



APPEAL STATEMENT

Consilio

AGAINST THE DECISION OF LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON TO REFUSE
PLANNING PERMISSION FOR:

‘Part Erection of a replacement dwellinghouse with associated car parking and
landscaping, following demolition of the existing bungalow’
(REF: 14459/APP/2021/1343)

AT: 29 Parkfield Road, Ickenham, UB10 8LN

PREPARED BY: HARMEET S MINHAS MRTPI

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0	SITE AND SURROUNDINGS.....	3
3.0	PLANNING HISTORY.....	5
4.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.....	6
5.0	PLANNING POLICY.....	6
6.0	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
7.0	CONCLUSION.....	13

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 These Grounds of Appeal have been submitted in support of an appeal against London Borough of Hillingdon's decision to refuse planning permission for the **'erection of a replacement dwelling house with associated car parking and landscaping, following demolition of the existing bungalow'**, at **29 Parkfield Road, Ickenham** (Ref 14459/APP/2021/1343).
- 1.2 The Council's decision notice cited one reason for refusal, as:
- **The proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the adjoining properties and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan; Part Two- Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 130 and 131 of the NPPF (2019).**

Pre-Application Submission

- 1.3 In December 2020, prior to purchasing the property, the appellant's sought paid pre-application advice from the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- 1.4 As part of the submission the appellant's provided detailed planning drawings, site photos and a detailed planning note which set out the recent planning history of the site as well as appeal decisions which they considered to be material to any subsequent assessment.
- 1.5 As part of the paid service the planning officer carried out an assessment of the street scene and provided detailed written advice. A copy of the pre-application submission is provided within Appendix A of the associated appendices. A copy of the Council's written response is provided within Appendix B.
- 1.6 As part of the officer's assessment of the plans provided as part of the pre-application, consideration was given to the Development Plan as well as the London Plan and NPPF (2019). The policies against which the drawings were considered are listed within the written response.
- 1.7 Para 2 of the written response lays out the expectation of Policies BE1 (2010) and DMHB 11 (2020) with relation to good design and harmonising with the local context. The written pre-app response was explicit that the Council would have regard to scale

which considers height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures as well as established street patterns, building lines and streetscape rhythm.

- 1.8 The planning officer assessed the street scene to be a mixture of bungalows and two storey properties, stating that the proposed two-storey dwelling would not itself appear out of place. Furthermore, the officer concluded that the design presented would maintain features readily apparent in other parts of the street, although concern was raised in relation to the height of the building originally posed at 8.9m.
- 1.9 Subsequent correspondence between the appellant and planning officer led to the recommendation from officers that the height be reduced from 8.9m to 8.5m to be more akin to other development within the vicinity which had recently been approved. The officer also noted the introduction of a crown to reduce the height may be acceptable as it's a feature on other dwellings within the street scene. A copy of this correspondence between both parties' forms part of Appendix C.
- 1.10 The correspondence (Appendix C) also makes reference to the final report being signed-off by a Senior Manager as well as a telecom conversation between the case officer and appellant. This positive engagement with the Council provided the appellant with some comfort that the Council advice was favourable towards the scheme and to proceed with the purchase of the property.
- 1.11 Following receipt of the written response, the appellant purchased the property and subsequently submitted a planning application for a replacement dwelling. The revised design reduced the height of the dwelling in line with officer comments and that concern which was laid out within the pre-app response.

Amended Plans

- 1.12 Following the submission of plans and associated information to the Council, the application was validated under application reference 14459/APP/2021/1343.
- 1.13 Towards the end of the statutory 8-week deadline date, correspondence was received by the agent, from officers, that they had concerns over the proposed design submitted.
- 1.14 Following a telecom with the case officer, they flagged that they would now no longer be affording any weight to the pre-application advice offered as they did not agree with it. In turn, they suggested that the appellant revise their scheme accordingly to wholly reflect the design and appearance of No.31 Parkfield Road. The officer further stated that they would only consider a significant reduction in the scale of the property appropriate in this location and that the assessment had been made between No.27, 29 and 31 Parkfield Road, not the wider area.

