from c15th with additions from the c16th onwards. It was originally a moated manor house and this feature still remains in part within the grounds of the house and beyond. The moat is scheduled, and the site falls within a proposed archaeological priority area. The site also falls within the Ickenham Village CA and the Green Belt.

Overall, this is a highly significant building, in both architectural and historic buildings terms. The potential impact of the new structure on the setting of this building is therefore an important consideration.

COMMENTS:

The proposed structure would be located adjacent to an existing small timber framed barn and would require the demolition of two circa 1920/30s concrete and asbestos garages and the removal of the concrete bases of other adjoining buildings. The new building would mainly sit within an area of the existing features/disturbed ground.

It is considered that the proposed structure would be fairly discrete and of a simple rustic design that would sit comfortably with the existing barn and appear as a secondary element to the existing house. It is considered that the removal of the run down garages would be an enhancement to the setting of the listed building.

There would be no objection to the proposed structures in listed building/conservation

terms, provided the following conditions were attached to any approval:

An archaeological condition as required by GLAAS
Details of all external materials- ideally samples to be provided for agreement.
Details of the works required to the existing barn to link it with the new development.
Details of any new external vents or grills.
Details of works to provide hard surfaced areas to frontage and side of new structure;
details of planter to southern end of new building.
Details of construction, materials and colours of new windows and doors.
Gutters/down pipes and other pipe work to be of cast iron.
Landscape/planting details.
Any other conditions as requested by English Heritage.

4. UDP / LDF Designation and London Plan

The following UDP Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:

LPP 7.16 (2011) Green Belt

LPP 7.8 (2011) Heritage assets and archaeology

EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains

BE1 Development within archaeological priority areas

BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas

BE8 Planning applications for alteration or extension of listed buildings

BE10 Proposals detrimental to the setting of a listed building

BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.

BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.

BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.

BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.

OL1 Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new development

OL4 Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings

NPPF1

HDAS-LAY Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning considerations are fourfold namely:-

- (1) The impact of the development of the Green Belt and its open setting;
- (2) The impact of the building and its architectural design upon the setting of the listed Manor House and the general nature, appearance and character of the Ickenham Conservation Area;
- (3) The scale of the development, and whether by reason of size and design it is capable of (or lends itself readily to future conversion) into a separate planning unit either as a separate studio residential unit or a workshop/independent office.
- (4) Potential impact of the development on the archaeology of the site.

GREEN BELT ISSUES:

Policy OL1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states within the green belt the local planning authority will not grant planning permission for new buildings or for changes of use of existing land and buildings, other than for purposes essential for and associated with (i) agriculture, horticulture, forestry and nature conservation;(ii) open air recreational facilities; (iii) cemeteries. The number and scale of buildings permitted will be kept to a minimum in order to protect the visual amenity of the Green Belt.

Policy OL4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states the local planning authority will only permit the replacement or extension of buildings within the Green Belt if:

- (i) The development would not result in any disproportionate change in the bulk and character of the original building;
- (ii) The development would not significantly increase the built up appearance of the site;
- (iii) Having regard to the character of the surrounding area the development would not injure the visual amenities of the green belt by reason of siting, materials, design, traffic or activities

London Plan Policy 7.16 states in respect of planning decisions within Green Belt "The strongest protection should be given to London's Green Belt, in accordance with national guidance. Inappropriate development should be refused, except in very special circumstances. Development will be supported if it is appropriate and helps secure the objectives of improving the Green Belt as set out in national guidance.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The NPPF goes on to state "a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this include:

- 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;
- The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces."

The proposed scheme would demolish two existing garages erected after 1945. The existing garages are significantly smaller in footprint (taken together 26sq.m) and ridge

height than that of the new building (82sq.m). The new building would have a footprint of approximately 81sq.m. The scheme's new build would physically conjoin with an existing barn structure to create a collective footprint of over 108sq.m and with a collective length of over 20m. This length of building would be longer than that of the Manor House.

The outbuilding is significantly larger than the existing building it replaces and is not for an agricultural purpose or any other type of development ordinarily compatible with stated local, London or national policy. There are precedents for extensions to residential dwellings within the Green Belt provided the extensions are not disproportionate and do not impact on the open character of the Green Belt with consideration given to the sum of internal floor area increased since July 1948 been kept to less than 50% of the original floor area of the dwelling house and any extension to not increase the ridge height of the home however these opportunities for enlargements are limited to extensions to an actual dwelling house and not to any detached outbuildings locate in the Green Belt.

The building's design shares certain visual characteristics typically found with agricultural purpose barn buildings. However in other respect it diverges significantly in design form, with its large glazed flank elevation and its domestic scale windows on the front and back elevations and a front door more reminiscent/characteristic of a residential building or a very large suburban garden outbuilding.

The general size and length of the footprint of the new building and the overall building height is significantly greater than the buildings it replaces and that of the existing retained barn to which it would conjoin. The development would significantly increase the built up appearance of the site and would impact adversely upon the open setting of the Green Belt and injure the visual amenities of the site located in Green Belt. As such, the proposal contributes to the overall built development on site and represents an inappropriate development which detracts from the openness of the site and therefore harmful to the Green Belt. It would therefore conflict with the fundamental aim of the Green Belt policies. The proposal is contrary to Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1, Policies OL1 and OL4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.16 of the London Plan Paragraph 79 and 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

IMPACT ON SETTING OF LISTED BUILDING AND UPON THE VISUAL APPEARANCE OF THE CONSERVATION AREA:

Policy BE4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states new development within or on the fringes of conservation areas will be expected to preserve or enhance those features which contribute to their special architectural and visual qualities; development should avoid the demolition or loss of such features. There will be a presumption in favour of retaining buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area. applications for planning permission should contain full details, including siting and design, or replacement buildings. applications for consent for demolition will depend upon the submission and approval of such details.

