



HILLINGDON

LONDON

URBAN DESIGN COMMENTS

Site Address: Tudor Lodge Hotel, 50 Field End Road, HA5 2QN
Planning ref: 4726/APP/2023/2216
Case Officer: Nesha Burnham
Design Officer: Joris van der Starre
Date of comments: 04/10/23
Proposal: Alteration to car parking layout, resurfacing and expansion of hardstanding. Installation of a sunken paving area with pergola and a standalone outbuilding for WC and store. Installation of a staff cycle shelter. Erection of a boundary fence and planting against Field End Road. Various landscape planting and paving to external pergola sitting area.

[Architect's comments 20/02/2024_comments](#)

1. Summary

The various proposals within the setting of the listed building would limit the visibility of the listed building too much and are not considered appropriate. The removal of trees, including within the TPO has not been justified. Therefore, the current application is not supported.

Objection	Comments	Conditions	Approval of Details
X	X		

2. Context and Designations

The site contains the grade II listed Tudor Lodge and a Tree Preservation Area (TPO).

The current proposals are likely to reduce the visibility of the Grade II listed Tudor Lodge, as seen from Field End Road, as well as from the Hotel parking areas. This is considered to harm the setting of the listed building and is not supported. This harm is not considered to be outweighed by significant public benefits. [JW: The proposal will only block up the view of ground floor portion \(Purple dotted line\) of the listed building as show on the FIG 1. The proposed planting will provide a softer context](#)



01 EXISTING VIEW 01
NFC 04A1



01 PROPOSED VIEW 02
NFC 04A1

FIG. 1 – Existing and proposed view from the car parking

The new white boundary permeable fencing allow greater visibility to the listed building (Fig 3), in comparison existing closed board fencing (Fig 2).



FIG. 2 – Existing boundary fencing at Field End Rd



FIG. 3 – Proposed permeable fencing at Field End Road which match the height of existing fence.

There is insufficient information regarding the trees proposed to be removed and those recently removed, but without it the current proposals are not considered acceptable. A detailed arboricultural report is required.

JW: Cantia's Arboriculture impact assessment and method statement were submitted as part of the application.




FIG. 4 – Arboriculture impact assessment and method statement by Cantia

Proposed landscape planting scheme prepare by studio Loci were submitted as part of the application. Furthermore, the landscape designer Alex Fraizer

From: Alex Frazier
 Sent: Friday, October 20, 2023 3:37 PM
 To: 'CY Projects' <CY_Projects@hotmail.com>; Nesha Burnham <NBurnham@hillingdon.gov.uk>; foisethi@gmail.com
 Subject: RE: re:4726/APP/2023/2216 & 4726/APP/2023/2218 Alteration to car parking layout, various external works

All

Regarding planting – Specifically the boundary to Field end road.

It is preferable to introduce a new *Prunus lusitanica* hedge along this boundary to aid privacy.

This will be in addition to the plan produced.

Thanks




FIG. 7 – landscape design query to case officer Nesha Burnham requesting clarity for proposed boundary planting in email on 20/10/2023. This email was forward to Niamh McMenamin on 08/02/2024 which we did not received response.

3. Pergola Area

The proposed 'pergola' is not what is normally considered a pergola; a light, open, wooden structure that would allow views and light to penetrate throughout. Instead, a large building of 11m by 11m is proposed with a solid green roof is proposed, resulting in a dark area underneath and blocking views towards the listed building. This is exacerbated by the proposed planting immediately adjacent and 2m tall ivy fences at close proximity. All these objects would reduce the visibility of the adjacent listed building and reduce the currently more open character of the setting. These elements are therefore not supported.

JW: The visibility issue has been elaborated on Fig 1. The proposed 'pergola' size has been reduced from 11 x 11m to 6.9x 6.9m, with the central area of 2.3 x 2.3m free from green roof (Fig 8). Please confirm this design is acceptable.




Fig 8 – revised pergola design

4. WC and Storage Building

The proposed wc/storage building could be acceptable in design, although further details on the materials and colours are requested.

JW: Many Thanks. The proposed materials are marked on drawing A204.




Fig 9 – WC / Storage building with material key drawing no. A204

5. Street Frontage

Recent changes have been made to the frontage, including a new white picket fence, removal of a hedge and various trees, and new planting including conifer type trees. It is unclear whether these changes benefit from planning permission. The hedge and trees along this frontage (visible in Fig.9 and removed in Fig.8 of the DAS) were within a Tree Preservation Area (TPO 801). Removal of TPO trees is generally not supported and no mitigation seems to be proposed.

JW: As part of application, we have submitted both Arboriculture impact assessment and method statement by Cantia & landscape design by Studio Loci. Those reports do not seem to have passed onto Joris van der Starre for review. As always we can provide additional info & clarification if required.

A 2m replacement fence is proposed along Field End Road, while the existing fence seems significantly lower. The existing fence seems to provide visibility of the listed building, while a 2m tall fence would not. This is not considered appropriate and not supported.

JW: The statement is misleading as the photos (Fig 2 & Fig 3) below clearly demonstrate the visibility is maintained, if not better than before. The new white boundary permeable fencing allow greater visibility to the listed building (Fig 3), in comparison existing closed board fencing (Fig 2).



FIG. 2 – Existing boundary fencing at Field End Rd



FIG. 3 – Proposed permeable fencing at Field End Road which match the height of existing fence.

6. Landscape

There is a general lack of information. It is unclear which specified plants and trees go where or what would be the colour and design of the proposed building and various fences. The landscape report does not have a map, so it is not clear where the proposed planting and reference images relate to. JW: As part of application, we have submitted both Arboriculture impact assessment and method statement by Cantia & landscape design by Studio Loci. Those reports do not seem to have passed onto Joris van der Starre for review. As always we can provide additional info & clarification if required.

Various maps and proposals and items in keys do not match each other. For instance, there are references to a POD, a gravel area and parasols, which do not seem to be proposed in the detailed plans or written descriptions anywhere. The planting reference codes on various maps refer to the landscape report but are not identified there. JW: [We will review and cross-reference the submitted info a correct manner.](#)

Apart from the already felled trees along the frontage, several more trees (at least 4) are proposed to be removed, at least one of which seems to be within the TPO area. There is no arboricultural report detailing the existing trees, nor confirming the total number and quality, value and mitigation measures. Therefore, the proposals are not supported.

JW: [As part of application, we have submitted both Arboriculture impact assessment and method statement by Cantia & landscape design by Studio Loci. Those reports do not seem to have passed onto Joris van der Starre for review. As always we can provide additional info & clarification if required.](#)