- 1.15 The appellant and planning agent re-submitted appeal decisions and delegated reports from previous development along the road which identified key features Parkfield Road as a whole, which clearly established the design position from Inspectors and officers.
- 1.16 The case officer and team leader chose not to give any weighting to the appeal decisions and/or the pre-app response. In light of this the appellant provided amended plans which they considered would overcome the basis of the council's concerns. The appellant significantly reduced the height of the dwelling which in turn reduced the bulk, mass and scale of the development. In support of the changes the appellant provided a detailed street scene drawing which positions the dwelling between its respective neighbours. However, the Council subsequently refused these amended plans which are listed in the decision notice.
- 1.17 For the Inspector's ease, a list of plans has been provided which lays out the plans originally submitted with the application and those which were submitted as amended plans (referred to in the decision notice).
- 1.18 *As is the appellant's prerogative, this appeal is submitted under Section 78 (Section 2) of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990).***

Key Matters

- 1.19 Within this appeal submission, we will address the reason for refusal and issues raised by the Council in the Officer's report. We identify the following key issues for consideration in this appeal are:
- Whether the proposal design of the dwelling would appear at odds with the character and appearance of the street scene and wider area.

2.0 APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The appeal site is located on the western side of Parkfield Road, Ickenham within the residential area of the London Borough of Hillingdon. The dwelling itself is a detached bungalow which has benefitted from additions/alterations including a single storey side addition which abuts the common boundary with No.27 Parkfield Road. Plot sizes are varied on the street and the appeal site sits on a wider plot compared to others on the road.
- 2.2 The immediate area is made up of predominantly single storey and two-storey dwellings. Dwellings within the setting do not have a prevailing architectural type or vernacular which is owing to recent development within the area, such as replacement dwellings and roof alterations.

- 2.3 Recent planning decisions which are material to the assessment of this appeal, and later referenced in this statement refer to the character of the road heavily. Under application 20899/APP/2016/2376 (54 Parkfield Road- Appendix E) the planning officer stated that:

'The existing street scene is varied comprising one, one and a half and two storey dwellings of varying design. The proposed dwellings have been designed to reflect various features within the street scene and have a hipped roof design with front and rear projections and a catslide feature to the front including a rear dormer window. In order to minimise the height and bulk of the proposed the roofs are finished with a small crown. Ordinarily this would be considered unacceptable, however it is noted that no.58 has been previously extended with the addition of a first floor. This was approved at appeal (APP/R5510/A/08/2077613) where the Inspector considered that 'the design of the proposal itself seems to have been thought through to fit into the street scene and to minimise the bulk of the resulting building and I do not think the flat roof element would stand out.'

- 2.4 A recent development at 2 Parkfield Road, Ickenham was granted permission at appeal under reference APP/R5510/W/19/3241390 for two dwellings (Appendix F). The Inspector assessed the street scene to be characterised as follows:

'Further down the street the number of two storey houses increases, some of which are much larger than surrounding properties and again there is no uniformity in style. Gaps between frontages are generous and combined with large rear gardens, this gives the area a spacious character. Parkfield Road opens on to a busy, predominantly commercial road and the backdrop to the site is that of notably higher buildings, including blocks of flats.'

'The proposals harmonise with the local context because they are within the envelope of height, mass and bulk already established by housing along the street.'

- 2.5 The site falls within the developed area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan. The site is not within a Conservation Area or statutorily or locally listed.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 The appeal site benefits from limited relevant planning history. The following applications are considered relevant to the appeal site and are referenced during the course of this appeal statement:

25734/APP/2008/491 – Erection of a first floor to form a 4-bedroom dwelling house and the conversion of the existing garage to habitable use. **Allowed at appeal (APP/R5510/A/08/2077613/WF)**

20899/APP/2016/2376 – Two x 2 storey dwellings with habitable roofspace, outbuildings to rear, installation of vehicular crossover to front and associated landscaping works, involving demolition of existing bungalow) **Allowed at appeal (APP/R5510/W/17/3192388)**

20899/APP/2017/3842 - Raising of roof to create first floor level, conversion of new roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, conversion of garage to habitable use and alterations to elevations **Approved**

74249/APP/2019/2423 – Erection of 2 x 3 bed, two storey semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space and installation of a vehicular crossover, involving demolition of the existing bungalow **Allowed at appeal (APP/R5510/W/19/3241390)**

20899/APP/2020/2472 - Variation of conditions 1 (Approved Plans) of planning permission Ref: 20899/APP/2020/1546 (Two x 2-storey dwellings with habitable roof space, outbuildings to rear, installation of vehicular crossover to front and associated landscaping works, involving demolition of existing bungalow) to allow for better use of space and amenity **Approved**

