

18 LINKSWAY, NORTHWOOD

Written Statement

NP12099
Written Statement

11 May 2021

REPORT

Document Status

Version	Purpose of document	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date
Dv2		Richard Boother	Richard Boother	Richard Boother	
FINAL		Richard Boother	Richard Boother	Richard Boother	

Approval for issue

Richard Boother



2021-05-11

This report was prepared by **RPS Consulting Services Ltd** ('RPS') within the terms of its engagement and in direct response to a scope of services. This report is strictly limited to the purpose and the facts and matters stated in it and does not apply directly or indirectly and must not be used for any other application, purpose, use or matter. In preparing the report, RPS may have relied upon information provided to it at the time by other parties. RPS accepts no responsibility as to the accuracy or completeness of information provided by those parties at the time of preparing the report. The report does not take into account any changes in information that may have occurred since the publication of the report. If the information relied upon is subsequently determined to be false, inaccurate or incomplete then it is possible that the observations and conclusions expressed in the report may have changed. RPS does not warrant the contents of this report and shall not assume any responsibility or liability for loss whatsoever to any third party caused by, related to or arising out of any use or reliance on the report howsoever. No part of this report, its attachments or appendices may be reproduced by any process without the written consent of RPS. All enquiries should be directed to RPS.

Prepared by:

Prepared for:

RPS Consulting Services Ltd

Mr & Mrs T Osazee

Richard Boother
Associate Director

20 Western Avenue, Milton Park
Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 4SH

18, Linksway, Northwood
HA6 2XB

T 01235 821888
E bootherr@rpsgroup.com

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT.....	3
3	CASE FOR THE APPELLANTS	5
4	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	13

Appendices

APPENDIX 1 PLANNING APPLICATION 2695/APP/2021/466
APPENDIX 2 DECISION NOTICE 2695/APP/2021/466
APPENDIX 3 PLANNING APPLICATION 2695/APP/2016/79
APPENDIX 4 DECISION NOTICE 2695/APP/2016/79
APPENDIX 5 OFFICER REPORT 2695/APP/2016/79
APPENDIX 6 OFFICER REPORT 2695/APP/2021/466
APPENDIX 7 RELEVANT EXTRACTS OF LOCAL PLAN: PART 1 STRATEGIC POLICIES
APPENDIX 8 RELEVANT EXTRACTS OF LOCAL PLAN PART 2: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES AND SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DESIGNATIONS
APPENDIX 9 RELEVANT EXTRACT OF THE LONDON PLAN
APPENDIX 10 CURRENT NEW BUILDS IN COPSE WOOD ESTATE,
APPENDIX 11 RECENT NEW BUILDS IN COPSE WOOD ESTATE
APPENDIX 12 RELEVANT APPEALS IN COPSE WOOD ESTATE
APPENDIX 13A ELEVATIONS 3 THE BROADWALK (18252/APP/2016/3600)
APPENDIX 13B DECISION NOTICE 18252/APP/2016/3600
APPENDIX 13C APPEAL DECISION APP/R5510/W/17/3173350
APPENDIX 14A ELEVATIONS 36 LINKSWAY (44603/APP/2013/960)
APPENDIX 14B DECISION NOTICE (44603/APP/2013/960)
APPENDIX 14C APPEAL DECISION APP/R5510/A/13/2201434
APPENDIX 15A ELEVATIONS 20 LINKSWAY (2203/APP/2012/585)
APPENDIX 15B DECISION NOTICE 2203/APP/2012/585
APPENDIX 15C APPEAL DECISION APP/R5510/A/12/2183821
APPENDIX 15D DECISION NOTICE 2203/APP/2013/1820
APPENDIX 16 RELEVANT EXTRACTS OF THE 2007 SAVED UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN ADOPTED AS THE HILLINGDON LOCAL PLAN: PART TWO

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 RPS has been instructed by Mr & Mrs T Osazee ('the Appellant') to appeal against the refusal by London Borough of Hillingdon ('the Council') of an application for planning permission for the 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, at 18 Linksway, Northwood, HA6 2XB (2695/APP/2021/466 refers) (**Appendix 1**).
- 1.2 The application was refused by notice dated 12 April 2021 (**Appendix 2**) for the following reasons:
- "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.2*
- 1.3 This written statement sets out the Appellant's full statement of case. The remainder of this section describes the location of the site, provides a description of the proposed development and explains the background to the appeal. Section 2 explains the planning policy context of the proposed development. Section 3 sets out the case for the Appellant. Section 4 is a summary of and conclusion to this written statement.

