



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 September 2021

by G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3278249

29 Parkfield Road, Ickenham 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 Mr & Mrs S Miah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 14459/APP/2021/1343, dated 28 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a replacement dwelling and associated parking/landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement dwelling and associated parking/landscaping at 29 Parkfield Road, Ickenham UB10 8LN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14459/APP/2021/1343, dated 28 March 2021, subject to the condition set out in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. An application for an award of costs was made by Mr & Mrs S Miah against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies approximately mid-way along a long, and largely straight, residential cul-de-sac. There is general agreement between the main parties that Parkfield Road has no distinct or consistent architectural style or facing materials, whilst the scale of buildings is equally varied. Both parties refer to other planning application and appeal decisions¹ for development along Parkfield Road which support this consensus.
5. Thus, although predominantly bungalow-style housing prevails closer to the entrance into Parkfield Road, the scale of housing subtly changes along its length. Thus, bungalows, some oriented with their gable-ends facing the road with first floor windows within the peak and other modest bungalows with

¹ Most notably in relation to APP/R5510/W/19/3241390 (No. 2), LPA Ref No 20899/APP/2016/2376 (No 54) and APP/R5510/A/08/2077613 (No. 58)

- hipped roofs, to two storey houses with upper-floor windows set wholly or partly within the roofline to the occasional, larger two storey house.
6. The appeal property and its immediately neighbours are a case in point in this respect. Nos. 27 and 29 are both modest hipped-roof bungalows, set close to one or, as in the case of No. 29 both, side plot boundaries. To one side of No. 27 lie a pair of chalet-bungalows with their two storey gable ends facing towards the road and their higher ridge lines extended rearwards, giving a sense of built depth to their plots. On the other side are three, larger and more dwellings.
 7. Of a recognisably larger scale and massing, the latter present one-and-a-half storey (half-) hipped elevations towards the road, flanked by large expanses of pitched hipped roofs, within which a dormer window to each is positioned. However, despite the notable variations there are also some consistent characteristics displayed along the road's length. There is therefore a consistent building line along both sides of the road. Whilst not generous, this nevertheless ensures that there is a pleasant sense of spaciousness and openness about Parkfield Road.
 8. The proposed replacement dwelling would be an altogether larger proposition than the existing bungalow and the neighbouring example at No. 27. Moreover, unlike the neighbouring properties to the north, the appeal proposal's full two-storey elevations would mark it out as of a different scale to Nos. 31, 31A and 33.
 9. However, it would otherwise reflect other consistent characteristics found along Parkfield Road. It would respect and maintain the building line established by properties along the western side of the road and also maintain the gaps between frontages on either side of the road. The dwelling, despite its substantial overall height, would feature sloping roofs to both side-facing roof planes giving it a hipped-roof appearance, whilst the projecting two-storey bays would also incorporate hipped roofs over.
 10. Whilst the transition from the vertical emphasis of the proposed two storey façade to the extensive sloping roof of No. 31 would be somewhat abrupt, it would not be harmfully so in the context of the projecting bays at the front of those neighbouring properties where such juxtaposition is not uncommon. Nor would the transition in scale from No. 27 to No. 29 be unduly harsh, despite their very different scale due to the flat-roofed single storey element at the side of the proposed dwelling. In the context of the street, such single storey flat roofed buildings, or parts of buildings, are not uncommon and this element of the proposed scheme would not appear any more or less so than others.
 11. As a corollary of the proposal's greater scale, the Council are also concerned about the dwelling's greater depth; greater in comparison with the existing property and greater in comparison with those around it. It may well be the case that the proposed dwelling would have a deeper footprint in both cases, although such a claim is not entirely clear from the submitted site and block plans. In any event, even if that were the case, I am not persuaded that it would be harmful to the character or appearance of the area.
 12. As described above, amongst the mix of buildings, there are those with clear and apparent depth, such as the chalet-bungalows whose gable elevations face the road and ridges run away perpendicular to the road. Approaching from the

south, the view towards the appeal property is reasonably open above No. 27 from where the depth of the appeal proposal would be noticeable, but it would not be disruptive to the pattern of development along Parkfield Road. Nor would it be particularly evident when viewed from the north where the greater scale and bulk of Nos. 31 – 33 would screen its depth.

