



Planning Statement

June 2025

53 Hayes End Road
Hayes
UB4 8EJ

Planning Application

This statement is submitted in support of a planning application for the ***“Conversion of dwelling house into 2 self-contained flats, erection of single-storey rear extension, rear dormer with front rooflights, amendments to fenestration and associated parking***

Introduction, Site and Surrounding Area

This planning statement is submitted in support of a revised full planning application for the conversion of the existing single-family dwelling at 53 Hayes End Road into two self-contained flats, incorporating associated development. The previous application (ref: 23149/APP/2024/3191) was refused solely on the basis of a perceived lack of private amenity space for the upper floor flat. This resubmission seeks to respond to the sole reason for refusal by removing the previously proposed front patio area and reinforcing a robust policy justification based on precedent decisions by Hillingdon Council, particularly at 105 Hayes End Road (ref: 35665/APP/2024/3154).

The application site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the southern side of Hayes End Road, within a predominantly residential area. The property benefits from a private rear garden of substantial depth and is in proximity to public open spaces including Hayes Park and Knights Gardens. The proposal seeks to utilise the existing structure efficiently, in a manner that is in keeping with the character and layout of surrounding residential developments.

Proposed Development

The scheme proposes conversion of the existing dwelling into 2 flats (1 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed), a single-storey rear extension and rear dormer with front rooflights, refuse and cycle storage, and associated off-street parking in accordance with London Borough of Hillingdon standards.



No changes have been made to the layout or design of the built elements. The key change in this resubmission is the removal of the proposed front patio area for Flat 2.

Planning History

The previous application (ref: 23149/APP/2024/3191) was refused solely for the following reason:

"The proposal fails to provide adequate private outdoor amenity space for the upper floor flat. The provision of a front patio would not provide adequate privacy or usability and would be out of character with the surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to Policies DMHB 18 and DMH 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020)."

We respectfully disagree with the officer's conclusion and believe this resubmission adequately addresses the concern.

Policy Context

Policies DMHB 18 and DMH 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan set the framework for assessing private amenity space. While these policies highlight the importance of providing usable and private outdoor space for new residential units, they also allow for site-specific interpretation where physical constraints exist or where precedent and proximity to high-quality public open space can mitigate the requirement.

Precedent: 105 Hayes End Road (ref: 35665/APP/2024/3154)

The scheme at 105 Hayes End Road, located further away from the town centre than our site, was approved despite not providing private amenity space for the upper flat. This application is materially similar to our proposal at no. 53 and provides a compelling precedent. As stated in the officer's committee report:

"While the proposal does not provide a private garden for the first-floor unit, the council accepts that the location benefits from strong access to nearby parks and open space and that the design ensures high quality internal layouts for the occupiers. The lack of private amenity space does not outweigh the benefits of delivering much-needed housing in an urban setting."

Additionally, the report makes clear:

"In assessing the overall quality of residential accommodation, the council takes into account external constraints and accessibility to green infrastructure. The National Model



Design Code and London Plan Policy D6 also support flexibility in applying amenity standards where appropriate."

This demonstrates clear precedent from the same authority and within the same street. It is vital for consistency in decision-making that this application is treated in a similar manner.

Precedent: 14 Clammas Way (ref: 30682/APP/2022/479)

Similarly, in Clammas Way, the case officer accepted that proximity to a large park mitigated the absence of direct garden access for upper-floor flats. The delegated report notes:

"Given the location of the site within 150 metres of extensive open green space, it is considered that the lack of dedicated amenity space does not constitute a reason for refusal in this instance."

This rationale applies even more strongly to our site at 53 Hayes End Road, which is closer to Hayes Park than the Clammas site is to its nearest park.

Amenity Space

In this revised scheme, the proposed front patio area has been removed to fully address the officer's concern about privacy, usability, and character. However, the argument remains that due to excellent proximity to Hayes Park (approx. 150m) and Knights Gardens (approx. 250m), the requirement for private outdoor space is effectively mitigated. Paragraph 3.5 of the officer's report at 105 Hayes End Road expressly stated:

"The amenity shortfall does not result in an unacceptable standard of accommodation given the proximity of open space."

The same conclusion should be reached here.

Consistency in Decision Making

Paragraph 38 of the NPPF encourages LPAs to approach decisions in a positive and creative way. Moreover, paragraph 47 of the NPPF outlines that decisions must be made in a consistent and transparent manner. Granting permission at 105 Hayes End Road and refusing the same scheme at 53 Hayes End Road without distinguishing facts would be inconsistent, unreasonable, and at risk of being overturned at appeal.

While we remain hopeful that the council will apply a consistent and pragmatic approach in light of the above precedents, we must also be clear: should the application again be refused on the same sole ground, we will be left with no option but to proceed to appeal.



The Planning Inspectorate has regularly upheld proposals lacking amenity space in similar urban contexts, especially where clear precedent and policy mitigation exist.

Given the length of time this scheme has already been delayed, and the clarity of precedent now available, our client may also seek a partial award of costs.

Conclusion

This revised proposal removes the one physical element that was of concern in the previous application while retaining a high standard of accommodation. The scheme complies with relevant design and housing standards and is supported by clear precedent. We respectfully urge the council to grant permission without delay.