



Fayeh Development Consultants

206 Hillingdon Street London SE17 3JD

Email: dapofdc@gmail.com

Telephone: 07956 965267

Website: www.fayehdevelopments.com

Richard Mitchell
3C Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Response to LPA Comments on Appellant's Statement of Case

Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3271814

02 September 2021

Dear Richard Mitchell,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Appeal by Mr Jazvinder Sokhi

Site Address: 1 Adelphi Crescent, HAYES, UB4 8LY

Below are our responses to London borough of Hillingdon comments to the above appeal as requested. The LPA comment are in blue ink and our responses are in black ink.

Impact on the character and appearance of the Site

2.1 The Council disagrees with the appellant that the proposed development would not appear as a cramped form of development and would respect the established character of the area for the reasons set out in Section 7.2 of the attached delegated report.

2.2 In response to the Council's concerns about the position of the proposed dwelling in close proximity to the boundary resulting in the loss of space on this prominent corner plot, the appellant has provided examples of extensions to the side of other properties in the area and tabled their open space area to the side and length along the street. However, these are single-storey extensions that are visually subordinate

to their respective dwellings. Conversely, the proposal is for a two-storey dwelling that would enclose this important visual gap both in area and vertically, appearing unduly cramped within the site. Therefore, the Council maintains that the proposed dwelling would by reason of its siting in this open prominent position, size, scale, bulk and design would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area as set out in section 7.2 of the officer delegated report.

RESPONSE

We have clearly demonstrated in drawing No: FDC/20/04/12a submitted that our proposal respects the important visual gap characteristic to the area.

The position of our proposed block to the front and rear forms an alignment with No's 3, 5, 7, 9 Adelphi Crescent etc as demonstrated on proposed street elevation, drawing No: FDC/20/04/09a. The proposal is similar to these rows of semi-detached to its left in bulk, scale and appearance, hence on a wider scale street view, it is more associated with the row of semi-detached block to the left than No 1 Adelphi Crescent.

The proposal does not form an attachment to the host building hence it would not be subordinate to the host building. We believe that the statement by the LPA that (*neighbouring building extensions are single-storey extensions that are visually subordinate to their respective dwellings*) does not describe the appearance of the proposed street setting. The visual gap between the host and proposed building from the street is approximately 15 meters compared to similar settings which are at most 11 meters wide.

We strongly believe the street character, appearance and visual amenities of the wider area as set out have been enhance and improved by our proposal.

Impact on residential amenity

2.3 The appellant maintains that the windows in the host dwelling, most affected by the proposal, serve non habitable rooms or rooms that are served by another light source. However, it is not only light provision that the Council raises concerns but also visual intrusion, particularly as the separation distance between the two storey elements of the host dwelling and proposed dwelling is just 5.6m. Given the proximity and orientation of the proposed dwelling, the outlook from rear facing windows and

the garden to the rear would be dominated by the proposed dwelling resulting in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook. The private patio area to the rear of the host dwelling would be dominated by the proposed dwelling. Living conditions for future occupants.

RESPONSE

The outlook of the proposed building at first floor level has been considered in the proposal even though its proximity and orientation look dominant. The windows closer to the proposed dwelling both at first and ground floor level are to non-habitable room the utility on the ground floor and the family bathroom on the first floor which consists of obscure glazing.

Even though we have shown that the primary light source to the kitchen/sitting/dining area of the host building is from the front window, we have also we demonstrated that the kitchen patio door give a full height outlook to at least 30% amenity space to the rear of the property,

however window to the utility; hall and staircase give further outlook to the other 70% amenity space to the property. We believe the combination of all windows give a fair amount of outlook and serve as a light source to the property.

The patio area suggested to have been dominated by the proposed dwelling only amounts to 30% of the private amenity space provide. The other 70% that is also served by a patio is open to the front of the dwelling as demonstrated on the proposed ground floor plan drawing No: FDC/20/04/07b. We do not agree that the majority of the host building amenity space would be dominated by the proposed dwelling.

2.4 The Council accepts that the amended plan submitted with this appeal to reflect a reorganisation of the internal first floor would meet the London Plan Requirements and National Space Standards. However, the application was refused based on the drawings submitted for the planning application.

Accessibility.

RESPONSE

No comment

2.5 The Council acknowledges that amended plans have been submitted with the appeal to ensure that the proposed dwelling incorporates design features which are incompatible with the standards required Policy D7 of the London Plan (2021). However, as noted above, the application was refused based on the drawings submitted for the planning application.

Landscaping.

RESPONCE

Wheelchair access was demonstrated on the last application refused by the local authority Application No: 75616/APP/2020/2866 that was validated on 08/09/2020. The information is on the ground floor plan (Drg No: FDC/20/04/07a) and the design and access statement, section 12; page 30.

We provided a 1:12 ramp leading to the rear of the property and a flush threshold into the property. We also formed the hallway to be wheel chair accessible and a disabled toilet.

We respectfully ask the Inspectorate to dismiss claim by the LPA that Policy D7 requirement was not addressed in the application submitted to the Hillingdon council.

2.6 The Council remains concerned that the frontage of the proposed dwelling would be dominated by hardstanding as set out in section 7.6 of the Officers delegated report.

RESPONCE

The provision of a hardstanding much need was very important to this proposal to address onsite parking issues, a driveway was needed because of the position of corner siting of the host site, however we have improved the existing soft landscape area to the existing property by 4 folds.

The soft landscaping to the existing property amounts to 6m², we propose increase this to 26m².

We have not proposed to remove the existing tree on site. We have proposed another 2 trees to the frontage to make a total of 3 trees

We propose introduce permeable block paving to all vehicular hardstanding, this is stated in our design and access statement, section 10 paragraph 10.11.

We believe we have addressed the soft landscaping issues raised by the LPA and made an improvement on what was existing on the site.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed the Impact on the character and appearance of the Site; the Impact on residential amenity and improvement on the landscape to the front of the existing property and the fact that the issue of disabled access raised had already been addressed in last application to Hillingdon council. We respectfully ask the ask the Planning inspectorate to grant permission.

Regards,

Ola

.....
Ola Fayehun
Principal Designer
.....