13. The proposed dwelling is not a beautiful or innovative dwelling, but nor does it purport to be. The front elevation would be well articulated and provide interest to the streetscene whilst incorporating features and details found variously along the road. It would not, as the Council assert, appear squat or bland, whilst final details of construction and fenestration materials could be satisfactorily dealt with by way of an appropriately worded planning condition.
14. Local Plan: Part 2 (LP2) policies DMHB11 and DMHB12 set out the Council's approach to securing high quality design. As I have set out above, the proposal would take account of the scale, architectural style and character of the surrounding area. As a consequence, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area and there would be no conflict with LP2 policies DMHB11 or DMHB12. Nor would there be with the design aims of policies D3, 4 or 6 of the London Plan or the Framework.
15. In noting the various appeal decisions and other schemes referred to by both main parties, I am conscious of the particular contexts within which those properties and sites lie. I accept that the properties at Nos. 2 and 58 lie more towards the opposite ends of Parkfield Road and are therefore not seen in quite the same mid-street context as the appeal site. Nevertheless, this does not diminish their respective assessments of the generally varied nature of Parkfield Road. I am satisfied though that, for the reasons I have set out above, the proposed dwelling would not be in conflict with the aims and provisions of LP2 policies DMHB11 or DMHB12. Nor would there be with the design aims of policies D3, 4 or 6 of the London Plan or the Framework.

Other Matters

16. I can understand the appellants' apparent frustration with the outcome of the planning application having previously sought pre-application advice from the Council. However, such pre-application advice provided by a Council is given without prejudice and cannot pre-determine the outcome of a subsequent application, which must take account of all material factors. This is not therefore a material consideration to which I give any significant weight.

Conditions

17. I have considered the list of conditions as suggested by the Council against the provisions of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance). Where necessary and appropriate I have made minor amendments to the suggested conditions. I am satisfied that in doing neither party would be disadvantaged.
18. I agree that a time limit condition is necessary and reasonable in the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty. So too, a condition setting out the approved plans. However, the plan reference numbers set out in the Council's suggested condition bear no resemblance to the plan numbers before me. I have, instead, used the plan numbers referred to on the decision notice with

the exception of the landscape plan (for reasons explained below) as it is clear that these are the plans considered by the Council in reaching their decision.

19. Whilst I do not agree with the Council in respect of the proposed dwelling's effect upon character and appearance, I nevertheless agree that a materials condition is necessary and reasonable in order to agree the finer details of the proposed materials in the interests of character and appearance.
20. With regard to proposed hard and soft landscaping proposals, a landscape plan was submitted with the application and was one of the plans referred to on the Council's decision notice. The refusal reason does not make specific reference to the landscape proposals or to matters relating to cycle or refuse storage provision and I have no further evidence before me to lead me to conclude that it is a matter of dispute between the two parties.
21. The existing property frontage is laid out in a very similar manner to that proposed by the appeal scheme which is, in turn, in keeping with the prevailing pattern of property frontages along Parkfield Road. Whilst I have noted the submitted landscaping plan, I share the Council's concern regarding a relative lack of detail regarding the hard and soft landscaping specifications and the contradiction between the landscape plan and the site plan.
22. Given the proximity and heights of upper floor windows on the side elevations of the replacement dwelling to neighbouring properties it is entirely reasonable and necessary to ensure that they are fitted with obscured glazing in the interests of living conditions and privacy. I have imposed the suggested condition with the addition confirmation that it should apply to first floor windows. I have taken the same approach with suggested condition 6, amending it to ensure that it refers to the correct neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Robbie

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PA-01 Rev. A (Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations) and PA-01 (Proposed Streetview).
- 3) Prior to commencement of development (other than demolition), samples and product information including manufacturer details, colour, finish and texture of all external materials and finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Samples shall be made available on site for inspection including a sample panel of the brickwork. Works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) Notwithstanding the details shown on Drwg No: PA-01 Rev A (Landscape Plan), prior to above-ground works, a landscape scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:
 1. Details of Soft Landscaping
 - 1.a Planting plans (at not less than a scale of 1:100); 1.b Written specification of planting and cultivation works to be undertaken; and 1.c Schedule of plants giving species, plant sizes, and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate
 2. Details of Hard Landscaping
 - 2.a Refuse Storage; 2.b Cycle Storage; 2.c Means of enclosure/boundary treatments; 2.d Hard Surfacing Materials; and 2.e External Lighting
 3. Schedule for ImplementationThereafter the development shall be carried out and maintained in full accordance with the approved details.
- 5) The first floor windows facing Nos. 27 and 31 Parkfield Road shall be glazed with permanently obscured glass to at least scale 4 on the Pilkington scale and be non-opening below a height of 1.8 metres taken from internal finished floor level for so long as the development remains in existence.
- 6) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England)Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be constructed in the walls or roof slopes of the development hereby approved facing Nos. 27 and 31 Parkfield Road.