Site Location and Description

- 1.4 The application site is located on the western side of Linksway, approximately 950m to the south west of Northwood Town Centre, and currently supports one detached house, garage, swimming pool and private amenity area. ('the Appeal Site').
- 1.5 Linksway is a quiet unclassified road within the Copse Wood Estate ('the Estate') that is accessed from Northgate or Copse Wood Way and consists of large detached residential properties set back from the fronting road. Rectangular in shape (approx. 36m wide x 90m deep), the site extends to an area of 0.327 hectares, and is one of the largest plots and frontages on Linksway, and the Copse Wood Estate as a whole.
- 1.6 The existing detached house has limited architectural merit and in need of major repair and renovation.

Appeal Proposal ('the proposed scheme'/'the appeal proposal')

- 1.7 As noted above, the application the subject of this appeal seeks planning consent for the 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.

Planning History and Background to the Appeal

- 1.8 The original property appears to date back to the 1930s.
- 1.9 Planning permission was granted in 2015 for a two storey, 5-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, basement and associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling house demolition of existing detached dwelling house (2695/APP/2015/3496 refers).
- 1.10 A further application for a two storey, 4-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roof space, basement and associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling house was approved in January 2016 (2695/APP/2016/79 refers) ('the previous scheme'). The approved plans, decision notice and Officer's report are attached at **Appendices 3, 4 and 5** respectively.
- 1.11 It is worth noting that the appeal proposal is almost identical in size to the previous scheme, with no increase to the main ridge height. Both the previously approved schemes displayed neo-georgian features which are prevalent in the area, and which are included within the proposal the subject of this appeal.
- 1.12 In recommending approval of the application under delegated authority, the Case Officer stated in Section 7.1 (second paragraph) that the proposal development sits loosely on the same footprint as the existing dwelling extending and infilling in the centre of the dwelling between the line of the two existing rear projections. Whilst noting in Section 7.2 (second paragraph) that the design of the replacement dwelling is more reflective of the existing dwelling and mirrors some of the design characteristics of the property opposite at no. 11., the Officer nevertheless notes that:

"There are a diverse range of styles, designs and materials in the makeup of the existing properties within the street scene, including period properties and newer replacement and infill dwellings. The dwelling to the north is a traditional period property with timber framed detailing, whilst the nearly completed property to the south is a much more modern design."
- 1.13 The planning application the subject of this appeal was submitted on 5 February 2021.
- 1.14 It is worth noting from Section 5 of the Officer's report on the application (**Appendix 6**), that of 7 neighbours and the Northwood Residents Association, only two objections were received in relation to the proposal, and these objections focused on the basement and impact on loss of trees. On these issues, the Officer accepted the findings of the Basement Impact Assessment (Appendix 1) that the risk of the proposed development causing flooding or drainage issues would be negligible, and that subject to condition for tree protection measures and landscaping, there is no objection to the removal of a small amount of existing vegetation.
- 1.15 It is also worth noting that there are no objections to the proposal in terms of traffic impact/pedestrian safety, car parking and layout, and urban design, access and security considerations, operational refuse requirements and construction logistics.

2 PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

- 2.1 This section sets out the planning policy context within which the appeal proposal should be considered.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 2.2 The NPPF was published in March 2012 and sets out the Government's planning policies for England, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. It replaced the various Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes, alongside other Circulars and Government guidance.
- 2.3 Paragraph 2 states that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. At the heart of the NPPF, however, is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, (paragraph 10). For the decision making, this means:

“approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting planning permission unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

- 2.4 Section 12 (paragraphs 124 to 132) relating to achieving well-designed places, is relevant to the consideration of this appeal. The creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. (paragraph 124).
- 2.5 Paragraph 126 states that to provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary planning documents should use visual tools such as design guides and codes. These provide a framework for creating distinctive places, with a consistent and high-quality standard of design. However, their level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified.

- 2.6 Paragraph 127 states that:

“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) 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;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) 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);

d) 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;

e) 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

f) 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.”

Development Plan Policy

2.7 For the purpose of S38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the relevant parts of the Development Plan in this case are:

- Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (HLP1);
- Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies and Site Allocations and Designations (HLP2);
- The London Plan 2021 (LP2021).

