

Grounds of Appeal

5 Leybourne Road, Hillingdon UB10 9HA

Ref: 33692/APP/2017/4098

CONTEXT

The site is in a quiet residential location characterised by a mixture of developments ranging from interwar housing mainly semi-detached from the 1930's to post war terraced housing from the late 1950's the area could accurately be described as having a mixed character. The proposal adjoins a pair of semi-detached houses to the South West of the site and a terrace of four houses built in the 1930's to the North East of the site. The proposal seeks to take its reference from the terraced housing adjoining and will be built on the same building line, have similar materials and architectural details. The building has been designed with a bay window feature although not identical similar in character to that of the adjoining terraced houses. The eaves height and ridge height would broadly match those of the adjoining houses. The site frontage of the proposed house is 5.3 metres which is slightly more than the adjoining terraced houses which have site frontage of 4.8 metres is slightly less than the adjoining semi-detached houses which have a frontage of 5.7 metres. Given the above it can be seen that the proposal has been designed to as far as possible blend in and compliment the character of the area. The council state that by reason of the sighting, size and design that the building would be out of keeping. The sighting of the building is on the established building line, the size of the building is very comparable with the housing stock in the area and the design is in context with the previous developments within the area we do not therefore feel that reason No.1 has been convincingly justified by the Local Authority.

The second reason for refusal relates to insufficient street parking, the proposal is a small two bedroom three person house and is likely to generate a requirement of one space in my judgment. The Hillingdon Parking Standards contained within the London Borough of Hillingdon's UDP dated September 2007 states that the parking for a dwelling house should be a maximum of two spaces. It follows therefore that a provision of one space could also be seen as complying with this standard. The standard of two spaces per dwelling applies equally to a six bedroom house and a two bedroom house such as we are proposing. So it is right to use a certain amount of judgement, it should also be noted that the road is characterised by an extensive amount of forecourt parking which means that the actual road is not particularly heavily parked. With regards to the parking provision

for the adjoining house, which is referred to in the reason for refusal, this is outside the application site and cannot therefore be used as a reason for refusal.

Reason No.3 relates to the unsatisfactory size of the proposed house, the Officer's report states that the gross internal floor area of the house is 61 square metres, I calculate the area of the proposed house to be 67 square metres, the house will also have the benefit of having a loft space providing an additional storage area of 13 square metres above 1.5 metres in height this area when added to the 67 of the lower floors gives an area of 80 square metres which complies with the London Plan. It is a requirement of the London Plan to provide adequate storage and it's perfectly justifiable to include this area of storage within the overall floor space provided.

Reason No.4 relates to useable amenity space, our proposal proves 60 square metres of usable amenity space which complies with the requirements in the UDP and from reading the Officer's report is accepted as being compliant with the policies. The reasons for the refusal appears to relate to the lack of amenity space for the existing house at No.5 which is owned by the applicant but outside the application site. He is quite happy with this size of garden particularly in view of the fact that he has a very large front garden area which although not considered by the Local Authority to be useable provides amenity value in the form of gardening and other activities. It's worth noting that the houses at 1a & 3 Leybourne Road have a similar garden size to the existing house at No.5 there are examples of smaller gardens in the area such as the house at Saint Ives which is five doors away, which appears to have an area of approximately 40 Square metres of amenity space, it is therefore not unusual or out of character for houses in the area to have relatively small gardens. There are also a number of large recreational spaces in close proximity to the site.

Conclusion: The proposed house would provide an additional house which due to its smaller size would be more affordable than the adjoining 3 and 4 bedroom units and improve the housing mix in the area. Although the addition of one house is not in itself going to solve the housing crisis in the Greater London area every little helps. The proposal in broad terms complies with the policies UDP and therefore the appeal should be allowed.