



THE GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP Ltd

CHARTERED ARCHITECTS & TOWN PLANNING CONSULTANTS

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED) SECTION 78

SITE AT 103 HILLINGDON HILL, HILLINGDON, UB10 0JQ

PLANNING APPEAL ON BEHALF OF MR PRADEEP MEHTA

APPLICATION REF.: 2699/APP/2021/2808

GMP REF.: 3423/22/JG

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT

“Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a 2 storey office outbuilding, including 2 parking spaces.”

APPELLANT’S GROUNDS OF APPEAL – STATEMENT OF CASE

JUNE 2022



1. SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

The site is situated off of a service road to the rear of a shopping parade fronting Hillingdon Hill. The service road services a number of existing commercial uses and in some cases the shops fronting Hillingdon Hill.

The majority of the existing uses accessed off of the rear service road are commercial, many of which are two storeys in height. The existing site has a dilapidated garage / storage building of very poor construction with a large forecourt area which is subject to regular fly tipping episodes which our client does his best to control. It is understood that there are also incidences of anti-social behaviour as the site is accessed via a small alley from the Hillingdon Hill shopping parade and at night this provides ideal access for people who appear to want to get out of the public gaze.

The site benefits from a recent consent for a single storey office building of a similar size to the existing garage however our client feels that the market for such a small office unit would be limited and is reluctant to proceed with the project. However the two storey proposal is more viable in terms of re-build costs etc.

2. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

There is one reason for refusal which relates to visual intrusion, overbearing, overshadowing, loss of light and loss of views. The proposal has been designed to have a limited height with the rooms set within a roof slope. The height of the ridge being set below the CIL height of flats at 101A, 103A and 105A Hillingdon Hill. The flat at 101 Hillingdon Hill is at ground floor level and the views would hence not be significantly affected as it is not immediately behind the proposed building.

Notwithstanding the fact that the views from these flats would not be significantly affected, I would point out that it is an established principle that there is no right to a view as such.

The overbearing impact which is suggested in relation to 101 Hillingdon Hill I feel is misguided in view of the fact that the roof of the proposed building is set at a height below the CIL height of the flat concerned. It is also proposed to have a tiled roof sloping away from the adjoining building at 103 Hillingdon Hill, 13.5 meters away from the windows in question.

With respect to the loss of light suggestion to the flats above the shops in Hillingdon Hill and at 105 Hillingdon Hill on the ground floor, all of these units are to the South of our client's proposal and therefore, due to the orientation, are not going to be overshadowed by our client's proposal. Our client has had a daylight and sunlight study done by specialist consultant prepared by Jonathan Nash, LLB (hons) which is attached to this appeal but did not form a part of the application.

The appearance of the building in terms of the conservation area and appearance in the street scene was carefully negotiated with the case officer during the life of the

application and the appearance of the building was considered acceptable in this respect.

I would conclude that the suggestion that the proposal would lead to significant loss of amenity for the adjoining flats is mis-founded. Furthermore the redevelopment of the site would have significant benefits in bringing this redundant and derelict site which is being subjected to abuse from fly tipping and other anti-social behaviour as outlined in the introduction to my statement of case.

I would therefore ask you to uphold our client's appeal.

Mr Jeffrey Gillett, R.I.B.A., The Gillett Macloed Partnership