



FINAL COMMENTS STATEMENT

Response to LPA's Statement and third-party representation

AGENT	EJB PLANNING 24 Pinders Farm Drive Warrington Cheshire WA1 2GF TEL: 07890 063888 EMAIL: ejbplanning@gmail.com
LPA	LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON
APPLICATION No.	16477/APP/2025/1616
RECEIVED DATE	10/06/2025
DECISION DATE	15/09/2025
SITE LOCATION	60 Lansbury Drive Hayes UB4 8SD
APPELLANT	Mr Gurpreet Lacchar

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared by EJB Planning, on behalf of Mr Gurpreet Lacchar, in response to the statement of the Local Planning Authority received by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 1.2 The LPA has stated that *“The LPA’s case is set out in the Planning Officer’s Delegated Reports, which should be read in conjunction with this statement.”* As the appellant has already submitted a detailed appeal statement in support of the appeal against the refusal of planning permission, many of the points made by the LPA have already been addressed. Nevertheless, the appellant will respond to the issues raised where necessary.

2.0 RESPONSE TO LPA’S APPEAL STATEMENT

- 2.1 The Planning Officer’s opinion that the appellant’s case only begins on page 21 of their statement is misleading, as the appellant’s appeal statement sets out the background to the case including the LPA’s decision, the consultation responses, a description of the site context from the appellant’s point of view and a detailed description of the proposed development, together with the relevant planning history of the property.
- 2.2 The appellant’s statement then goes on to detail the relevant planning policies and not just those used by the LPA to justify their decision, with the ‘Grounds of Appeal’ identifying the relevance of the policies detailed and how these apply to the development, including the parts of the development not disputed by the Planning Officer, in order to present a rounded argument that identifies and highlights the positive aspects of the development to balance against the arguments raised by the LPA.
- 2.3 In regard to **Appendix A - Revision A Plan Set**, submitted with the appeal, the only plan of relevance is the one discussed in the appellant’s statement (Drawing No. PL – 07), which demonstrates how the parking space can be **reorientated** to meet the requirements of the Highways Officer. The obsolete first floor plan in this plan set has been included in error and does not form part of this appeal. It is therefore requested that **Appendix A** be disregarded to avoid any confusion.
- 2.4 It is reiterated that the Appellant’s Statement as a whole from page 1 – 27 is relevant to this appeal, especially as it accurately describes what is being proposed and at no point suggests a change to the proposal, which is for the conversion of a single dwelling house into 1no. 2-bedroom and 1no. 1-bedroom flats, with amendments to rear fenestration, associated parking, amenity space, bin storage and bicycle storage, other than in reference to changing the layout of the front garden to meet the suggestions of the Highways Officer, which is requested, can be dealt with as a condition. The appeal proposal, therefore, remains identical to that determined by the Council.

- 2.5 The LPA suggests that the approval at No. 76 Lansbury Drive under reference 28415/APP/2019/715 be disregarded as the policies have changed; however, local planning policies remain the same. Whilst it is acknowledged that the London Plan has since been updated, it is argued that the fundamental need for more housing is one of the more significant changes. A smaller family-sized unit, with garden access, will be provided, and this is an important factor, as many smaller households require affordable options.
- 2.6 Furthermore, as detailed in the appellant's Appeal Statement, the Hillingdon SHMA Report (2025) highlights that new build properties are often out of reach for buyers or renters, and also raises the issue that more than one family are often living together to afford the rent of a larger house, leading to overcrowding.
- 2.7 The London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2024) both support a mix of housing to meet the needs of various households, and it is argued that this development, in an area dominated by 3-bedroom housing, can provide a good alternative to traditional family housing and newer flatted developments, which may have one or two bedrooms but lack gardens.
- 2.8 Although the LPA has provided their own example of what it considers to be a similar development at No. 106 The Larches, this proposal included a first floor extension and conversion of a 4-bedroom house, the application was refused for 3 reasons. The appeal was also dismissed with the planning balance being positive in terms of a new unit of accommodation, and negatively, due to its impact on the character of the area and neighbouring amenities, as detailed below:

"Planning Balance

18. *The proposal would provide an additional dwelling as well as providing smaller dwellings for which there is a need, in accordance with Policy H2 of the LP. It would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes. I attach moderate weight to these benefits given the quantum of development. The use of matching materials, refuse and cycle storage, and adherence to a construction management plan are requirements of well-designed development, and neither weigh in favour or against the proposal.*
19. *The proposal would result in the loss of a larger unit suitable for a family, for which there is an identified housing need. Harm would also be caused to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of nearby occupiers, in conflict with the development plan. These are matters to which I give significant weight.*
20. *Consequently, whilst the proposal offers a number of benefits, they are not sufficient to outweigh the policy conflict and other harms I have identified."*

3.0 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 In summary, it is argued that the current proposal for the conversion of a single dwelling house into a 2-bedroom, 3-person flat and a 1-bedroom, 1-person flat, is a high quality form of development, and in this case, would provide a small family unit of accommodation, together with a smaller unit for a single person, both of which have the advantage of a good sized garden.
- 3.2 Whilst it is acknowledged that the Council seek to protect family housing, the provision of good quality, affordable homes for smaller households is also important.
- 3.3 For the reasons set out in the delegated report and this statement, the appeal proposal ought to be considered acceptable, and the Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to allow the appeal.

4.0 CONDITIONS

- 4.1 As previously detailed, it is requested that **Appendix A** be omitted from the appeal submission, as this was intended to demonstrate that the parking arrangement requested by the Highways Officer could be accommodated, not to introduce a new proposal for the conversion, with an older plan set included in error. The appeal proposal, therefore, remains identical to that determined by the Council.
- 4.2 It is therefore requested that the revised front garden design, with parking space, bin storage and planting, can be dealt with via a condition, with the appellant willing to agree to any other conditions deemed necessary by the Inspector.