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 This appeal seeks planning permission for the erection of a detached two-storey dwelling house incorporating landscaping. The dwelling has been carefully designed to respect its neighbouring properties as well as that of the established character of the street scene.
- 4.2 The proposal would see the demolition of an existing bungalow with a dwelling approx. 8m in height, 14m in width at ground floor level and 14.3m in depth. The flank walls of the proposed dwelling will not be any closer to the shared boundary of No.27 & No.31 and maintain the building line of the existing bungalow.
- 4.3 As part of the proposal a detailed landscaping scheme was submitted which lays out features to be retained/removed and introduced into the site. Notably the largest introduction of soft landscaping features was to the front driveway to soften the appearance of the proposal. In addition, a minimum of 2 parking spaces can be achieved within the front driveway to serve the dwelling.
- 4.4 The appellant proposes the use of brick and concrete tiles as the facing finish to the dwelling. However, for matters such as these the appellant considers they were best suited to pre-commencement conditions to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

5.0 PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy

- 5.1 The Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework in 2019. The NPPF which is the overarching planning document in England, continues to seek to secure positive growth in a way that effectively balances economic, environmental, and social progress for this and future generations.
- 5.2 The NPPF (2019) attaches importance to the design of the built environment, which is seen as a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning, that should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- 5.3 Chapter 12 of the NPPF (2019) reiterates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. It then states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments.

- 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.

- Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout, and appropriate and effective landscaping.
- 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).
- 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.
- 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
- 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.

Local Planning Policy

- 5.4 Sitting underneath the NPPF is the London Plan (2021), The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2020), The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) and Supplementary Planning Documents.

London Plan (2021)

- D6 - Housing quality and standards
- SI2 - Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
- HC1 - Heritage conservation and growth
- T6 - Car parking

Development Management Policies

- PT1.BE1 – (2012) Build Environment
- DMHB 11 – Design of New Development

- DMT 2 – Highways Impact
- DMT 6 – Vehicle Parking
- DMTC 3 - Maintaining the Viability of Local Centres and Local Parades

The above documents are, therefore, material considerations in the determination of this appeal.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Reason for Refusal One

Character and Appearance

- 6.1 The Council's sole reason for refusal stems around the size, scale, bulk and design of the dwelling when viewed within the immediate and wider setting of Parkfield Road. The appellants will seek to demonstrate that the Council's assessment is flawed and inconsistent but has also failed to give adequate, or any weighting, to appeal decisions/recent approvals which were material matters to the consideration of the application and this appeal.
- 6.2 The Council is also silent on the fact that the Council has given no weight to the advice and recommendations of the pre-application report, which in detail assessed the proposal against the very same planning policies and guidance which the Council has now refused upon.
- 6.3 Prior to laying out the appellants grounds, it is considered appropriate to highlight key comments from the delegated officers report which lay out the concerns of the authority. Para 10 of section 7 of the report states:
- 'Whilst the wider street scene of Parkfield Road is characterised by a variety of architectural styles, this part of Parkfield Road comprises a distinct pattern of development and within this context, the replacement dwelling house due to its size, scale and design fails to transition appropriately between the bungalow at No. 27 and the property at No. 31. The proposed development has failed to have regard to the local context and fails to harmonise with the local context.'*
- 6.4 Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan; Part Two- Development Management Policies (2020) states the importance of good design in new development, in particular by having regard to local context with relation to scale, height, mass and bulk of surrounding buildings amongst other factors.

