

THE FORMAL RESPONSE OF THE APPELLANT
TO THE WRITTEN STATEMENT OF THE LPA

10 Lawn Avenue,
West Drayton UB7 7AQ

Appeal Reference: 6005469

20 April 2026

1. This response is submitted on behalf of the appellant in reply to the council's appeal statement. It should be read alongside the appellant's Appeal Statement and the Supporting Statement that accompanied the original planning application.
2. In relation to character and appearance, the council places emphasis on the spatial character of the area, rather than variation in the architectural design of individual buildings. The appellant does not dispute that the area is characterised by relatively open plots. However, the appeal proposal relates to a corner site with an atypical relationship to the street and neighbouring properties, within an area that already displays variation in plot sizes, building forms and orientations.
3. The proposal has been deliberately designed to reduce its apparent scale and bulk, including through the use of a partly sunken form. The council has not demonstrated that the limited change proposed would result in material harm to the character of the area, particularly having regard to policy support for the optimisation of small sites.
4. In respect of accessibility, the council treats compliance with M4(2) as an absolute requirement. The appellant has acknowledged that full compliance is not achieved and has explained that this is a direct consequence of a design-led response to site constraints and the need to limit height and bulk. The council's statement does not engage with this point, nor with the need to balance accessibility objectives against other development plan considerations. The shortfall is limited and does not justify refusal of an otherwise acceptable form of development.
5. In relation to highways and parking, the council does not dispute the findings of the Transport Statement or the parking stress survey, which demonstrate that the surrounding highway network has substantial spare capacity and that any displacement of parking would not give rise to harm.

6. The council has not identified any specific safety issue associated with the existing access, nor has it demonstrated that the modest intensification proposed would result in an unacceptable impact on highway or pedestrian safety. The high threshold for refusal set out in paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework is not met.
7. In terms of living conditions, the council relies on qualitative concerns regarding outlook, enclosure and privacy. However, it does not provide any technical evidence to demonstrate unacceptable levels of daylight or sunlight. The proposed dwelling exceeds the minimum internal space standards, provides direct access to external space and includes private amenity space that meets policy requirements. While the accommodation reflects the constraints of the site, it would provide an acceptable standard of living for future occupiers.
8. For the reasons already set out, the appellant considers that the proposal accords with the development plan when read as a whole and that the limited concerns identified do not justify refusal of planning permission.