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies

2.8 The HLP1 was adopted on 8 November 2012 (relevant extracts are attached at **Appendix 7**). Policy BE1 is a multi-criteria-based policy relating to the built environment, and the Council also cites Policy HE1 (Heritage) in its first two reasons for refusal.

Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies and Site Allocations and Designations

2.9 The HLP2 was adopted as part of the Borough's development plan at Full Council on 16 January 2020. Relevant extracts of HLP2 are attached at **Appendix 8**.

2.10 The policies map accompanying HLP2 shows that the site is within an Area of Special Local Character (ASLC) where Policies DMHB 5 and DMHB 6 apply. Otherwise, the site is not the subject of any specific designations or allocations.

2.11 Other policies referred to in the decision notice are:

- DMHB 1 Heritage Assets;
- DMHB 11 Design of New Development;
- DMHB 12 Streets and Public Realm;

The London Plan 2021

2.12 The Council cites two policies of the London Plan 2021 in its reason for refusal (**Appendix 9**): Policies D4 (Delivering good design) and HC1 (Heritage conservation and growth).

3 CASE FOR THE APPELLANTS

General comments

- 3.1 In this case, the Appellant has instructed an experienced firm of local architects with a long track-record of working in the Estate and across the Borough. There are currently 8 new builds under construction in the Copse Wood Estate as follows, of which 50% have been designed by the Appellant's architect (marked with an asterisk) (**Appendix 10**):
- 6 Linkway;
 - 8 Linkway;
 - 27 Linkway;*
 - 19 The Broadwalk;
 - 5 Nicholas Way;*
 - 21 Nicholas Way;*
 - 45 Nicholas Way;
 - 53 Copse Wood Way.*
- 3.2 In addition to these, the following new builds have been completed in the Copse Wood Estate over the last c. 24 months (**Appendix 8**):
- 23 Linkway;
 - 38 Linkway;
 - 6 Rogers Ruff;
 - 3 The Broadwalk;
 - 15 Nicholas Way;
 - 12 Copse Wood Way;
 - 44 Copse Wood Way;
 - 57 Copse Wood Way;
 - 83 Copse Wood Way.
- 3.3 It is evident that new builds are a common feature of this area. The images and/or photographs in Appendices 7 and 8 show the variety of architectural styles deemed acceptable in the Copse Wood Estate.
- 3.4 Whilst it is right that the appeal be assessed on its merits, there are nevertheless, three relevant appeals allowed over the past decade, relating to development within the ASLC which are directly comparable to this case (**Appendix 9**).

3 The Broadwalk

- 3.5 3 The Broadwalk is situated approximately 350m to the south of the Appeal Site, The existing dwelling was a large detached property also in the early 20th Century Arts and Craft style, and it was proposed to replace this with a dwelling with a mock Georgian façade with two front projections either side with a central covered porch above the front door, similar to the appeal proposal (**Appendix 10a**).

- 3.6 The original application was refused by the Council for the following reasons, which are closely aligned with the first and second reasons for refusal of the appeal proposal (**Appendix 10b**):

“1. The proposed development, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design would represent a visually unsympathetic form of development that would detract from the character, appearance and visual amenity of the street scene and the wider Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

2. The proposed boundary treatment and gates would serve to significantly further erode and detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Extensions.”

In his decision letter (Appendix 10c), the Inspector found that the proposal had an interesting façade, with the inclusion of the front gables and centrally positioned entrance which does not appear out of keeping with other properties within the area, concluding that *“the proposal would harmonise with the surrounding area and would be an attractive addition to the street scene at this part of the road”* (paragraph 5).

36 Linksway

- 3.7 36 Linksway is approximately 240m to the south of the Appeal Site on the opposite side of the road. The original dwelling was described in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) accompanying the application as appearing reminiscent of the Arts and Crafts style, albeit it was a rather a plain example. The replacement dwelling was described by the Council as having been designed in a grand classical idiom, symmetrical with a two storey pillared portico feature, tall sash windows and with a huge crown roof (**Appendix 14a**). The original application was refused by the Council on 12 June 2013. Reason 1 was similar to the reason for refusal for the appeal scheme (44603/APP/2013/960 refers) (**Appendix 14b**):

“The proposed dwelling, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk, design (including columned porticos and excessively sized crown roof), significant depth and proximity to the site boundaries would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and would harm the character and appearance of the wider Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE5, BE6, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3.8 In allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded that:

"Whilst the detailed design of the replacement dwelling may not be to the Council's liking, I consider that it has given insufficient weight to the design and appearance of other redeveloped houses along Linksway, several of which display similar classical features. Far from standing out as an example of poor design, the dwelling's appearance would complement the general standard of new design on display in Linksway. The use of hips on the side elevations, together with a reduced roof level to the south, acceptably succeed in mitigating the effects of otherwise excessive bulk at the side boundaries" (paragraph 6, **Appendix 14c**).