- 6.5 The officers report is not clear as to the established character of the area, instead glazing over the character assessment and limiting it to 'being a variety of architectural styles', but then suggesting that the setting of the appeal site was more distinct.
- 6.6 As previously highlighted, Parkfield Road has been the subject of significant development over the past 5/6 years with a number of replacement dwellings and developments. A handful of these schemes were the subject of appeal decisions upon which they were allowed. Inspectors summarise the setting of Parkfield Road as below (copies of these appeal decisions form part of the associated appendices):
- *'The Council accept the road is a mixture of bungalows and two storey houses and the provision of the first floor is not itself out of place. I would agree and I saw on my visit that there were a number of taller houses. Some appeared to be purpose built two storey dwellings and others seemed to be conversions of existing bungalows. I do not think the proposed conversion would be out of place. No. 60 to the north has a large roof extension and so would not be excessively dominated by its new larger neighbour. To the south are a number of smaller bungalows, but the juxtaposition of two storey houses with bungalows is not unusual in the road.'* (Appeal Ref; APP/R5510/A/08/2077613 – 58 Parkfield Road)
 - *'The site is close to the entrance of a long, flat cul-de-sac, at this end comprising mainly detached bungalows of no consistent style or finishing material. I observed during the site visit that many incorporated significant extensions and alterations, including roof conversions. The next-door bungalow is semi-detached (No 2A and No 4) and has had the roof raised to the same height as that of the current proposal. Further down the street the number of two storey houses increases, some of which are much larger than surrounding properties and again there is no uniformity in style. Gaps between frontages are generous and combined with large rear gardens, this gives the area a spacious character. Parkfield Road opens on to a busy, predominantly commercial road and the backdrop to the site is that of notably higher buildings, including blocks of flats. The bungalow is the first house on this side of the road and as such makes a moderate contribution to setting the character for the area.'* – (Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3241390-2 Parkfield Road)
- 6.7 The local authority granted permission for 'Raising of roof to create first floor level, conversion of new roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, conversion of garage to habitable use and alterations to elevations', at 54 Parkfield Road under delegated powers. The case officer referenced within the appeal decision at 58 Parkfield Road, as part of their assessment of the character of the street scene. An extract from the delegated officers report is laid out below:

- *'The proposed first floor extension sits above the main body of the original dwelling and part of the rear extensions, retaining a 3.2 m deep single storey element at the rear and converting the single storey garage at the side, set beneath a flat roof of 2.9 m in height. The proposal would increase the height of the building by 2.4 m to a maximum of 8 m, with a hipped roof detail which is reflective of other two storey properties within the street scene. It is noted that no. 58 has previously been extended with the addition of a first floor. This was approved at appeal (APP/R5510/A/08/2077613) where the Inspector considered that "the road is a mixture of bungalows and two storey houses, and the provision of the first floor is not in itself out of place". He further advised that "the juxtaposition of two storey houses with bungalows is not unusual in the road." The proposal does not increase the footprint of the dwelling and although it is acknowledged that this is a large addition to the existing property, the reduction in height of the single storey side and rear elements move the bulk of the dwelling away from the side boundary to the centre of the large plot. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not detract from the architectural integrity of the original house or the wider area. As such it is considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and HDAS: Residential Extensions.'*

6.8 In addition, following the appeal decision the local authority granted permission for a further enlargement of the roof and crown element 'Variation of conditions 1 (Approved Plans) of planning permission Ref: 20899/APP/2020/1546 (Two x 2-storey dwellings with habitable roof space, outbuildings to rear, installation of vehicular crossover to front and associated landscaping works, involving demolition of existing bungalow) to allow for better use of space and amenity' at 54 Parkfield Road under delegated powers which were deemed acceptable within the street scene. Extracts from the delegated officers report is laid out below:

- *'The application site is a large sized plot, located on the north eastern side of Parkfield Road. It currently comprises a large detached 4 bed bungalow with an attached garage to one side and an additional parking space in front. There is also another driveway to the other side of the property. It benefits from a good sized rear garden. To either side there are detached bungalows however the general street scene is made up from a mixture of house types and styles including bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings.'*
- *'It is considered that the proposed alterations are relatively minor and would respect the character and appearance of the approved building. There would be no additional impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would provide adequate living accommodation, amenity space and parking.'* - (App Ref: 20899/APP/2020/2472 - 54 Parkfield Road)

