



APPEAL BY:
Mr Ian Cook (Ian Cook & Co)

AGAINST HILLINGDON BOROUGH COUNCIL'S REFUSAL
TO GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION FOR:

Erection of a single building encompassing three self-contained, independent dwellings over two levels (two 1-bedroom ground floor units and a second floor two-bedroom unit) plus associated access, parking and landscaping

AT
Land Adjacent To 1a Nicholls Avenue, Hillingdon, UB8 3JL

London Borough of Hillingdon Council's Reference: 54817/APP/2022/2568

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS: RESPONSE TO LPA STATEMENT AND
THE THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

December 2023

RJS PLANNING

T: 0208 3543582 M: 07884 138682 E: info@rjsplanning.co.uk
RJS Planning. 15 Vale Court, Ealing Road, Brentford, TW8 0LN

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared by RJS Planning, on behalf of Mr Ian Cook (Ian Cook & Co), in response to the statement of the Local Planning Authority and the third-party representations received.

2.0 RESPONSE TO COUNCIL'S STATEMENT

- 2.1 The following paragraphs will respond where appropriate to the Council's statement.
- 2.2 The development represents a two-storey building with a butterfly roof and a front porch. The building would have three flats: two on the ground floor and one on the first floor. The flats would vary in size, layout, and amenities. The building would use high quality materials which respect the prevailing character of the area.
- 2.3 The Council have objected to the proposal stating that 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.
- 2.4 The appeal site is located in a section of Nicholls Avenue that has a variety of houses with different styles and sizes, creating a lively and attractive streetscape. The houses include detached and semi-detached two-storey buildings, as well as bungalows and chalet bungalows. The appellant argues that the proposed two-storey project with its gabled roof appearance would blend in with the existing streetscape and not harm its character.
- 2.5 The principal elevation is suggested to imply some symmetry and visual balance by including features from both adjoining properties; with only a marginal road width greater than house 1a, but considerably less than Olive Tree House or the pair of semi-detached houses directly opposite. In the appellant's opinion the council have not provided any coherent evidence to support their refusal reasons, and are not prepared to discuss them in detail
- 2.6 The proposal respects the diversity and evolution of the roof scape in the area, which reflect the different needs and preferences of the residents. The development would have a minimal impact on the street scene, as it would be largely screened by the neighbouring houses. The appellant considers the council's objection is based on a subjective and outdated view of the roof forms, which does not consider the existing variety and changes that have occurred over time.
- 2.7 The scheme has successfully combined different elements of the built environment to produce an attractive high-quality building that would contribute to the vitality and attractiveness of Nicholls Avenue.

- 2.8 The appellant asserts that this proposal is a sustainable development with no significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants, or any surrounding property, but does contain many favourable environmental and residential reasons for acceptance. The proposal will create more versatile, long-term living accommodation, which is always required in the area.
- 2.9 The council refused the scheme citing that the development includes an over provision of vehicle parking and therefore, fails to promote sustainable forms of transport.
- 2.10 The council have since amended their decision stating that issues regarding EV charging could be removed from the reason for refusal.
- 2.11 However, with regard to parking according to Appendix C Table 1 the proposal needs 4.5 - 3 parking spaces plus visitor parking. The appeal site has a PTAL rating of 2 thus indicating poor access to public transport.
- 2.12 The proposal has 4 parking spaces at the back and 1 at the front of the property, which could be for a flat with disabled access on the ground floor. This is a reasonable number of parking spaces, considering the low public transport availability. The council points out that parking is not allowed on one side of Nicholls Avenue, so the proposal would not worsen the on-street parking situation by having enough parking on-site.
- 2.13 The council consider the proposed additional vehicle crossover would endanger pedestrians crossing the site as well as vehicles users entering and exiting the site. The proposal would not create an excessive or unsafe crossover, but rather a reasonable and practical one which is compliant with the council's guidance which allows for a range of crossover widths depending on the site conditions.
- 2.14 Therefore, the appellant establishes that the proposal would not harm the pedestrian amenity or safety, but rather improve the vehicular access and parking provision for the site.
- 2.15 The appellant appreciates the council's feedback and has ensured that the internal floor space standards are met and that all rooms have adequate natural light and outlook. The new windows are designed to respect the privacy of the neighbours by using obscure glazing and appropriate positioning and we hope that the Inspector will find the provided details satisfactory and approve the proposal in its current form.

Suggested Conditions

- 2.16 The appellant would accept any reasonable and appropriate conditions deemed necessary in the circumstances of this case.
- 2.17 However, in response to the Appendix 1 list of items 1 to 10 the appellant considers that most of the conditions requested were covered in his D&A Statement to some extent, with certain items having a thorough reasoning. Although the appellant does accept that selected items may need further detailed clarification.
- 2.18 The appellant's emphasis on this development was make best use of the site and to deliver attractive, efficient and modern homes, utilising simple but advanced, active and passive, eco-friendly systems to protect and improve our lives and reduce our impact on the environment locally and beyond. Living our day-to-day life efficiently and responsibly is of utmost importance.
- 2.19 Active systems such as solar water heating, solar PV, VTG & VTH, the potential 85,000 litres of clean rainwater from rooves, some fed directly into gravity cisterns, ground source heat capture and air ventilation with heating & cooling recovery.
- 2.20 Subtle systems such as low-flow/flush toilets, smaller wash basins and sinks, eco-showers with WWHR, energy and water saving appliances, low-energy lighting, drought-resistant low maintenance shrubs and trees, whilst always retaining a simplicity to update as technology advances, owing to inbuilt service ducts, design and layout.
- 2.21 Grey Water recycling was considered not appropriate for this small development configuration and therefore a condition requesting further details would be inappropriate.

3.0 THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATION

- 3.1 The appellant acknowledges the third-party representations and reiterates some of the points raised. All of the representations are in support of the project, there have been no objections.
- 3.2 There are five third party representations put forward in favour of the proposal who regard it is a well-designed and appropriate development that would make use of the vacant land and provide much-needed housing for the area.
- 3.3 The development has received strong support from the local residents, who have criticised the council's exaggerated concerns. They do not share the council's opinion that it would cause any harm to the streetscape, the privacy, or the parking

situation. On the contrary, they consider it would improve the appearance and the functionality of the site, by providing parking bays behind gates, mirroring the neighbouring properties, and blending in with the existing character.

- 3.4 The close community of neighbours consider the land itself has sat empty as wasteland for decades as a result of Hillingdon council refusing a number of decent proposed schemes.

Example third party comments comprise:

- Not a single person in our neighbourhood has objected to the proposal and all local neighbours agree this appeal should be allowed.'
- 'The proposed appeal scheme is a welcome addition, if anyone of us felt the applicant was proposing something ugly or monstrous in size/shape we would collectively object.'
- 'In general, we feel the proposed scheme is reflective of demand in the area.'

- 3.5 Considering the above information, the appellant states that the letters of support should weigh heavily in favour of the appeal proposal.

4.0 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 Taking the above information into account, the appellant states that the scheme would not conflict with the aims of national, regional and local planning policy and therefore, respectfully requests that this appeal is allowed.