20 Linksway

3.9 20 Linksway is immediately adjacent to the south of the appeal site., It is of particular note because of its contemporary design, having replaced one of the original 1930's houses on the Estate (**Appendix 15a**). The first reason for refusal was also similar to the reason for refusal of the appeal proposal (2203/APP/2012/585) (**Appendix 15b**):

"1. The proposal, by reason of its design, size, scale, bulk, massing and siting would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site of an inappropriate design that would detract from the open character and appearance of the surrounding area and the visual amenities of the street scene and the Copse Wood Area of Special Local Character. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE5, BE6, BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

3.10 While the appeal was dismissed on the grounds of failure to address adequately the question of protected species (bats), the Inspector found that (**Appendix 15c**):

"From my inspection of the site, and more particularly of the surrounding area, I was struck by the variety of house designs within the Copsewood Estate which, as Policy BE6 states, is characterised by large, individually designed houses. It is clear that a number of properties have been built relatively recently and these now form part of the character of the area. Whilst many of these more recent buildings make reference to earlier styles, I noted there are also one or two examples of more contemporary design. I consider that, in principle, the proposal would fit with the requirement of providing a large, individually designed house. The width of the site, which would be unchanged, is of similar width to neighbouring properties."

3.11 A revised application with appropriate ecological mitigation was approved by notice dated 4 April 2014 (2203/APP/2013/1820) (**Appendix 15d**).

3.12 In the remainder of this section, RPS has undertaken a detailed assessment of the constituent parts of the reason for refusal, leading to a consideration of the development against the provisions of the development plan. The key issue is:

- Would the proposal have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Copse Wood Estate ASLC?

Would the proposal have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Copse Wood Estate ASLC?

Siting

- 3.13 As shown on the Site Layout Plan (1366/P/1, Appendix 2) where the original dwelling is outlined in red, the main body of the replacement dwelling is fundamentally in the same position within the plot, i.e. central and set back the same distance from the road frontage. There are no buildings proposed in advance of the front elevation, in common with many other properties in along Linksway (e.g. nos. 3, 5, 9A, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 15a, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22 and 24).

Scale

- 3.14 The Officer's report (Appendix 6) records the Conservation Officer's concerns about the scale of the proposal. As noted in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) accompanying the application (Appendix 2), there is no increase in the main ridge height, and the width of the proposed dwelling is 3.6m narrower than the existing property, and as such has improved the separation distance between the flanks and the existing boundaries. The Site Layout Plan (1366/P/1, Appendix 2) shows that the main body of the house is broadly on the same alignment to the rear as the approved scheme, and does not project as far as the rear elevation, and nor does not project as far to the west as the ground floor elements of the existing building.
- 3.15 The resulting scale of the dwelling is very much in keeping with a majority of properties on the Estate. The height, bulk and massing segmented and articulated by the use of gable projections and other features like horizontal bands, projected quoins, sash windows, detailed corncicing and a projecting portico to the main entrance.

Design

- 3.16 As noted in the DAS, the appearance of the house has been developed to simulate a traditional neo-georgian design that is considered to be suitable for the location of this site, and in this respect is similar to the schemes allowed at 3 The Broadwalk and 36 Linksway. The design will be enhanced by the use of traditional materials and details, such as aluminium sash windows, a high-quality rendered finish, detailed leadwork, rendered projected quoins, GRP moulded window and door surrounds, GRP string courses, detailed GRP corncicing, together with plain clay roof tiles. The use of render is prevalent along Linksway and across the Estate, and can be found at the following locations:
- Linksway: 16, 23, 25, 30, 32, 33, 34, 40, 42 and 48;
 - The Broadwalk: 4, 5, 14, 17, 26, 28 and 30;
 - Nicholas Way: 3, 6, 8, 20, 29, 39, 41, 44;
 - Copeswood Way: 10, 14, 22, 34, 50.

