

An appeal by **Rivergate Homes Ltd** against the decision of

London Borough of Hillingdon

to refuse planning permission for;

Variation of Condition 2 (Development in Accordance with Approved Plans) of planning permission Ref: 73184/APP/2017/3359 dated 05/12/2017 (Two x 2-storey, 3-bed dwellings with habitable roof space, parking and amenity space and single storey cycle shed) to add a parking bay in front of plot 1 with new access from Pine Needle Lane (private road) and associated landscaping changes at;

Land Rear Of 140-142 Green Lane

Northwood

HA6 1AN

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT

Prepared by: **Duncan Gibson. B.A. (Hons.) M.R.T.P.I.**
Chartered Town Planning Consultant.
www.duncangibson.com

Date: September 2021.
LPA Ref 73184/APP/2021/2561

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Planning Officer Report and Recommendation in respect of the Appeal
Application

Appendix 2: Appeal Decision letter APP/Q3115/A/08/2072184

1.0 THE APPELLANTS CASE

- 1.1 Planning permission reference 73184/APP/2017/3359 granted consent for two x 2-storey, 3-bed dwellings with habitable roof space, parking and amenity space and single storey cycle shed. Condition 2 of that permission listed the approved drawings. The approved site plan drawing listed therein, drawing no. 17/3445/1 Rev A, indicates that the proposed car parking for plot 2 would be located to the front of the dwelling but the allocated parking for plot 1 would be located much less conveniently alongside (to the east) of plot 2's rear garden. The applicant/appellant is of the opinion that this is an unfavourable position which will detract from the attractiveness of the approved dwelling (now under construction) and could potentially lead to future occupiers of that dwelling parking instead kerbside in Church Road.
- 1.2 The appeal application – an application under Section 73 of the Act - therefore sought to vary condition 2 in order to add submitted drawing “Parking 1” to the list of approved plans thereby agreeing a more conveniently located single parking space in front of plot 1.
- 1.3 The appeal application was refused for the reasons set out in the notice of refusal. The appellant is of the opinion that those reasons for refusal are not soundly based and do not stand up to detailed scrutiny. This appeal has been lodged consequently.
- 1.4 The appellant does not dispute the content or weight of the policies quoted in the reasons for refusal. It is the actual on the ground impacts of the proposal which it takes issue with. The appellant believes that those impacts are greatly exaggerated by the Council, that the alleged harm will not arise and therefore the policy conflict does not arise. This brief statement will therefore simply address those alleged impacts.
- 1.5 The first reason for refusal alleges that the proposed parking space would result in an over dominant expanse of hardstanding which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of this verdant suburban setting. However, it will be evident from the submitted layout drawing that the appeal proposal allows for a wide band of

landscaping across the front of the site frontage. This planting will extend across a wider length of pavement edge than the approved position. The planting would also limit the visual impact of both the hard surfacing itself and any vehicle that might be parked on it.

- 1.6 The proposed alternative layout also provides sufficient space for the planting of the tree shown on the approved landscaping details – there will be no significant diminution of the verdant suburban setting as alleged.
- 1.7 The second reason for refusal alleges that the proposal would lead to an overprovision of parking for the development and a threat to highway and pedestrian conditions in the area. This is a puzzling allegation. The intent of the appeal proposal is to provide a more conveniently located space for proposed plot 1. Plot 1 would, as a result of the proposal have the benefit of three parking spaces, two of which would be in tandem form in the originally approved location and constrained by fencing for gardens on either side. If these three spaces have a wider consequence than making the quantum and location of parking more convenient then the appellant would be willing to forego one of the two tandem spaces and a condition to that effect could be imposed – though the appellant questions quite what purpose would be served thereby. The intent of the appeal proposal is to provide a more conveniently located parking space, not to increase the quantum of provision.
- 1.8 The “*substantial threat to the highway and pedestrian/occupiers conditions of the area*” alleged in the second reason for refusal is also a mystery to the appellant. The approved situation has potential for plot 1 having to reverse out of its parking spaces and potentially into the public highway if the turning area within the car park is occupied. Conversely, the appellant has demonstrated by swept path diagram that a relatively easy reversing movement into the side access road (known as Pine Needle Lane) is available thus allowing exiting vehicles to enter the highway in forward gear. Perhaps more likely still is a scenario whereby the occupier of plot 1 reverses in to the proposed space from Pine Needle Lane and thus exits it in a forward gear.

1.9 In short, there is no overprovision of spaces and no threat to highway or pedestrian safety. The harm alleged in the second reason for refusal does not arise and there is consequently no policy conflict.

1.10 In light of the foregoing the Inspector is respectfully asked to allow this appeal.