



Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 78 Planning Appeal

London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

Appeal By:

Mr and Mrs Miah

Proposal:

Erection of a replacement dwellinghouse with associated car parking and landscaping,
following demolition of the existing bungalow

Appeal Site:

29 Parkfield Road, Ickenham, UB10 8LN

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

14459/APP/2021/1343
APP/R5510/W/21/3278249

1. Introduction

1.1 This appeal statement is submitted by the London Borough of Hillingdon, as the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in respect of the appeal against its refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of a replacement dwellinghouse with associated car parking and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing bungalow.

1.2 The LPA refused planning permission on 27.05.2021 for the following reason (as stated on the decision notice):

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 the 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).

1.3 The LPA's case is set out in the Planning Officer's delegated report, which should be read in conjunction with this statement. A copy of the delegated report is provided at Appendix 1. Copies of relevant planning policies are included at Appendix 2.

1.4 This statement will not repeat the delegated report and will focus on addressing matters raised in the Appellant's statement of case. An overview of the relevant NPPF paragraphs which was adopted since the Application was decided will also be provided.

2. National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)

2.1 The latest version of the NPPF was adopted in July 2021. The relevant paragraphs that apply to this Appeal are set out below.

- Paragraph 126 notes that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
- Paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2021) notes planning decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. It requires decision to ensure developments 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.
- Paragraph 134 of the NPPF notes Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

3. LPA Comments on Appellant's Statement of Case

3.1 In paragraphs 1.3 to 1.11, the Appellant sets out details of the pre-application process and advice which resulted in the Appellant purchasing the current property. However, Officers note, pre-application advice constitutes the informal opinion of an officer of the Council based on the information submitted, and does not prejudice any decision the Council might make subsequently following the submission of a formal planning application where other issues may come to light including responses received as part of the consultation process. The LPA considers that there were sound reasons for refusing the application. Clearly concerns were raised relating to height and scale of the building during the pre-application process. There is

no record of further verbal conversation with Officers which provided assurance that the proposal would be viewed positively. The only record on file is the written response which raises concerns relating to the scale and height of the proposed dwellinghouse. When the application was submitted, due weight was given to the pre-application advice issued, however a full assessment was undertaken against the Development Plan and a decision was made considering all material planning considerations.

- 3.2 The Appellant states at paragraph 1.13 that correspondence was received towards the end of the 8-week process. This is not accurate as correspondence was sent on 04.05.2021 which was well within the 8-week process to allow the Appellant to consider the amendments sought. Officers disagree with the assertions at paragraph 1.14 that Officers simply disregarded the pre-application advice given. Instead, Officers noted the pre-application advice was considered alongside all other relevant material planning considerations.
- 3.3 In paragraphs 1.15 and 1.16, the Appellant makes reference to the Appeal decision for No. 2 Parkfield Road alleging that the LPA failed to give weight to the decision which the Appellant suggests established a design position. The LPA strongly disagrees with the assertions made by the Appellant. The LPA had considered the Appeal decision, however each application should be considered on its merits. Notwithstanding the Appeal decision, the proposal was considered inappropriate within the site's context. The Appellant asserts that the height of the proposal was significantly reduced which is not the case. The height was reduced from 8.5m to 8.1m and because of the amendment, the proposal introduced a crown roof which would be incongruous within the streetscene within the site's context.
- 3.4 Reference is made to the Appeal decision at No. 2 Parkfield Road, however the Appeal site sits within a very different context to No. 2 Parkfield Road, there is an established pattern of development along this part of Parkfield Road which comprises modest detached and semi-detached bungalows, interspersed with a small number of chalet bungalows and a few detached houses. Within this particular context the proposal was considered inappropriate. In their determination of providing a full sized 2.5-storey dwellinghouse, the Appellant has failed to consider the immediate context and instead draws upon examples of properties allowed that would be inappropriate within the site's context. The properties between Nos 1 and 37 Parkfield Road are bungalows or 1.5 storey chalet bungalows, whilst the architectural details of the properties vary, this part of Parkfield Road comprises an established pattern of development. The 2.5 storey replacement dwellinghouse proposed would clearly out of keeping in this context. This was clearly expressed to the Appellant in an email dated 12.05.2021.
- 3.5 The Appellant suggests that Parkfield Road has been subject to 'significant development over the last 6 years' referring to the decisions at Nos. 2, 54 and 58 Parkfield Road which should be seen as a precedent for the current proposal. However, Nos 2 and 58 Parkfield Road sit closer to the end of the roads and No. 54 Parkfield Road has a much wider plot which have a different context to the Appeal site. As the Inspector noted in their decision that No. 2 Parkfield is set towards the end of Parkfield Road which opens up onto a busy, predominantly commercial road. They do not relate to the character of the road in the same way that the Appeal site does, in that No 29 is part of a long unbroken row of bungalows/chalet bungalows which are highly visible and which effectively establish the fundamental character of the road from its junction with High Road. Whilst properties have been extended, the replacement of a bungalow with a 2.5 storey dwellinghouse of the scale and depth proposed would look incongruous in the site's setting. The Appellant's assertion that the LPA's assessment of the application of the setting as 'truly unrepresentative' is disingenuous. Appeals have also been dismissed at other properties on Parkfield Road in recent years which the Appellant has not considered.

- 3.6 The replacement dwelling is not of a beautiful or innovative design. Contrary to the Appellant's assertions in their statement of case, the proposed replacement dwelling is bland, box like and squat in appearance. It is not positioned symmetrically within the plot, rather it is built up largely against the boundary with No. 31 and the gap retained between the proposed footprint and No. 31 at 1m, is minimal and no gap is created with the property at No. 27. The large roof form over the projecting bay windows appear at odds with and diminish the appearance of the bay windows. The materials for the windows and doors appear to be inconsistent, the Appellant is proposing white UPVC on the front elevation and grey aluminium doors to the rear. The proposal seeks to provide white UPVC windows which are not of a high quality and would not provide a beautiful as advocated by the NPPF (2021) instead the proposal would be unsightly and violate the existing context in which it would be built.
- 3.7 The proposed roof form includes a hipped roof with a crown roof element which would copy a detrimental roof forms within the area. The proposal would be both large in scale and height compared to the neighbouring properties. The crown roof element would be evident within the streetscene which would exacerbate its scale and bulk.
- 3.8 An indicative landscaping plan is provided however further details are required by way of a condition, especially given the plans remains inconsistent with the proposed site plan which illustrate 3 cars parked across the drive.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 For the reasons set out in the delegated report and this statement the proposed replacement dwellinghouse would be of an inappropriate size, scale and depth that would result in it appearing bulky and out of character with its surroundings which, along almost the whole of the south-eastern end of the road, comprises relatively small, low bungalows or chalet bungalows. The replacement dwellinghouse would become an over-dominant feature in the street scene. The proposal would fail to harmonise both with the street scene and with the scale, form, architectural composition in the immediate local context. It would not complement or improve the character of the area 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 126, 130 and 134 of the NPPF (2021). The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.
- 4.2 In the event that the Inspector considers the appeal should be allowed, and without prejudice to the Council's case, a list of recommended planning conditions is included at Appendix 2.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Planning Officer's Delegated Report

Appendix 2 – The LPA's Recommended Conditions