



Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Section 78 Planning Appeal

# London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

**Appeal By:**  
**Purewal Property Ltd**

**Proposal:**  
**Creation of two additional floors above existing building to incorporate 4 x 1-bed flats (Prior Approval)**

**Appeal Site:**  
**68-76 Albert Road, WEST DRAYTON, UB7 8ES**

**Our Ref: 33654/APP/2020/2582**  
**Your Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3275115**

# 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 prior approval for the creation of two additional floors above existing building to incorporate 4 x 1-bed flats (Prior Approval)
- 1.2 The LPA refused the application on 17 November 2020 for the following reasons (as stated on the decision notice):
  1. The proposed development does not constitute permitted development by virtue of the provisions of Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as the proposal, by reason of its siting, height, scale, bulk and design, would fail to harmonise with the character and architectural composition of surrounding properties, appearing as an awkward, incongruous and cramped form of development which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and prior approval is refused under Condition A.2 -(1)(e).
  2. Insufficient information has been submitted in order to enable the Local Planning Authority to establish whether the development complies with Condition A.2.-(1)(g) in respect of loss of light, such that detrimental impacts to the amenity of neighbouring properties could arise from the proposed development. The proposed development by virtue of the increase in height of the application building would result in an overly dominant form of development which would detract from both the levels of natural light and outlook available to the occupants of Nos. 59 and 61 Albert Road, resulting in an unacceptable loss of amenity for neighbouring premises contrary to the requirements of Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and prior approval is refused under Condition A.2.-(1)(g).
  3. The proposed development does not constitute permitted development by virtue of the provisions of Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as the proposal would fail to provide acceptable light to two (2) habitable rooms (kitchens) within the proposed residential units annotated as 76A and 76C on the submitted plans contrary to the requirements of Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and prior approval is refused under Condition A.2-(1)(f).

4. The proposed development does not constitute permitted development by virtue of the provisions of Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as the proposal, by virtue of the restricted manoeuvring space, would fail to provide sufficient off street parking provision which would meet the councils approved parking standards. The development would therefore lead to additional on-street parking to the detriment of public and highway safety on Albert Road and is therefore contrary to Policies DMT2 and DMT6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and prior approval is refused under Condition A.2-(1)(a).
  5. The proposed development does not constitute permitted development by virtue of the provisions of Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as the proposal would fail to provide acceptable secure cycle storage provision to service the proposed residential units contrary to the requirements of Policy DMT6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and prior approval is refused under Condition A.2-(1)(a).
  6. The proposed development does not constitute permitted development by virtue of the provisions of Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as the proposal fails to demonstrate that 5% of all parking spaces would be provided with an active electric vehicle charging point with a further 5% having passive provision contrary to the requirements of Policy DMT6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and prior approval is refused under Condition A.2-(1)(a).
- 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.
  - 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, in the appeal statement confirms that the proposed upward extension is a modest and subordinate addition. The Council maintains that the proposed extension would not appear subordinate and as the proposal, by reason of its siting, height, scale, bulk and design, would fail to harmonise with the character and architectural composition of surrounding properties, appearing as an awkward, incongruous and cramped form of development which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the

Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and prior approval is refused under Condition A.2 -(1)(e).

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 For the reasons set out in the delegated report, the Council considers that proposal would be unacceptable. The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Planning Officer’s Delegated Report  
Appendix 2 – Suggested conditions.