

PLANNING STATEMENT



DRIVING DEVELOPMENT

75 Shakespeare Avenue, Hayes, UB4 0BE

Erection of a 2-bedroom dwelling and associated car parking and amenity space to the side of the existing dwelling involving a part single storey, part double storey extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, and the enlargement of an existing dropped kerb to facilitate vehicular access

December 2025

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Supporting Information	2
3.	Site Description	3
4.	Planning History	5
5.	Proposed Development	7
6.	Planning Policy Framework	8
7.	Assessment	12
8.	Planning Balance	26
9.	Conclusion	29

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

This Planning Statement supports an application for full planning permission to the London Borough of Hillingdon made by Mr & Mrs Saini.

The application seeks permission for the following development at 75 Shakespeare Avenue, Hayes, UB4 0BE:

“Erection of a 2-bedroom dwelling and associated car parking and amenity space to the side of the existing dwelling involving a part single storey, part double storey extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, and the enlargement of an existing dropped kerb to facilitate vehicular access”

In preparing the submitted scheme, regard has been given to the local Development Plan (comprising London Borough of Hillingdon’s Local Plan Parts 1 & 2, The West London Waste Plan, and The London Plan), the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) and all other material considerations which affect the application site.

The Planning Statement assesses the proposed development against all relevant planning policies and relevant material considerations. The Statement identifies why the scheme accords with the development plan and subsequently, why permission should be granted.

2. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

2. Supporting Information

This Planning Statement should not be read in isolation. The current submission is supported by the following information:

Plans

- Block and Location Plan - PA4-21100-00
- Existing Ground Floor Plan - PA4-21100-01
- Existing First Floor Plan - PA4-21100-02
- Existing Roof Plan - PA4-21100-03
- Existing Elevations - PA4-21100-04
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan - PA4-21100-05
- Proposed First Floor Plan - PA4-21100-06
- Proposed Roof Plan - PA4-21100-07
- Proposed Elevations - PA4-21100-08
- Existing Block Plan - PA4-21100-09
- Proposed Block Plan - PA4-21100-10

Documents

- Application Form
- This Planning Statement

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3. Site Description

The application site comprises a semi-detached property with flat roofed side extension on the western side of Shakespeare Avenue, on the corner with Balmoral Drive. The area is mainly residential in character, comprising mainly semi-detached and terraced dwellings.

Lying within the built-up area of Hayes, the property sits on the western side of Shakespeare Avenue at the junction with Balmoral Road.

The site does not lie within any environmental planning designations (e.g. conservation area, SSSI, National Landscape or National Park) other than being within an Air Quality Management Area. For the purposes of the spatial strategy of the Development Plan, the site lies within the built-up area of the Borough.

The table below sets out which environmental designations (if any) are of relevance to the site.

Designation	Relevance
Green Belt	No
Listed Building	No
Conservation Area	No
World Heritage Site	No
Scheduled Monument	No
Historic Park & Garden	No
Registered Battlefield	No
National Landscape	No
National Park	No

Designation	Relevance
Local Landscape Designation	No
National Nature Reserve	No
Local Nature Reserve	No
Ramsar Site	No
SSSI	No
SAC	No
SPA	No
SINC	No
Ancient Woodland	No
Tree Preservation Order	No
Flood Zone	Flood Zone 1
Nutrient Neutrality Scheme	No
Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land	No BMV
Air Quality Management Area	Yes

This statement will assess the impact of the Proposed Development upon these designated features as relevant.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

4. Planning History

Relevant Planning History

In preparing this Statement, the London Borough of Hillingdon's publicly accessible online planning register has been accessed. The table below identifies planning history which is considered to be of relevance to the site and the proposed development.

