



Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 78 Planning Appeal

London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

Appeal By:
Mr J S Hayer

Proposal:
Construction of single storey, one-bedroom house with associated parking, amenity space
and installation of vehicular crossover to front

Appeal Site:
Land Between 85 & 85A
Larch Crescent, Hayes, UB49EB

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

21521/APP/2020/3641
APP/R5510/W/21/3275918

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This appeal statement is submitted by the London Borough of Hillingdon, as the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in respect of the appeal against its refusal to grant planning permission.
- 1.2 The LPA refused planning permission on 21 January 2021 for the following reason (as stated on the decision notice):
 1. The proposed attached house, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk, design and appearance, would fail to harmonise with the existing houses in the street resulting in a cramped form of overdevelopment to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).
 2. The proposal has not demonstrated that sufficient off street parking/manoeuvring arrangements would be provided, and therefore the development is considered to result in substandard car parking provision, leading to on-street parking/queuing to the detriment of public and highway safety and contrary to policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) and to Hillingdon's Adopted Parking Standards as set out in Appendix C of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).
- 1.3 The LPA's case is set out in the Planning Officer's delegated report, which should be read in conjunction with this statement. A copy of the delegated report is provided at Appendix 1. Copies of relevant planning policies are included at Appendix 2.
- 1.4 This statement will not repeat the delegated report and will focus on addressing matters raised in the Appellant's statement of case.

2. LPA Comments on Appellant's Statement of Case

- 2.1 The appellant has advised that the two garages, previously approved under the extant consents, 21521/APP/2020/1290 (Number 85) and 75542/APP/2020/1288 (Number 85A), have now been built and contends that the visual impact of the appeal proposal would not be significant over that which has now been built.
- 2.2 The Council however considers that these extensions were approved as ancillary extensions to existing dwellings rather than the creation of a separate dwelling. The approved garages with garage door openings, clearly have the visual appearance of ancillary garages for each respective dwelling and is a typical development that one can expect in a residential location. Conversely, the proposed dwelling would subdivide these plots to create a separate planning unit, and awkwardly adopt an amalgamated garage form to create an odd, single-storey, flat-roofed housing

typology that is wholly alien within the street scene. This harmful visual impact would be exacerbated by the fact that the dwelling would be awkwardly crammed between and adjoin both 85 and 85A Larch Crescent. This would create a cramped and harmful terracing impact, latching the uniform terrace of Nos. 81-85 Larch Crescent onto the detached No. 85A Larch Crescent. This would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the street scene and the character of the area and would set a harmful precedent for future development.

- 2.3 It is noted that the Inspector in his previous appeal decision for a two-storey dwelling at No. 85 advised:

"Whilst the appeal site lies within an area which is home to a range of dwelling types the proposed dwelling would be attached to a terrace of four similar houses. The proposed dwelling would be noticeably narrower than the other properties within this terraced row and it would include an integral garage, which is not a feature of the other houses and would appear out of context as a result.

These factors lead me to the conclusion that the proposed dwelling would be at odds with the appearance, scale and form of the other houses within the terrace of which it would be a part"

- 2.3 Whilst it is accepted that the current proposal is single storey, it would not retain the separation from No. 85A that the above appeal application did. For the reasons outlined above it is considered that the creation of a new dwelling between the two properties, would be at odds with the established character of the area and the visual amenities of the area in conflict with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11; DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part two (2020).
- 2.4 The appellant has advised that two parking spaces would be provided for each of the existing houses at Numbers 85 and 85A Larch Crescent with one new space being provided for the proposed dwelling. However, concerns are raised in terms of accessing the proposed parking spaces with the crossover arrangement shown on the submitted plans. The proposed development fails to provide sufficient off-street parking provision which meets the councils approved parking standards to service the proposed dwellings. The development would therefore lead to additional on street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety and is therefore contrary to Policies DMT2 and DMT6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020).

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 For the reasons set out in the delegated report and this statement the proposal would fail to harmonise with the existing houses in the street, resulting in a cramped form of overdevelopment to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would also fail to provide adequate off-street parking. The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.

- 3.2 In the event that the Inspector considers the appeal should be allowed, and without prejudice to the Council's case, a list of recommended planning conditions is included at Appendix 3.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Planning Officer's Delegated Report

Appendix 2 – Copies of Relevant Planning Policies

Appendix 3 – The LPA's Recommended Conditions