



WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS: RESPONSE TO LPA STATEMENT

BY

Mr J Singh

FOLLOWING THE REFUSAL OF PLANNING BY:

London Borough of Hillingdon Council

APPEAL REFERENCE:

APP/R5510/W/24/3350018

FOR:

Construction of two storey attached dwelling on land at no. 84 East Road

AT:

84 East Road, West Drayton, UB7 9HA

November 2024

1.0 Background

- 1.1 This statement is prepared on behalf of Mr J Singh in response to the LPA's statement and third-party representation following the submission of appeal ref APP/R5510/W/24/3350018 in response to council reference 31005/APP/2024/1086.

2.0 LPA statement

- 2.1 The council state that the development would largely fill a gap between nos. 84-86 to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 2.2 The appellant firmly rejects this claim, pointing out that the proposed property would be set back from the side boundary, thereby maintaining a visual gap between the buildings. The proposed design and set back, combined with the single-storey extensions which is located to the side of no. 86, ensures that the spatial character and appearance of the area remain largely unaffected.
- 2.3 Furthermore, while the council asserts that they currently have a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, this should not come at the expense of refusing a suitable new windfall site. The appellant emphasises that such opportunities are valuable for meeting housing needs without compromising the overall quality and character of the area.
- 2.4 As outlined, Policy DMHD1 pertains to household extensions, whereas this proposal concerns the creation of a new dwelling. Thus, the focus should be on developing a property that aligns with and respects the existing development pattern. Requiring the new dwelling to appear subordinate would conflict with the objectives of Policy DMHB11, which emphasises that developments should harmonise with the scale of surrounding structures, including considerations of height, mass, bulk, plot sizes, widths, coverage, and established street patterns.
- 2.5 The appellant acknowledges that a previous appeal was dismissed. However, substantial modifications have been made to address the earlier concerns. Consequently, the current proposal would not cause the same level of harm; in fact, it is designed to have a positive impact on the street scene, enhancing the overall aesthetic and cohesiveness of the area.
- 2.6 Regarding the 'open gap' which the council argue is a key characteristic, this would not be lost and would still be visible between the new dwelling and no. 86. Consequently, the gap retained would break up the mass of the built form and would be compatible, if not larger, than other gaps between dwellings upon East Road.
- 2.7 At paragraph 2.6, the council's statement sets out that the row of terrace properties was originally designed in this way and that adding additional bulk would be harmful. However, the council have failed to acknowledge that no. 78, to the opposite end of the host terrace, has already been extended with a substantial two-story side and rear

extension, reducing the gap between it and No. 76. This indicates that the terrace has been modified from its original construction, and the reduced gap has not negatively impacted the wider street scene.

- 2.8 The appellant accepts that each case should be judged on its own individual merits but put forward similar developments within the borough by way of highlighting that the council's decision to refuse the scheme at no. 84 East Road on this occasion is unsound.
- 2.9 The proposal on East Road will unquestionably elevate the character, appearance, and visual appeal of the area and street scene. The thoughtfully designed dwelling promises to be a high-quality and fitting addition, seamlessly integrating with the surroundings while enhancing the overall aesthetic and community charm. This development not only respects but also enriches the existing environment, contributing positively to the neighbourhood's identity and ambiance.
- 2.10 Taking the above points into account the appellant states that the council have not put forward any compelling evidence or arguments that demonstrate that their decision to refuse was well-founded.

3.0 Suggested conditions

- 3.1 The appellant would accept any conditions deemed necessary and appropriate in the circumstances of the case.

4.0 Third Party Representations

- 4.1 The appellant takes into account the feedback received through the third-party representation and believes that these comments echo the prevailing sentiment among local residents.
- 4.2 There is a strong consensus that the underutilised land would be far more beneficially repurposed for new housing. This redevelopment not only addresses the pressing need for additional homes but also enhances the value and utility of the area, transforming an underused plot into a vibrant, productive space that serves the community's needs.
- 4.3 Taking the above information into account the supporting response from a local resident should add weight in favour of the proposal.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 Thus, it is stated that the appeal proposal conforms with the overall aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMH6, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D3, D4, D6 and D8 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2023).

5.2 Therefore, we respectfully request that this appeal proposal be allowed with any reasonable and appropriate planning conditions deemed necessary in the circumstances of this case

11th November 2024