Reference	Address	Description	Outcome
35060/84/1578	75 Shakespeare Avenue	Change of use to Medical/Health 166sq.m.	Approved
35060/A/87/2367	75 Shakespeare Avenue	Erection of a single storey side extension	Approved
35060/APP/2015/611	75 Shakespeare Avenue	Removal of ramp and entrance way and installation of window to front and removal of windows to side and rear and change of use from doctors surgery (Use Class D1) to a 3-bed dwelling house (Use Class C3)	Appeal Allowed
35060/APP/2019/1702	75 Shakespeare Avenue	Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and two front rooflights, change of use of existing property from a house in multiple occupation to single dwelling house and demolition of existing side extension and erection of a two storey, 3-bed, attached dwelling house with associated amenity space	Appeal Dismissed
35060/APP/2022/3734	75 Shakespeare Avenue	Erection of part single storey, part double storey side and rear extensions to create additional HMO units	Approved
35060/APP/2025/203	75 Shakespeare Avenue	Erection of a 2-bedroom dwelling and associated car parking and amenity space to the side of the existing dwelling involving a part single storey,	Refused

Reference	Address	Description	Outcome
		part double storey extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include conversion from hip to gable end, 3 front and 3 rear facing roof lights.	

5. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

5. Proposed Development

The current application seeks permission for:

“Erection of a 2-bedroom dwelling and associated car parking and amenity space to the side of the existing dwelling involving a part single storey, part double storey extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, and the enlargement of an existing dropped kerb to facilitate vehicular access”

The proposals are similar to those previously submitted under application 35060/APP/2025/203 but the following changes have been made:

- The proposed 2 bedroom dwelling now incorporates a hipped roof.
- Vehicular access to the parking spaces at the front of the site is proposed via a widened dropped kerb access, shared between the proposed dwellings.
- The parking provision has been altered, with 2 spaces provided at the front of the site for the 3 bedroom dwelling and 1 space provided at the front of the site for the 2 bedroom dwelling.
- The cycle parking provision has been altered.
- The rear gardens have been altered and benefit from increased usable space as a result of the removal of a parking space.

6. PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

6. Planning Policy Framework

The Legal Framework for Planning Decisions

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides the legal foundation for decision-making in the planning system. It establishes the primacy of the development plan by requiring that decisions on planning applications be made in accordance with the policies of the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

This principle ensures that local planning authorities make decisions based on policies that reflect the strategic and site-specific priorities of their area. Development plans, which include local plans, neighbourhood plans, and spatial development strategies, provide a clear framework for assessing whether proposals are acceptable in planning terms.

However, Section 38(6) also recognises that planning decisions cannot rely solely on development plan policies. It allows decision-makers to take into account material considerations, which may include national planning policies such as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), site-specific circumstances, or emerging policies in draft development plans. This flexibility ensures that decisions remain responsive to changing circumstances while retaining the central role of the development plan.

Ultimately, Section 38(6) provides a balanced approach to planning decision-making, ensuring that local policies remain the starting point for evaluating proposals while enabling wider factors to be considered where relevant.

Relevant Planning Policies

The below is a summary of the national and local planning policies which are most relevant to the Proposed Development.

National

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), updated in December 2024, is the central national planning policy document for England and serves as a material consideration in the determination of all planning applications. While the local 'Development Plan' containing the London Borough of Hillingdon's planning policies, remains the primary basis for decision-making, the NPPF provides critical guidance, ensuring planning decisions align with national objectives.

Central to the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, set out in Paragraph 11. This policy directs decision-makers to approve proposals that align with an up-to-date Development Plan without delay. Where there are no relevant policies within the Development Plan, or where the policies most important for determining the application are out of date, permission should generally be granted unless specific policies in the NPPF provide a strong reason for refusal, or the adverse impacts significantly outweigh the benefits.

The principles of sustainable development, as outlined in Paragraphs 7-10, provide the foundation for the planning system. These principles are guided by three interdependent objectives (economic, social, and environmental) that must be pursued in a balanced and supportive manner. Paragraph 9 highlights the need for planning policies and decisions to consider local circumstances while contributing to overarching national goals. This ensures that development reflects local needs and opportunities while delivering sustainable outcomes.

