



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3241390

2 Parkfield Road, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8LN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mdn Inv Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 74249/APP/2019/2423, dated 18 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is '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'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for erection of 2 x 3-bedroom semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space, and installation of a vehicular crossover, involving demolition of the existing bungalow at 2 Parkfield Road, Ickenham, Uxbridge, UB10 8LN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 74249/APP/2019/2423, dated 18 July 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. A new Local Plan Document¹ was adopted between the date of application for planning permission and the appeal decision. This replaces the Local Plan Part 2 Saved UDP Policies (2012). Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal.
3. The description of development on the application form was inaccurate in referring to a single dwelling. However, the appellant and Council both later refer accurately to the development as two dwellings, which is reflected in the banner heading for this decision and is the description on which I have determined the appeal.

Main Issues

4. The effects of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the area;
 - The living conditions for future occupants, with particular regard to daylight in the first floor 'study'.

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon, Local Plan Part 2, Development Management Policies, Adopted January 2020

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. 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.
6. 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. The plot coverage, building lines and setbacks are all consistent with the character of the area and gaps between structures would only be marginally changed. Proposed materials are appropriate in the context of highly mixed finishes along the rest of the street. I therefore consider this to be an example of good design, as defined in Policy DMHB11 of the Local Plan.
7. The Council suggest that the current upper level open space provides visual relief in a densely developed area and a visual gap between the adjacent bungalows to the north. However, the roof line would only be raised by 1.3 m, to the same height as next door and the roof structure would remain hipped, reducing the potential for visually intrusive bulk. I therefore do not consider this reduction in the upper level space significant in harming visual relief. Sufficient space remains between the buildings, consistent with the HDAS SPD² and when also allowing for the neighbour's garage a visual gap remains that would be consistent with others along the street. I note that the applicant has introduced Dutch gables and crown roof to achieve the equivalent roofline as next door. Whilst I agree with the Council that these structures are not typical of the area, given the wide variety of architectural styles locally, I do not consider the proposal harmful and in conflict with Policy DMHB12, which requires that the established character and quality of the area should be taken into account.
8. For the reasons above I find that the proposals would not harm the character and appearance of the area and are therefore not in conflict with Policies DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Local Plan, or 3.5 of the London Plan (2016) which ensure among other things, that development responds positively to the character of the surroundings.

Living Conditions

9. I have noted debate over whether the first floor 'study' in proposed No 2b is of sufficient size to be considered a 'bedroom' and have concluded that it is

² Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document (2006)

clearly a habitable room in which occupants could reasonably expect to spend time and it is therefore appropriate that natural light should reach the room. The Council has raised concerns that there would be no 'natural/sunlight'. Plans show there would be two roof lights in the rear elevation and I have therefore concluded that the room would receive natural daylight. However, given the aspect, it is unlikely that it would receive much in the way of direct sunlight. I have not been provided with analysis of whether occupants would have any outlook. The plans show that the rooflights would be at a similar elevation to the rear dormer, but as they would be at an angle and in the absence of any other information, I have assumed that outlook would not be easily achievable.

10. Policy DMHB11 and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016) state that development should be designed to the highest standards. Although not explicit in Policy DMHD11, the supporting text to which I give some weight, says the Council will seek to ensure development optimises levels of daylight and sunlight, and expects the BRE guidance to be followed, although this analysis is not in the documents before me. Section 4.0 of the HDAS SPD only requires that residential development should receive 'adequate' daylight. Given that the room is small, which I have assumed will reduce residence time compared to a larger room, and that there are plenty of other opportunities for outlook from the house, I consider the proposed living standards adequate and do not find conflict with local policies.

Other Matters

11. I have noted concerns from neighbours regarding loss of privacy and parking. I agree with the Council's analysis that, based on the HDAS SPD guidance, there would be no loss of privacy from the proposal. The parking proposals are in line with current guidelines and there should not be any impact on street parking.
12. I also note comments from neighbours regarding house numbering and restoration of fence lines if fruit trees are removed. These are not matters over which I have agency.

Conditions

13. The Council requests that 6 conditions be imposed in addition to those set out in the Officer's Report. In addition to the statutory time limit (1), I have imposed a condition (2) specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I consider that sufficient information regarding the finishing materials is provided on these drawings and a separate condition to control this is not necessary. Condition (3) is necessary for the purpose of securing and maintaining appropriate soft and hard landscaping, but I have altered the implementation period to prevent it being a pre-commencement condition. I have also amended part 2d regarding requirement for electrical charging points because it is not possible to demonstrate 5% of two parking spaces are served by electrical charging points. This condition also satisfies the recommendations of the tree and landscape officer. Condition (4) secures visibility splays in the interests of highway safety and Condition (5) ensures that car parking provision is secured. Conditions (6) satisfies the recommendation of the access officer in the interests of accessibility over the lifetime of the development. I have not imposed a condition referring to housing standards because I do not have sufficient information to justify this, in line with the Planning Practice Guidance on optional technical standards for housing. The aim of this condition is in any case covered by other legislation.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the application form and drawing numbers A500-SK1, A500-P-01, A500-P-02, A500-P-03, A500-P-04, A500-P-05, A500-P-06, A500-P-07.
- 3) A landscape scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out before the development hereby permitted is brought into use and thereafter the development shall be maintained in full accordance with the approved details. The scheme shall include: -
 1. Details of Soft Landscaping
 - a) Planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100),
 - b) Written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken,
 - c) Schedule of plants giving species, plant sizes, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate
 2. Details of Hard Landscaping
 - a) Refuse Storage (including elevations, if appropriate)
 - b) Cycle Storage (including elevations, if appropriate)
 - c) Means of enclosure/boundary treatments (including elevations, if appropriate)
 - d) Car Parking Layouts
 - e) Hard Surfacing Materials
 - f) External Lighting
 - g) Other structures (such as play equipment and furniture)
 3. Details of Landscape Maintenance
 - a) Landscape Maintenance Schedule for a minimum period of 5 years.
 - b) Proposals for the replacement of any tree, shrub, or area of surfacing/seeding within the landscaping scheme which dies or in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority becomes seriously damaged or diseased.
- 4) The access for the proposed car parking shall be provided with those parts of 2.4m x 2.4m pedestrian visibility splays which can be accommodated within the site in both directions and shall be maintained free of all

obstacles to the visibility between heights of 0.6m and 2.0m above the level of the adjoining highway.

- 5) The car parking spaces to be provided shall be kept available for the parking of a car at all times.
- 6) Prior to works commencing, details of step free access via the principal private entrance shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Such provision shall remain in place for the life of the building.