

GROUNDNS FOR APPEAL

Householder Planning Application
LB Hillingdon

56 Frogmore Avenue
Hayes, UB4 8AR

LBH Ref Nos: 7040/APP/2019/3521
Drawing Nos: 17/38/210 15/32 17/38/211

16 March 2020

Grounds For Appeal

1. A retrospective planning application was made to the London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH) for planning permission of the erection of a pitched roof portico received by the Council on the 25 November 2019. Development was refused by LBH on the 6 January 2020.

2. The application site comprises a two storey semi detached dwelling situated on the eastern side of Frogmore Avenue. The property is set back from the adjacent highway to accommodate off road parking for up to two cars to the front, and is finished in white render with a plain tile roof. The property has been previously extended by way of a hip to gable roof extension, rear extensions and the recent addition of a front portico. The application site falls within a residential area of Frogmore Avenue, Hayes which is characterised by a row of semi-detached properties that are of a similar size and design, and set back from the adjacent highway to accommodate spacious front gardens and off road parking.

3. The proposed design of the portico is of a modest size and design similar to others erected to neighbouring properties which can be seen by photographs issued with this Grounds for Appeal. These are shown within the appendix.

4. With reference to the Borough UDP Policies, the Local Planning Authority (LBH)) has been inconsistent in the application its policies in the vicinity of the premises. The LPA appears to have arbitrarily set different standards for this proposal, inconsistent with the standard in existence to neighbouring properties (see para 3).

5. With regard to statements made in the delegated report:

1. We would contest that

The front canopy by reason of its size, scale, bulk, width and design represents an incongruous form of development which is detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area

2. We strongly disagree that there is

visual harm caused to the character and appearance of the property and streetscene resulting from the front canopy

4. We would dispute that

The proposal constitutes a considerable change to the character and appearance of the existing property, which fails to be subordinate to the original property.... and impacts unduly on the character and appearance of the area in general.

6. The Local Planning Authority should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In this case the LB Hillingdon has not acted in a proactive way of which should be expected.

In assessing the planning application the Council has either used different/ dual standards and/or failed to recognise precedents along the street which contribute to the architectural diversity of the area.

For the reasons given above we would respectfully ask that the Planning Inspector allows the Appeal.