Effective and positive decision-making is a key theme of the Framework, as detailed in Paragraph 39. Local planning authorities are encouraged to work proactively with applicants to secure high-quality developments that improve the economic, social, and environmental conditions of their areas. Paragraph 48 further reinforces the statutory requirement for planning decisions to be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations suggest otherwise, maintaining the centrality of the Development Plan in decision-making processes.

Paragraph 61 sets out the Government's ambition of significantly boosting the supply of housing.

National Planning Practice Guidance

To complement the NPPF, the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) offers practical support to ensure that national policies are applied consistently and appropriately. The NPPG provides detailed advice on topics such as evaluating material considerations, assessing viability, and addressing technical issues like flood risk, biodiversity, and heritage conservation. This guidance equips decision-makers with the tools to navigate complex planning scenarios while remaining consistent with the principles of the NPPF.

Together, the NPPF and NPPG establish a robust framework for planning in England, ensuring that all decisions are informed, balanced, and aligned with national objectives while being responsive to local needs. This integrated approach fosters sustainable, high-quality development that serves both present and future generations.

Local

The London Borough of Hillingdon's adopted Development Plan consists of the following documents:

- Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies
- Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies
- Local Plan Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations
- The West London Waste Plan
- The London Plan

Of these documents, only **Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies, and The London Plan** are likely to be relevant for the purposes of the current application.

Emerging

The Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan, but this is not expected to be adopted until the summer of 2027 and as such there are no emerging policies that carry weight for the purposes of determining the current application.

The following policies are likely to be most relevant to the determination of the current planning application.

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies

- Policy NPPF1 - National Planning Policy Framework - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy BE1 - Built Environment

Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies

- Policy DMH 2 - Housing Mix
- Policy DMH 6 - Garden and Backland Development
- Policy DMHB 11 - Design of New Development
- Policy DMHB 12 - Streets and Public Realm
- Policy DMHB 14 - Trees and Landscaping

- Policy DMHB 16 - Housing Standards
- Policy DMHB 18 - Private Outdoor Amenity Space
- Policy DMT 1 - Managing Transport Impacts
- Policy DMT 2 - Highways Impacts
- Policy DMT 5 - Pedestrians and Cyclists
- Policy DMT 6 - Vehicle Parking

The London Plan

- Policy D6 - Housing quality and standards
- Policy H1 - Increasing housing supply
- Policy H2 - Small sites
- Policy T6.1 - Residential parking

7. ASSESSMENT

7. Assessment

This section of the Statement assesses the Proposed Development against the relevant policies of the Development Plan and identifies any other material considerations which are relevant to the determination of the application.

Principle of Development

Policy NPPF1 states:

“When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work pro-actively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or**
- Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.”**

Policy H1 of the London Plan sets out housing requirements for the London Boroughs over a ten year period. Table 4.1 of the London Plan confirms the ten year target for Hillingdon is 10,830 homes (covering the period 2019/20 – 2028/29). The policy states, inter alia:

“To ensure that ten-year housing targets are achieved, boroughs should:

...optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites through their Development Plans and planning decisions, especially the following sources of capacity:

...e) small sites (see Policy H2 Small sites)”

Policy H2 of the London Plan states, inter alia:

“Boroughs should pro-actively support well-designed new homes on small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) through both planning decisions and plan-making in order to:

- 1) significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meeting London’s housing needs**
- 2) diversify the sources, locations, type and mix of housing supply**
- 3) support small and medium-sized housebuilders**
- 4) support those wishing to bring forward custom, self-build and community- led housing**
- 5) achieve the minimum targets for small sites set out in Table 4.2 as a component of the overall housing targets set out in Table 4.1.”**

As the site lies within the built-up area of the Borough and outside of any area designated as Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land, there is a starting presumption in favour of sustainable residential development on the application site, in accordance with policies H1 and H2 of the London Plan.

Policy DMH 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that the Council requires the provision of a mix of housing units of different sizes in schemes of residential development to reflect the Council's latest information on housing needs.