- 3.17 These materials will harmonise with the pleasant appearance within the road and will not detract from the traditional appearance of other houses that exist within the locality or the character of the area generally.

Harmony with Architectural composition of the original property

- 3.19 The dwelling, understood to date back to around the 1930s, is built in a traditional vernacular style with detailing influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement. The neo-georgian style of the proposed replacement building, as with the previously approved proposal, is a clear departure from the original design concept, but has been chosen as it is very much in evidence throughout the area (as acknowledged in the Case Officer's report (Second paragraph, page 10, Appendix 6)), including the immediately neighbouring properties. The building is however not listed, nor is it included in the local list of buildings, which, according to the Council's website "*consists of buildings of good quality design or are historically significant and therefore important to the local community.*"

Harmony with historic character of the Copse Wood Estate and Visual Amenity of the Streetscene

- 3.20 Linksway, the Estate and the wider area has evolved and developed in such a way that a wide variety of styles and influences can be seen. Rather than detract from the visual amenity of the area, these add to its interest. In allowing the 3 The Broadwalk appeal, the Inspector noted that:
- "A number of the properties have been extended, and some have been demolished and replaced with more modern designs, however this does not appear to have resulted in any visual deterioration in terms of the overall character of the area (paragraph 3, Appendix 10c)."*
- 3.21 Similarly, with the 36 Linksway appeal, the Inspector noted:
- "...there is ample evidence of recent development and redevelopment in Linksway and adjoining streets, and a wide variety of architectural styles is on display (paragraph 3, Appendix 11c)."*
- 3.22 In the 20 Linksway appeal, the Inspector also noted the variety of house designs, and stated that the Estate "*is characterised by large, individually designed houses*" (paragraph 5, Appendix 12c).
- 3.23 It is not just the buildings however that give the Estate its special character, it is also the existing landscaping, large plots and attractive gardens and ancillary domestic development/paraphernalia, which combine to create an attractive streetscene. In this respect, the replacement dwelling will continue to be in harmony with the historic character of the Estate. The development comprises a large detached dwelling with pleasing architectural features which reference other buildings found in the vicinity. While the built footprint extends across a majority of the plot, the replacement dwelling is in fact narrower than the existing dwelling and will be positioned such that it will retain its open character and appearance, with generous distances maintained with the side boundaries, whilst retaining and/or enhancing the existing landscaping.

Form of Development

- 3.24 The above elements: the siting, scale and design, combine to create a form of development that not only meets the needs of a modern family unit, but also would not be out of keeping with the architecture found elsewhere along Linksway and across the wider Estate, including the current new and recently built properties.
- 3.25 It is clear that the replacement dwelling is not overly large, being narrower than the existing dwelling with an almost identical ridge height, and similar in scale to the dwelling previously approved by the Council (Appendix 3). Similarly it is not considered to be incongruous, given that by the Council's own acknowledgement, the development "*closely resembles the more recently redeveloped mock Georgian style properties adjacent*" (second paragraph, page 10, Appendix 6). It is also puzzling to see how the Council could conclude that the development is cramped, given that when viewed from the streetscene the replacement dwelling is narrower than the existing dwelling, given it occupies broadly the same footprint as the previously approved scheme, and that given it occupies only 15% of the total plot area.

Development Plan

- 3.26 In general terms, while the Conservation and Urban Design Officer expresses concern about the proposal unacceptably alter the traditional character of the site (page 5, Appendix 6), it is important to note that the thrust of the development plan policies cited by the Council seek to preserve the current character and appearance of the area, as opposed to reversion back to original design standards and concepts. Whilst it may be that the previous proposal more closely resembles the original property, it nevertheless still had a number of neo-georgian features such as the columns to the front of the house, dormer windows, hipped roof and decorative headers above the windows. This was combined with some more modern twists to the rear including the bifolding doors and balustrading. The appeal proposal is much more consistent with its design approach, which, as noted above, will blend in with the variety of design found along the streetscene.
- 3.27 The Council has dismissed the precedent set by the many proposals for replacement dwellings referred to above. However, it is worth noting that HLP1 has been in force since November 2012, and that the previous 'Part 2' policies of the Local Plan, comprising saved policies of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan had broadly the same objectives as the current policies in the HLP2, notably BE5 and BE6 (i.e. harmony with materials, design features, architectural style and building heights etc. that are predominant in the area (**Appendix 16**).
- 3.28 As far as the development plan is concerned, Policy BE1 of the HLP1 requires at a strategic level, development to "*achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations, extensions and the public realm which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area, contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place*" (criterion 1), and "*be designed to be appropriate to the identity and context of Hillingdon's buildings*" (criterion 2). For the reasons outlined above, it is considered the development complies with these criteria. The Lifetime Homes Layout Plan submitted with the application (1366/P/11, Appendix 2) demonstrated how the appeal proposal complies with criterion 3. Compliance with criteria 8 is considered in more detail below. Concerning sustainability, page 6 of the DAS (Appendix 2) sets out the energy efficiency measures incorporated into the design to help minimise heat loss, energy use, water

