

Michael Joyce
north2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

10th May 2023

Dear Michael,

APP/R5510/W/22/3309744 – 251 Long Lane, Hillingdon, Uxbridge, UB10 9JP

A Statement of Case was submitted by the Appellant when the appeal was lodged. It is not our intention to re-cover the topics identified in the Statement of Case, but to simply respond to any new points raised in the third party representations.

Response to third party representations

One of the third party comments states that, *“the Appellant provides no substantive reason to the Council’s position. The dwelling, by way of its siting, would abut the front boundary of the site and would project beyond the established building line”*.

However, as detailed at paragraph 3.3-3.4 of the Appellants full SoC, all of the properties sit at an angle to Parkway. If the relationship along Parkway is extrapolated to the appeal site, it is an appropriate position for a new house.

The garage door is not considered to be overdominant, it is an integrated design, allowing parking for 1 car. The proposed elevations and visualisation show how the design will be a high quality addition to the streetscene.

The Appellant disagrees that there is a conflict with the proposal and the established character of the area, the area contains significant variation in architectural ages and styles.

The comments regarding residential amenity have already been discussed in the full SoC and so will not needlessly be repeated here. However, it is important to note that the Council have not raised an objection on the basis of the quality of internal space being provided, so the third party comments on this point are irrelevant.

With regard to reason 3 for refusal, road user safety, the expert statement from Markides Associates (included within the full SoC) addresses these matters in detail, confirming that there should be no transport objections to the scheme on the grounds of highway impact, trip generation or parking. Indeed, the site benefits from an existing crossover and the fundamentals of the existing access arrangement remain unchanged as part of the proposals. Therefore, the comments from the third party relating to this point are not justified.

Other Matters

Two of the three third party comments are from the same surname and include very similar bullet points, the only points to clarify are that the proposal is an entirely different site and proposal to that of the appeal previously dismissed on the neighbouring site (extracts included in the full SoC) and the parking space provided in the garage does meet the required standard.

Accordingly, and for the reasons set out in the submitted planning statement, full statement of case and the final comments set out in this letter, we believe that this appeal should be allowed.

Yours sincerely,

Zoe Wilkinson

Zoe Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI
Associate
01722 638008