Policy DMH 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 - Development Management Policies states:

“There is a presumption against the loss of gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space and biodiversity. In exceptional cases a limited scale of backland development may be acceptable, subject to the following criteria:

- i) neighbouring residential amenity and privacy of existing homes and gardens must be maintained and unacceptable light spillage avoided;**
- ii) vehicular access or car parking should not have an adverse impact on neighbours in terms of noise or light. Access roads between dwellings and unnecessarily long access roads will not normally be acceptable;**
- iii) development on backland sites must be more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties; and**
- iv) features such as trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat must be retained or re-provided.”**

Whilst the Council’s assessment of the recent application sought to argue that the proposed development would be in conflict with policy DMH 6. The applicant considers that the current proposals do not result in conflict with DMH 6 because:

- The proposals would not result in a meaningful ‘loss’ of gardens and the proposals are arguably not ‘backland’ development, so the policy is not directly relevant to the application;
- Regardless of the above, the development would:
 - Maintain the amenity and privacy of existing properties to an acceptable degree, avoiding unacceptable light spillage (discussed in further detail in the relevant subsection below);
 - Have an acceptable impact in terms on neighbours as a result of vehicular noise and light associated with the new dwelling;

- Incorporate extensions which are of a more intimate mass and scale than the existing dwelling, clearly being subservient to the existing dwelling;
- Provide adequate opportunity to incorporate landscaping features.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

The site is not located in a 'valued landscape' for the purposes of applying Paragraph 187 of the NPPF, such as a National Park, National Landscape, or other local landscape designation.

As set out within section 7.2 of the Officer's Report, policies BE1, DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHD 1, and Paragraph 135 of the NPPF all seek to encourage designs of a high quality which respect the established characteristics and appearance of their surroundings.

The Officer's Report states:

“Due to the prominent corner plot position, the development would be readily seen from multiple vantage points. Whilst double storey side extensions and rear additions do exist in the immediate area, it is not considered that the overall design of these extensions would integrate with the host property and would appear out of character within the street scene. The development would involve a hip to gable extension and the addition of a double storey side extension, this is directly contrary to point iv) of Policy DMHD 1. Whilst a hip to gable extension on the original dwelling may be able to be constructed under permitted development, it would not allow the construction of an additional side and rear extension, as such there is no valid fall back position.”

The Applicant notes, in opposition to the Council's position:

- As the Council accepts, there are many examples of double storey side and rear extensions within the surrounding area. The Applicant therefore contends that these additions would be in-keeping with the established character and appearance along Shakespeare Avenue and the connecting residential streets.
- Criterion (iv) of DMHD 1 requires that “new extensions respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials”. The design of the proposed extensions is clearly subservient to the original dwelling and reads as a logical

later addition, respecting the design of the existing property. As confirmed on the proposed elevation drawings, the external materials would match the existing property, thus complying with the second component of criterion (iv).

- Whilst properties along Shakespeare Avenue predominantly feature hipped roofs, there are multiple examples of gabled roofs, suggesting that this design feature would not be out of character.
- The double storey side extension would not be out of character within the streetscene because rather than appearing as an extended single property, the new dwelling would read from the public realm as a physically connected yet separate entity.
- The Applicant is not relying on a fallback position, but it is noted that a hip to gable enlargement could be undertaken under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the GPDO.

The Officer's Report further stated:

"It is also questioned why the development includes front and rear facing rooflights within the roof slopes of both properties as there is no habitable living accommodation proposed."

The provision of rooflights provides the internal space of the dwellings with additional natural light, which will enhance the enjoyment of the properties. Rooflights offer an opportunity to improve the amenity of the internal spaces (habitable or not) with relatively little impact on the external appearance of the host property. The addition of rooflights on both the front and rear roof slopes would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the properties and as such there is no requirement for these rooflights to serve habitable spaces.

The previous Officer's Report also stated:

"It should also be noted that an application for extensions and an additional

dwelling was refused and dismissed at appeal under reference 35060/APP/2019/1702 (APP/R5510/W/19/3240683). Within the appeal decision, the Inspector stated:

6. Due to the siting of the surrounding dwellings, the junction on which the appeal property is located is positively characterised by its spaciousness and the separation of dwellings from the surrounding footpaths and roadways.

