

42 PIELD HEATH ROAD HILLINGDON

Response to the LPA's comments on Appellant's Statement of Case

Demolition of a two-storey bed and breakfast, and the erection of a three storey residential development comprising of seven flats, alterations to existing drop kerb, all associated external works and landscaping.

LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY REF 17611/APP/2022/993
Planning Inspectorate APP/R5510/W/23/3315737

In response to the LPA's comments on Appellant's Statement of Case, the appellant would make the following observations. The Inspector is invited to note that this response will not repeat the matters set out in the Appellant's statement of case.

The concerns by the LPA, as set out in the Council's committee report and refusal reasons have already been comprehensively covered in the Appellant's appeal statement. (refer to pars 2.2 – 2.4 of the LPA's comments on Appellant's Statement of Case).

The Inspector is invited to note correspondence from the case officer and the Appellant, (attached at Appendix 1) , where the officer acknowledges that the revised proposal was much better and acceptable. However, subsequently the officer was directed to refuse the application.

With regards to para 2.5 of the LPA's comments on Appellant's Statement of Case , the Council acknowledges that if a legal agreement were in place restricting future residents from applying for parking permits. Refusal reason 4 could be overcome, A Grampian style condition could be imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed.

With regards to para. 2.6, the Council agree that if the new access wall and associated planting were 60cm in height or lower, then objections regarding the adverse impact of the proposed access on pedestrian and highway safety could be overcome. A suitably worded condition could be imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed.

The Appellant raises no objections to the suggested conditions, as set out at Appendix 1 of the LPA statement.

For the reasons set out in the Appellant's Statement of Case and this rebuttal, the Inspector is respectfully requested to allow the appeal.

APPENDIX 1

Correspondence

Ellis Ave

Gerrards Cross

Bucks SL9 9UA

01753 885159

07961 149626

www.trafalgarpromerty.com

From: Haydon Richardson <HRichardson@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Sent: 30 November 2022 14:49

To: gary@trafalgarpromerty.com

Subject: RE: Pield Heath Road -Revised Scheme - 17611/APP/2022/993

Hi Gary,

I have received all additional information relating to the proposed development and its light impacts.

My manager reviewed the scheme and raised some concerns regarding the recommendation.

The Head of service then reviewed the scheme and had similar issues.

This being the case the development has been recommended for refusal at committee.

The agenda should be published tomorrow and it will outline the LPA's concerns in full.

Sincere apologise for any confusion and inconvenience.

Kind regards,

Haydon Richardson *MRTPI*

Principal Planning Officer

Residents Services

London Borough of Hillingdon

Civic Centre (3N/02)

Uxbridge

UB8 1UW

The advice given in this email represents the officer's opinion and is given in the spirit of helpfulness, without prejudice. It does not bind the Council to a particular outcome regarding any planning matter

Richardson

Sent: 17 August 2022 11:55

To: Gary Wynne <gary@trafalgarpolicy.com>

Subject: RE: 42 Pield Heath Road, Hillingdon

Hi Gary,

1. This is a massive visual improvement on the previous scheme and would be much more in keeping with the areas character.
2. You will have to demonstrate how and why residents of the new flats would still have adequate outlook and access to light to habitable spaces (regardless of the bay window designs) without also compromising neighbours amenities in terms of privacy loss. A 1:20 plan of a bay window showing how it would be used, glazed and potential views from it could be helpful. It should clearly be explained how and why you think the dormers would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenities (with regard to overlooking and loss of privacy to gardens and habitable windows).
3. Great (I think the policy requires 2.5m ceiling heights for 75% of any residential unit)!
4. We look forward to receiving the assessment

I hope the above helps

Kind regards,

Haydon Richardson *MRTPI*

Principal Planning Officer

Residents Services

London Borough of Hillingdon

Civic Centre (3N/02)

Uxbridge

UB8 1UW

The advice given in this email represents the officer's opinion and is given in the spirit of helpfulness, without prejudice. It does not bind the Council to a particular outcome regarding any planning matter.

From: Gary Wynne <gary@trafalgarpromerty.com>

Sent: 02 August 2022 11:18

To: Haydon Richardson <HRichardson@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 42 Field Heath Road, Hillingdon

Hi Haydon,

Thank you for your valued guidance to overcome the refusal reasons.

Please find attached draft elevations showing amended proposal:

1 The overall design is changed to a much more traditional design as a large single building as suggested, taking reference from the existing property. The proposed building is 2 storeys in scale and proportion to relate better to the nearby houses. The roof pitch is designed at 35deg pitch to use plain tiles to match existing building, Loft flat will have dormers and inset windows. Again, dormers are key features of the existing property. The external finishes will be in fair face brickwork with some feature bands to enhance the design. The dormer walls and triangular bay windows will have plain tiles cladding to blend better as existing property.

The adjoining commercial building do not have any design features of value and all the houses are simple traditional 2 storey in fair face brickwork finish with pitched roofs.

The proposed elevations now include more of the context, and you will note the scale and proportion relates very closely to the existing houses.

The distances between proposed building and houses are all in compliant with the planning guidelines.

2 The triangular bay window design to overcome looking by way of frosted glass up to 1.75m but still retains reasonable outlook and ample daylight.

You will note that the existing 2 storey flank wall sits right on the boundary. We can move the building closer to boundary which will help to improve the overlooking. In essence ground floor is not an issue as the view is shielded by matured conifer trees so only 2 bedrooms on the first floor can have frosted windows on one side.

3 Confirmed internal floors to ceiling heights are 2.5m to all flats.

4 Regards Lift, we hope to submit a financial unviability statement which will be submitted once I receive it from my Quantity Survey.

As you will see we have completely redesigned the proposal to keep in context of the local character.

I hope the redesign is acceptable and look forward to your favourable response, please let me know your thoughts.

Regards

Gary Wynne
Trafalgar Properties

• **From:** Haydon Richardson <HRichardson@hillingdon.gov.uk>
Date: 4 October 2022 at 09:00:46 BST
To: gary@trafalgarpportunity.com
Subject: RE: Field Heath Road -Revised Scheme - 17611/APP/2022/993

Morning Gary,

Following our call last week and as promised. I can confirm that I have now reviewed the amended scheme with my manager.

We both believe that it is massive improvement on the last scheme and on this basis I am going to begin writing the report when the consultation period has ended.

I have consulted on the plans today, as we reviewed the scheme yesterday and neighbours will be given the 21 days to comment on the scheme as the building is completely different to the previous one.

The report deadline for November's committee is the end of this week, so the application will be going to December's committee which is on the 8th.

The new deadline will also give you time to submit the justification report for their being no lift (i.e accessibility issues). Please get it to me as soon as you can.

The final report will be published on the agenda which normally goes out 5-7 days before the meeting.

Taking into consideration the above, **can we please agree to a final deadline extension on this to 9th December, so that the decision can go out the day after committee?**

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks again for your patience with this one.

Kind regards,

Haydon Richardson MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Residents Services
London Borough of Hillingdon
Civic Centre (3N/02)
Uxbridge
UB8 1UW

The advice given in this email represents the officer's opinion and is given in the spirit of helpfulness, without prejudice. It does not bind the Council to a particular outcome regarding any planning matter.