BE10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) states planning permission or listed building consent will not normally be granted for proposals which are considered detrimental to the setting of a listed building.

The new building would be single storey and located over 25 metres away from the listed

Manor House. Given these factors plus other considerations including the choice of proposed external finish materials and the scheme would deliver the removal of 2 garages of no visual/heritage merit the Conservation Team are of the opinion that the scheme in visual appearance terms is considered consistent with Policy BE4 and by reason of its general height, scale and distance from the listed Manor House would not have a detrimental impact upon the house and therefore also complies with Policy BE10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). This view is taken notwithstanding the site's visual prominence located in front of the Manor House (as one enters the site) and notwithstanding the proposed building's long footprint.

READY ADAPTION TO CONVERT INTO SEPARATE PLANNING UNIT:

The new building would have an external footprint of approximately 81 square metres. Whilst it is acknowledged some of this would be partially open to the elements and would serve as an open but covered garage it would appear difficult to resist the full enclosure of this space at a future date should this be sought since the principle of this length and scale of development would have been conceded with this planning consent should this scheme be approved. There is ample scope to provide car parking for the Manor House elsewhere on the site.

Informed by the above considerations and by the fact the site is remote and therefore future conversion would not be readily noted by third parties and given the scheme would create a well lit room alongside a separate toilet and hand sink space. The external floor area would be 48sq.m. The internal floor area would be 40 sq.m. It is considered the scheme readily lends itself, with minimal adaptation, to a separate residential unit or alternatively a commercial office/workshop unit. The proposed internal floor area would exceed the minimum residential space amenity standards as set out in the Council's HDAS New Residential Layout's SPD (of 33sq.m) and the London Plan (of 37sq.m) for a studio/1 person flat. As such the scheme is considered contrary to policies OL1, OL4, BE4, BE13, B19, BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents New Residential Layouts.

IMPACT ON ARCHAEOLOGY:

The application lies within a proposed Archaeological Priority Area. A designation that is proposed for the site and its surroundings as the wider site is situated within the medieval moated manor of Manor Farm.

The application is not accompanied by a desk top or field based archaeological assessment of the site and with no details provided of the proposed foundation details. In the absence of an archaeological evaluation of the site and measures in place to ensure minimal disturbance to potential archaeology from the building works it is considered the scheme fails to comply with Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2011) and Paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This view is shared in the written comments received from Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service.

6. **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The outbuilding would be significantly larger in length, height and overall footprint than the existing two buildings it replaces. It would not be for agricultural purpose and would share certain design characteristics more reminiscent of a domestic/suburban building than that of a farm building. As such the proposal contributes to the overall built development on site and represents an inappropriate development which detracts from the openness of the site and therefore harmful to the Green Belt. It would therefore conflict with the fundamental aims of the Green Belt policies. The proposal is contrary to Policy EM2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies OL1 and OL4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.16 of the London Plan (2011) and Paragraph 79 and 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The building is considered by reason of its size, location and facilities to be readily capable of adaptation into a separate residential unit or an independent business use and is thus tantamount to the provision of a separate planning unit where such a unit would not be accepted. It is therefore contrary to policies OL1, OL4, BE4, BE13, B19, BE23 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: HDAS: Residential Layouts

3 NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

In the absence of an archaeological assessment of the site and any details of measures including foundation details to minimise the disturbance to potential archaeology in the environs of the development the development fails to comply with Policy HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2011) and Paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (July 2011) and national guidance.

LPP 7.1 (2011) Green Belt

LPP 7.8 (2011) Heritage assets and archaeology

EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains

BE1 Development within archaeological priority areas

BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas

- BE8 Planning applications for alteration or extension of listed buildings
- BE10 Proposals detrimental to the setting of a listed building
- BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
- BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of the area.
- BE23 Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
- BE24 Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
- OL1 Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new development
- OL4 Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings
- NPPF1
- HDAS-LA Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006

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 Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) as incorporated into the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including the London Plan (July 2011) and national

Part 1 Policies:

- PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment
- PT1.HE1 (2012) Heritage

Part 2 Policies:


- LPP 7.16 (2011) Green Belt
- LPP 7.8 (2011) Heritage assets and archaeology
- EM2 (2012) Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains
- BE1 Development within archaeological priority areas
- BE4 New development within or on the fringes of conservation areas
- BE8 Planning applications for alteration or extension of listed buildings
- BE10 Proposals detrimental to the setting of a listed building
- BE13 New development must harmonise with the existing street scene.
- BE19 New development must improve or complement the character of

guidance.


	the area.
BE23	Requires the provision of adequate amenity space.
BE24	Requires new development to ensure adequate levels of privacy to neighbours.
OL1	Green Belt - acceptable open land uses and restrictions on new development
OL4	Green Belt - replacement or extension of buildings
NPPF1	
HDAS-LAY	Residential Layouts, Hillingdon Design & Access Statement, Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2006

Contact Officer: Gareth Gwynne

Telephone No: 01895 250230



Notes

 Site boundary

For identification purposes only.

This copy has been made by or with the authority of the Head of Committee Services pursuant to section 47 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (the Act).

Unless the Act provides a relevant exception to copyright.

© Crown copyright and database rights 2013 Ordnance Survey 100019283

Site Address

**Ickenham Manor House
Ickenham**

**LONDON BOROUGH
OF HILLINGDON
Residents Services**

Civic Centre, Uxbridge, Middx. UB8 1UW
 Telephone No.: Uxbridge 250111

Planning Application Ref:

32002/APP/2013/2732

Scale

1:2,000

Planning Committee

North

Date

January 2014



HILLINGDON
LONDON