



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/25/3373647

FOR:

Alterations and extension to existing extension to create new end of terrace dwelling with associated amenity, parking and bin storage

AT:

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

November 2025

1.0 Background

- 1.1 This statement is prepared on behalf of Mr J Singh in response to the LPA's statement following the submission of appeal ref APP/R5510/W/25/3373647 in response to council reference 78009/APP/2025/1540.

2.0 LPA statement

- 2.1 The Council's statement largely reiterates concerns raised in the previous appeal but fails to acknowledge the substantive revisions made to the current proposal. The appellant has carefully addressed the Inspector's earlier findings, and the scheme now represents a proportionate and compliant form of development that makes efficient use of land without causing material harm to local character or living conditions.
- 2.2 On the principle of development, the Council misapplies Policy DMH 6 by treating all garden land as untouchable. The policy seeks to prevent inappropriate loss of gardens, but it does not impose a blanket prohibition. The appeal site is not conventional rear garden land; it forms part of an already developed corner plot, with the existing side extension and altered curtilage materially changing its character. The proposal does not result in the loss of usable rear garden space for the host dwelling, nor does it undermine biodiversity or local character. National and London Plan policy emphasises efficient use of land and small-scale infill where it can be achieved without harm, and this scheme meets that objective.
- 2.3 In terms of design, character and the street scene, the Council repeats the Inspector's earlier concerns but overlooks the design changes made. The reduced width, set-back, and articulation of the front elevation ensure the dwelling reads as a separate unit rather than a mere extension. The proposal respects the rhythm of the terrace while maintaining separation from the boundary.
- 2.4 The Council also exaggerates the impact on openness, the corner plot has already been altered by the existing approved development, and the appeal scheme does not materially worsen this. The absence of rear-facing first-floor windows is not a design flaw but a deliberate response to privacy and overlooking concerns. Moreover, the existing extension does not include first floor rear windows.
- 2.5 The Council's claim of "cramped and incongruous" development is subjective and unsupported by substantive evidence given the existing on-site circumstances. The design is proportionate, contextually responsive, and consistent with the London Plan's design-led approach.
- 2.6 With regard to living conditions, the scheme provides over 40sqm of amenity space to the side and rear of the property, meeting the requirement of Policy DMHB 18. The Council's objection rests on subjective judgments about shape and privacy, however, the outdoor amenity space is functional, usable, and well-integrated and will be private

due to proposed boundary treatments. The front garden while partially visible, is screened and comparable to many existing dwellings in the borough.

- 2.7 The Inspector's previous concerns have been addressed, the dwelling footprint has been reduced, the side access improved, and the private garden enlarged. The Council's assertion that the scheme "fails to overcome" earlier issues disregards these tangible improvements. The proposal delivers a high-quality and acceptable living environment for future occupiers.
- 2.8 On housing need, the Council acknowledges the general need for housing but dismisses the contribution of small units. This is inconsistent with the London Plan, which recognises the role of smaller dwellings in meeting diverse housing needs. While the SHMA identifies demand for family housing, it does not preclude delivery of smaller units. A one-bedroom dwelling contributes to housing choice and supports incremental supply. The Council's reliance on its five-year supply position does not negate the benefits of delivering an additional unit in a sustainable location.
- 2.9 In conclusion, the Council's statement relies heavily on repetition of earlier concerns without proper regard to the revisions made. The appellant has demonstrated that the principle of development is acceptable and consistent with national and local policy, that the design is proportionate and contextually sensitive, that adequate and policy-compliant amenity space is provided, and that the scheme contributes positively to housing supply and choice. The appeal proposal represents a sustainable, well-considered form of development that makes efficient use of land without causing material harm. The Council's objections are overstated and fail to outweigh the benefits. Accordingly, the appellant respectfully requests that the appeal be allowed.

3.0 Suggested conditions

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

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 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, DMHB 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).
- 4.2 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