consumption (criteria 10). Criteria 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11 are not considered to be relevant to the determination of this appeal.

- 3.29 In terms of HE1, this requires the Council to “*conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape, which includes, among other things, locally recognised historic features, such as Areas of Special Local Character*”. This is given more detailed expression through Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, and DMHB 6 of the HLP2. It is worth emphasising that in each of the three appeal cases referred to above, it was held by the Inspector that the departure from the design of the existing buildings did not harm the character and appearance of the Copse Wood Estate, and did not conflict with the relevant development plan policies relating to the ASLC in operation at the time.
- 3.30 With regard to DMHB 1, the heritage asset in question is the ASLC, not the existing building itself, and as such there is no direct conflict with this Policy with the loss of the existing building *per se*. The replacement dwelling will contribute- to the variety of styles found in the ASLC in a way which does not undermine its significance, in accordance with criterion A i. As a development in keeping with its surroundings, the development will not lead to a loss of significance or harm to the asset (criterion A ii). The new dwelling, in combination with the new and enhanced landscaping, will make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area, and will enable the significance of the asset to be appreciated more readily (criterion A iii) and A vii)). For the reasons outlined above, it is considered the proposal relates appropriately in terms of siting, style, scale, massing, height, design and materials (criterion A v). The sustainability measures outlined in the DAS (page 6, Appendix 2), have been incorporated into the design of the dwelling in a way that does not harm the significance of the ASLC (criterion B). Criteria A iv, A vi and C are not considered to be relevant this appeal.
- 3.31 In terms of Policy DMHB 5, as noted above, the replacement dwelling has been designed to reflect the character of the area and its original layout (criterion A). Criterion B is not relevant to this appeal, and the character and local importance of the existing building and the contribution it makes to the ASLC is not so positive to be even given local listed status (criterion C).
- 3.32 As far as DMHB 6 is concerned, the width of the plot will not change as a result of this proposal (criterion i). The replacement dwelling is on the same building line as other properties along the western side of Linksway. The scale, form proportion, materials, roof design, design features and architectural style are all reflective of many other buildings on the Estate and surrounding area (criterion ii). The proposed boundary treatment, as detailed on the landscape plan accompanying the application (1366/P/8, Appendix 2) is considered to be unobtrusive, and natural materials appropriate to the character and appearance of the Estate will be used (criterion iii). The Site Layout Plan shows between the side elevations and the side boundaries of 4.3m to the south and 3.4m to the north, well in excess of the 1.5m required by criterion iv). Mature trees are to be retained, and the proposal includes a landscaping scheme designed to reinforce the existing landscaping and Estate settings (noting that the Landscape Officer had no objection to the proposal (Appendix 6) (criterion v).
- 3.33 With regard to Policy DMHB 11, it has been demonstrated above that the development fully harmonises with the local context taking into account the principles listed under criterion A i. High quality building materials and finishes will be used (criterion A ii)), and the DAS explains how sustainability will be maximised (criterion A iii). The extent to which heritage assets will be safeguarded is considered in more detail above (criterion A iv), and the proposed landscaping

of the site will protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure, in accordance with criterion A v). The Council acknowledges in the Officer's report that; *"it is not considered that the proposal would harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings from increased overshadowing, loss of sunlight, visual intrusion and over-dominance"*; and that *"It is therefore considered that the proposal would not significantly increase overlooking or loss of privacy to that already in existence."*(section 7.1, Appendix 6), thus complying with criterion B. The development will not be prejudicial to any redevelopment potential the adjoining plots may have (criterion C), and the proposal makes more than adequate provision for internal and external storage (criterion D).