- 6.9 Having regard to the above, the appellant considers that the Council's assessment of the setting is truly unrepresentative or have any regard to previous appeal decisions. Dwellings along the eastern side of Parkfield Road, within which the appeal property is nestled, are varied in their architectural style. This is not only limited to their fenestration, use of materials but also their bulk, massing and general scale.
- 6.10 A number of bungalows along this side of Parkfield Road have increased ridges through the introduction of roof extensions/alterations, dormer windows and first floor extensions. There is limited cohesion or uniformity in the bulk, size or scale of dwellings within this part of the road. This is none more prevalent than when the appeal property is viewed between its respective neighbouring dwellings, No.27 and No.31 Parkfield Road. No.27 benefits from a more modest roof profile with No.31 having a significantly higher ridge height than No.27 and No.29. The transitions between the eaves and ridge heights of these do not appear at odds with the general vernacular. This row of three properties is one of numerous examples where varying architectural styles, ridge heights and roof profiles harmonise within the street scene.
- 6.11 The variation highlighted above is also reconfirmed within the Inspectors comments with regard to appeal reference Appeal Ref; APP/R5510/A/08/2077613 – 58 Parkfield Road)
- *The Council accept the road is a mixture of bungalows and two storey houses and the provision of the first floor is not itself out of place. I would agree and I saw on my visit that there were a number of taller houses. Some appeared to be purpose built two storey dwellings and others seemed to be conversions of existing bungalows.*
- 6.12 It is apparent the existing street scene is extremely varied. The aerial photograph and photographs produced at Appendix D illustrates the location of the site, varied roof forms and the diversity in architecture.
- 6.13 In developing the originally submitted scheme to the Council, also the subject of the pre-app, the appellant had regard to these appeal decisions as well as the appearance of their neighbouring properties. However, the Council have made their decision on the revised, reduced scheme and as such it is considered appropriate to consider that scheme against our assessment of the street scene and its subsequent suitability.
- 6.14 The plans which were listed on the associated decision notice show a two-storey dwelling house. There is no policy objection from the Council to the principle of a replacement dwelling or a two-storey dwelling. The roof profile incorporates a small flat crown with hipped profiles on all four sides.
- 6.15 The Council's decision notice states that it is the architectural form of the dwelling that would appear at odds with the street scene. It is considered that the appellant as

well as decision makers are in agreement that the street scene is varied, and there are various examples where two-storey dwellings and chalet bungalows, as well as more modest bungalows can sit adjacent one another without visually clashing.

- 6.16 The replacement dwelling has been carefully designed to respect the proportions of the plot and the general suburban setting of the area. This is maintained through retaining good visual gaps beyond the property, open frontages with landscaped areas as well as its mix of materials.
- 6.17 The symmetrical appearance of the front elevation with protruding bay windows has taken its design derivative from a number of other dwellings, of varying size and scale, within the street scene. Bay windows are not alien fenestration forms within the setting and add character to the dwelling that may otherwise be amiss, had the design incorporated a bland, flat frontage.
- 6.18 The proposed pitched roof with its apex would be of similar height as the neighbouring dwelling, No.31, with the pitch being shallower and less obtrusive when viewed from the public highway than other similar forms of development. The proposed street scene drawing depicts how the dwelling would sit between the adjoining dwellings, and it is evident that it would not visually appear prouder or out of context than has been suggested by the Council in their decision notice.
- 6.19 The design of the dwelling would sit easily beside the neighbouring buildings. The characteristic visual gap between the progressive eaves and ridge heights of the dwellings would not diminish the character of the area. It is our opinion that the dwelling by virtue of its size, scale and general architectural features would harmonise with the neighbouring dwellings, and wider street scene.
- 6.20 As part of the proposed re-development of the site, the applicant has provided a detailed landscaping scheme. The enhancements to the landscaping scheme would improve the existing arrangement which is largely laid to hard surface with limited scope for further planting. This landscaping scheme when considered in hand with the retained open driveway and frontage would ensure the development would maintain the intrinsic features of the street scene, previously laid out.
- 6.21 The Council raised no concerns with relation to parking provision, impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties, flood risk or landscaping matters. As such, these are considered to be common ground between both parties.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that the appellant has worked proactively to deliver a scheme that satisfactorily harmonises within the immediate setting and wider street scene. An appeal has been made as a last resort.
- 7.2 Furthermore, by virtue of the timeline of events and referenced correspondence from pre-application stage to the formal refusal, the appellant has demonstrated the inconsistent assessment and advice offered by the Council. It would appear that the objection is based very much on subjective officer opinion, rather than an objective assessment having been made against the relevant planning policies and guidance, as well as any material appeal decisions.
- 7.3 It is therefore concluded, in respect of these issues raised, that the proposed development would be of a design and appearance that would harmonise with the character of the Parkfield Road, and not appear at odds nestled between the adjoining properties.
- 7.4 Overall, the proposal satisfies the context of the NPPF, the London Plan, Development Management Policies and supporting Supplementary Planning Documents.
- 7.5 In light of the above, we respectfully request the Inspector allows the appeal, subject to any planning conditions they considered appropriate to the development.