



Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 78 Planning Appeal

London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

Appeal By:
Mr S Singh

Proposal:
Erection of two storey side and rear extension to create 1 x 1-bed dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and boundary treatment following demolition of existing single storey extension.

Appeal Site:
89 Warwick Crescent, Hayes, UB4 8RQ

Our Ref: 76347/APP/2022/4
Your Ref: APP/R5510/W/22/3313395

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 planning permission.
- 1.2 The LPA refused planning permission on 29.06.2022 for the following reasons (as stated on the decision notice):
 1. The proposed development, by virtue of its overcomplicated design, siting, size, scale and bulk would fail to appear as a subordinate or architecturally sympathetic addition to the host dwelling and small terrace of houses to which it would be connected. It would unbalance the visual symmetry of the terrace and would form an unsightly addition to the street scene. The proposal is therefore considered to be detrimental to the character, appearance of the host dwelling, the other terraces within the terrace block and the wider street scene, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).
 2. The proposed extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and projection forward of the recognised established return line along this side of Warwick Crescent on this corner plot, is considered to represent an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development within the street scene. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenities of the street scene and open spacious character of this plot and surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), as well as paragraphs 71, 124 and 130 of the NPPF (2021).
- 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. Appendix 1 contains a list of recommended conditions, should the inspector be minded to allow this appeal.
- 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 Within their statement of case the appellant has raised the following summarised points:
 - The proposed development would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling, terraces in which the dwelling is sited or the general character and appearance of the area.

- This appeal scheme overcomes concerns raised regarding other schemes which have been refused at the development site.

Taking into consideration these points the appellant believes the proposed scheme to be acceptable. The LPA's responses are set out below.

- 2.2 The proposed development is not in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and it is considered to be harmful to the visual amenities of the streetscene and existing block of terraces, for reasons set out in section 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 of this report, as well as the Officer's Delegated Report and Decision Notice.
- 2.3 The previously refused development at the site was taken into consideration in the assessment of this appeal scheme (See the Officers Delegated Report).
- 2.4 The net provision of 1 additional residential unit (alongside minor economic benefits) would not outweigh the schemes significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

3. Other Matters

- 3.1 The officers delegated report and copies of the relevant planning policies (referenced in the delegated report) have been sent separately.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 For the reasons set out in the Officers Delegated report and this statement the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.
- 4.2 In the event that the Inspector considers the appeal should be allowed, and without prejudice to the Council's case, a list of recommended planning conditions is included at Appendix 1.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – The LPA's Recommended Conditions