- 3.34 As a proposal for a replacement dwelling, policy DMHB 12 has limited relevance to this appeal as it does not involve the creation of new areas of public realm. However, the landscaping scheme accompanying the proposal is considered to be suitable for the location, serve a purpose, and contributes to the appearance of the area, in compliance with criterion iii.
- 3.35 D4 of the LP2020 is a strategic level policy which creates a framework within which good design can be delivered. There does not appear to be any dispute with the Council in terms of the level of information provided by the Applicant to satisfy this Policy, and there does not appear to be any direct conflict with it. Indeed there is no assessment of the proposal against this Policy in the Officer's report (Appendix 3).
- 3.36 With regard to Policy HC1, criteria A and B are not relevant to the consideration of this appeal, relating as they do to the management and designation of heritage assets and the development of plans and strategies relating to them. For the reasons outlined in more detail above, it is considered that the proposal conserves the significance of the ASLC, and the Appellant demonstrated an appreciation of the site's surrounding through the DAS in compliance with criterion C. There are no issues of archaeological interest in relation to this site (criterion D), and building has not been identified as being 'At Risk' (criterion E).

Areas of Common Ground

- 3.37 As noted above, it should be noted that the proposed development will not give rise to any adverse impacts from a traffic impact/pedestrian safety point of view (section 7.3 of the Officer's report, Appendix 6), there is adequate parking provision (section 7.4, Appendix 6), there is adequate living and private amenity space (section 7.5, Appendix 6), and there are no objections to the proposed boundary treatment and landscaping (section 7.6, Appendix 6). Given that the proposed ridge height is identical to that of the previously approved scheme (2696/APP/2016/79), it also appears to be the case that the Council does not have any particular issue with the height of the dwelling the subject of this appeal.

4 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 RPS has been instructed by Mr & Mrs T Osazee to appeal against the refusal by London Borough of Hillingdon of an application for planning permission for the 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 at 18 Linksway, Northwood.
- 4.2 It is considered that the replacement dwelling is proportionate to the size of the plot and appropriate to the character and appearance of the surrounding residential neighbourhood and has been designed to ensure the development complements the existing built form and contributes positively to the Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character.
- 4.3 The Planning Inspectorate has, on multiple occasions, allowed an appeal in directly comparable circumstances in relation to properties in the immediate vicinity of 18 Linksway. Each appeal was considered by a different inspector, but the result was the same every time.
- 4.4 This appeal statement demonstrates that every effort has been made to produce a scheme that relates to and seeks to protect the character of the existing street scene and neighbouring properties, including landscaping to enhance the dwellings setting within the wider area.. The proposal accords with the development plan, and the Inspector is respectfully requested to allow this appeal.

Appendix 1
Planning Application 2695/APP/2021/466

Appendix 2

Decision Notice 2695/APP/2021/466

Appendix 3

Planning Application 2695/APP/2016/79

Appendix 4
Decision Notice 2695/APP/2016/79

Appendix 5
Officer Report 2695/APP/2016/79

Appendix 6
Officer Report 2695/APP/2021/466

Appendix 7

Relevant Extracts of Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies

Appendix 8

Relevant Extracts of Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies and Site Allocations and Designations

Appendix 9

Relevant Extracts of the London Plan

Appendix 10

Current New Builds in Copse Wood Estate

Appendix 11

Recent New Builds Copse Wood Estate

Appendix 12

Relevant Appeals in Copse Wood Estate

Appendix 13a

Elevations 3 The Broadwalk

Appendix 13b
Decision Notice 18252/APP/2016/3600

Appendix 13c
Appeal Decision APP/R5510/W/17/3173350

Appendix 14a
Elevations 36 Linksway (44603/APP/2013/960)

Appendix 14b
Decision Notice 44603/APP/2013/960

Appendix 14c
Appeal Decision APP/R5510/A/13/2201434

Appendix 15a

Elevations 20 Linksway (2203/APP/2012/585)

Appendix 15b
Decision Notice 2203/APP/2012/585

Appendix 15c
Appeal Decision APP/R5510/A/12/2183821

Appendix 15d
Decision Notice 2203/APP/2013/1820

Appendix 16

Relevant Extracts of the 2007 Saved Unitary Development Plan Adopted as the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two.