



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/24/3351213

FOR:

Alterations and extension to existing part single/part two storey side extension to create new end of terrace dwelling with associated amenity, parking and bin storage

AT:

123A Central Avenue, Hayes, Hillingdon, UB3 2BS

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/24/3351213 in response to council reference 78009/APP/2024/1578.

2.0 LPA statement

- 2.1 The appellant acknowledges the council's current position on housing supply, however, the council's housing position and the type of housing proposed should not be considered sufficient reason to justify a refusal.
- 2.2 Moreover, the appellant highlighted relevant policies pertaining to the proposal which clearly sets out national aims to make efficient use of land by giving substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes. The proposal would support the development of underutilised land and buildings whilst also improving the character and appearance of the site and wider area.
- 2.3 The council overlooks the positive effects of the development, which are evident in this case. The proposal aims to replace a prominent side extension—deemed by the appellant to be out of character with the existing property—with a new dwelling that seamlessly integrates into the existing terrace row.
- 2.4 The council argue that the extensions currently read as a subordinate addition; whilst that may be the case the council fails to take into account that the existing extensions unbalance the appearance of the host terrace row.
- 2.5 Regarding the design of the new dwelling this has been sensitively considered taking into full account the existing on-site situation to provide a development that is acceptable in terms of its width, height, bulk and design. The reduction in space to the side boundary would be largely unnoticeable and thus the openness would not be dramatically reduced which in turn would not cause harm to the Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).
- 2.6 The subdivision of the site would also provide suitable outdoor space for both existing and future occupants. Whilst the appellant accepts that policies look to protect residential gardens the proposed scheme amounts to a negligible loss of existing underutilised side garden which is outweighed by the benefits of providing a new dwelling.
- 2.7 The council refused the application citing reasons based around character, appearance and visual amenities of the area.
- 2.8 As a consequence the appellant considered it relevant to highlight similar development also within the ASLC. Whilst these examples may not form separate self-contained dwellings they, nonetheless, highlight that the characteristics of the area has changed to enable schemes like the appeal proposal to be acceptable.

- 2.9 Regarding the provision of outdoor amenity space, this would exceed the requirements set out in policy DMHB 18. This policy does not specifically state what shape or where the outdoor space should be provided just that it should be good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space. A side gate and tall boundary fence (which can be seen on the submitted 3 model plans, General Perspective (2) and are annotated on the Proposed Site Plan) would make the outdoor space private without affecting sightlines for vehicles parked to the front of the property.
- 2.10 The council argue that there is a gap of just 0.86m for occupiers to pass through between the house and boundary fence which is not considered useable.
- 2.11 A typical wheelie bin is just 0.58m wide and as there would be ample room to manoeuvre this through the gap it is clear that the council's concerns in regard to the outdoor space are overly exaggerated. Occupants could leave the house via the rear door and enter all zones of the proposed garden even through the gap to the side.
- 2.12 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 The author clearly considers that the development would make efficient use of the available space and contrary to the council's opinion would have a positive effect on the street scene as well as providing an additional dwelling to meet the demand for more homes.
- 4.3 Taking the above information into account the supporting response from a local resident who could be considered to be most affected by the proposal should add weight in favour of the scheme.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 Thus, it is stated that the appeal proposal conforms with the overall aims of overall aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMH6, MHDB 5, DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14 and DMHB 18 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

22nd November 2024