



Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 78 Planning Appeal

London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

Appeal By:
Mr Juchau

Proposal:
Erection of a detached 7 bed dwelling with basement and habitable roof space to include 4 rear dormers including demolition of existing dwelling, replacement new wrought iron gates and piers and removal of the front boundary brick walls

Appeal Site:
18 Linksway, Northwood

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

APP/R5510/W/21/3274769
2695/APP/2021/466

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 detached 7 bed dwelling with a basement and habitable roof space to include 4 rear dormers including demolition of the existing dwelling, replacement new wrought iron gates and piers and removal of the front boundary brick walls.

1.2 The LPA refused planning permission on 12th April 2021 for the following reason:

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, size, scale and design, would fail to harmonise with the character and architectural composition of the original property and the historic character of the Copse Wood Estate, appearing as an overly large, incongruous and cramped form of development which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character, contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

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.

1.4 This statement will not repeat the delegated report and will focus on addressing matters raised in the Appellant's statement of case.

2. LPA Comments on Appellant's Statement of Case

2.1 Paragraph 1.11 of the Appellant's Statement claims that the appeal proposal is almost identical in size to the previous scheme (2695/APP/2016/79) with no increase to the main ridge height. The Council does not fully agree with this statement. Whilst it is noted that the ridge height and width of the appeal proposal is similar to that of the previous scheme, the overall size, volume and massing of the development is substantially greater.

2.2 The previous scheme was deliberately designed with the first-floor level of the building being set-back from the front and rear ground floor building lines. Thus, achieving a well-balanced and proportionate form of development. However, this appeal proposal fundamentally increases the overall massing and volume of the proposed dwelling to such a significant extent that it would appear as an imposing and highly conspicuous form of development when viewed from the street scene.

2.3 Whilst it is appreciated that replacement dwellings have been constructed over the recent years on Linksway and within the wider Copse Wood Estate ASLC, none of

which are to the magnitude of that currently being proposed, in terms of size, scale, volume and massing. It is therefore considered that the appeal proposal would have a negative impact to the street scene, and the overall setting of the Copse Wood Estate ASLC.

- 2.4 Section 3 of the Appellant's Statement refers to the Appeal Decisions relating to 3 The Broadwalk, 36 Linksway and 20 Linksway. The schemes that were considered under these respective appeals are not directly comparable to the subject appeal proposal, in terms of size, scale and architectural style. It is therefore considered that these Appeals carry very limited weight, and that each planning application should be assessed on its own individual merits. It is also important to note that the Council has adopted a new Local Plan since the determination of these appeals, which specifically includes Policy DMHB 6 which states that new houses in the Copse Wood Estate should be of a similar scale, form and proportion as adjacent houses and reflect the materials, traditional roof design, design features and architectural style predominant in the area (emphasis added).
- 2.4 In terms of design, the Council does not share the Appellant's position that the proposed dwelling would be of a 'traditional neo-Georgian design'. Whilst some design cues have been drawn from neo-Georgian architecture, the building fails to truly invoke the principles of Georgian architecture (as highlighted by the Council's Conservation Officer). Instead, the appearance of the building is somewhat confused and comprises features from various architectural periods. This is evident by the Victorian style sash windows, full height Tuscan style columns, and the large pediment at roof level.
- 2.5 The Council is of the view that the design of the proposed dwelling lacks cohesion and would appear as an incongruous and jarring form of development within the surrounding street scape on Linksway. The proposed render finish would also make the dwelling much more visible and prominent, which adds further weight to the unacceptability of the appeal proposal.
- 2.5 It is not disputed that there are properties of a neo-Georgian inspired design on Linksway. However, unlike the appeal proposal, these neighbouring properties have a more subtle and traditional appearance. As stated above, these neighbouring properties are not comparable to the massing and volume of the proposed development being considered in this Appeal.
- 2.6 Similarly, it is also acknowledged that there are properties on Linksway that are externally finished in render. However, the Council considers that it is the combination of the size, massing and volume of the proposed dwelling, together with its jarring design and choice of external finishes, which would cause significant harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the setting of the Copse Wood Estate ALSC.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 For the reasons set out in the delegated report and this statement it is considered that the Appeal proposal would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF. 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