

APPEAL STATEMENT

Against refusal of planning permission
6476/APP/2020/1931

for

Erection of a two storey, 1-bed dwelling house with associated
parking and amenity space including demolition of existing single
storey side extension

at

87 Mulberry Crescent, West Drayton, UB7 9AQ

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Description of Site/Local Environs
- 3.0 Grounds of Appeal
- 4.0 Other Matters
- 5.0 Summary & Conclusions
- 6.0 Appendix

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document comprises the appellants Planning Appeal Statement for refusal of planning application 6476/APP/2020/1931 by London Borough of Hillingdon ("Council") for Erection of a two storey, 1-bed dwelling house with associated parking and amenity space including demolition of existing single storey side extension ("Proposal") at 87 Mulberry Crescent, West Drayton, UB7 9AQ ("Site").

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF SITE/CHARACTER OF AREA

- 2.1 The property known as 87 Mulberry Crescent, West Drayton, UB7 9AQ is a two storey semi-detached dwelling house, situated near the corner of Mulberry Crescent and Eastwood Road. Currently used as an extended small family dwelling house consisting of one living room, three bedrooms, two bathrooms, a kitchen, and open plan dining room. Appearances of walls are pebbledash render, pitched tiled roof, white uPVC windows and doors. Rear amenity space with an outbuilding and a garage to the side.
- 2.2 Area mostly consists of a mixture of terraced and semi-detached dwellings.

3.0 GROUNDS OF APPEAL

- 3.1 Refusal reason number 1, planning officer incorrectly used total floor area figure of 56 square metres, instead of correctly using the Gross Internal Area (GIA) figure 61.8 square metres. Proposal complies with the minimum floor standard for two storey one-bedroom dwelling house, which requires 58 square metres.
- 3.2 Refusal reason number 2, previous proposal for two-bedroom dwelling house had identical ground floor layout, without W.C. and had no objections, but simply a recommendation for a condition. Please see page 5 section 5 of document "Delegated Report 6476/APP/2020/611", report extract is also in Appendix 1.
- 3.3 Refusal reason number 3, previous proposal for two-bedroom dwelling house had identical design and appearance, this proposal simply reduced with width of the development by 0.8 metres. It was not deemed unacceptable during initial application.
- 3.4 Refusal reason number 4, previous proposal for two-bedroom dwelling house had identical parking layout, with one parking space for each dwelling, and had no objections from Transport department. Please see page 5 section 5 of document "Delegated Report 6476/APP/2020/611", report extract is also in Appendix 2.

4.0 OTHER MATTERS

- 4.1 Previous refusal reason number 1 under reference 6476/APP/2020/611 has been addressed by increasing the set in from the boundary from 1 metre to 1.8 metres to provide the additional visual gap with properties number 2 & 4 Eastwood Road.
- 4.2 Previous refusal reason number 2 under reference 6476/APP/2020/611 has been fully addressed by reducing the width of the proposed development from 4.6 metres to 3.8 metres, to ensure width of proposed development is no more than half the width of the original dwelling.
- 4.3 Previous refusal reason number 3 under reference 6476/APP/2020/611 has been fully addressed by reducing the number of bedrooms from 2-bedroom house to 1-bedroom house, and as a result complying with the minimum indoor floor area standard.
- 4.4 Planning Condition to submit soft and hard landscaping to the Council for prior approval prior would seem sensible in order to resolve any concerns in relation to front and side landscaping.

5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- 5.1 During previous application with reference 6476/APP/2020/611 no objects were raised from Access nor from Transport department, however, those elements remained altered on the appeal proposal, and now cause significant concern. The decision making does not seem fair or consistent.
- 5.2 Both applications were determined by the same planning officer, the overall aspect of the proposal has not greatly changed, only to incorporate previously raised concerns, which seemed minimal. However, the appeal proposal views and concerns now greatly vary and seem much more unacceptable. This raises doubt in the way applications are determined.
- 5.3 All refusal reasons from previous application with reference 6476/APP/2020/611 were all addressed and design incorporated new changed to adhere to the concerns raised.
- 5.4 Objects and concerns raised in appeal proposal were absent in the previous application, where parking arrangements, and ground floor layout without W.C. remained altered.

6.0 APPENDIX

- 6.1 Delegated Report extract for previous refusal 6476/APP/2020/611 had no objections from Access in relation to current issue with no W.C. on ground floor:

5. **Comments on Public Consult**

7 neighbouring properties were consulted via letters on 02-03-20. No response was received.

Highways: No comment

Trees/Landscape: No comment

Access: No objection, but recommend a condition

- 6.2 Delegated Report extract for previous refusal 6476/APP/2020/611 had no objections from Transport department:

5. **Comments on Public Consult**

7 neighbouring properties were consulted via letters on 02-03-20. No response was received.

Highways: No comment

Trees/Landscape: No comment

Access: No objection, but recommend a condition