7. Part of the proposed development involves the construction of a new dwelling adjoining the existing pair of semi-detached properties. It would follow the same roof-line and building lines of the existing pair. However, due to its design, effectively a mirrored version of the existing dwelling, and its siting, creating a terrace of three properties, it would harmfully unbalance the pair, spoil the symmetry and appear incongruous and out of character. It would add excessive bulk and mass to the existing property and would not appear subordinate, nor would it sit comfortably in the street-scene. Due to the scale and siting of the development, on a prominent corner projecting forward from the building line of properties on Balmoral Drive, it would appear intrusive and highly prominent in the street-scene.

8. Due to its design, scale and siting, the new dwelling would also conflict with the established spaciousness of the surrounding area. It would unbalance the spaciousness of the junction and would not sit comfortably with the established character of the area, that being of predominantly semi-detached properties.

It is considered that this is still the case within this application and overall, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.”

The Appellant notes that the appeal decision was made in the context of a previous iteration of the Development Plan but nonetheless argues that the current scheme and the appeal scheme are not materially similar and therefore the Council is drawing a false equivalency through reference to the dismissed appeal.

The Applicant therefore considers that the design of the development would appropriately assimilate into the streetscene and as such, would accord with the requirements of BE1, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1.

In relation to Policy DMHB 14, the Officer's Report noted:

"In the event of an approvable scheme, a landscaping condition would have been added to ensure the proposed development integrates well with the surrounding area."

Accordingly, the Applicant invites an appropriately worded condition to secure a proportionately detailed landscaping scheme in association with the grant of permission.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Impact on the Residential Amenity of Neighbouring Properties

Policy DMHB 11 states that developments should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties. Policy DMHD 1 states that proposals should not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook.

In considering the previous iteration of the proposed development, Officers considered that the proposals would not result in adverse impacts on the neighbouring properties (No. 73 Shakespeare Avenue and No. 1 Balmoral Drive):

"Due to the corner plot positioning and distance from other neighbouring properties, it is considered there would be no harmful loss of light, loss of outlook, overshadowing, nor would the extensions or new dwelling be overbearing. There would be one new upper floor side facing window, however as this served a hall this can be conditioned to be obscurely glazed and non opening should the application have been recommended for approval to reduce any overlooking or loss of privacy."

Overall, the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties in compliance with Policy DMHB 11.”

There is no reason to suggest that the revised scheme would have any different impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and as such, the Applicant contends that the development would be compliant with DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 in relation to impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Residential Amenity of Future Occupiers

Policy D6 of the London Plan and DMHB 16 set out the minimum internal floor space standards required for new dwellings in order to ensure that there is an adequate level of amenity for future occupants. This reflects the standards set out within the nationally described space standard.

Whilst the Council’s found that the previous iteration of the scheme would comply with the space standards set out in D6 and DMHB 16, the previous Officer’s Report states:

“Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) states that all housing development should have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment.

...there are concerns regarding the ground floor front facing rooms within the existing and proposed dwelling as the proposed car parking spaces would be sited currently in front of these rooms creating light spillage and a loss of outlook. It is noted that there is a ground floor side window within the new property bedroom, however concerns are still raised regarding the light spillage from the car parking spaces. It is not considered that adequate screening could be provided given the proximity of the parking spaces to these front windows.

As such, the proposed development would lead to a substandard form of internal living accommodation for future occupiers, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMHB 16 of the Local Plan Part 2 (2020).”

The Applicant strongly contests the notion that the proximity of the parking spaces would result in unacceptable levels of amenity for future occupants of the 2x dwellings, for the following reasons:

- This objection entirely ignores the on-street reality along Shakespeare Avenue, where the vast majority of properties (including the existing dwelling at the application site) feature parking spaces directly in front of windows on the dwelling's frontage.
- In the UK, the average height of a typical hatchback vehicle is around 1.5 meters, although this varies significantly with vehicle type, with SUVs being taller (often 1.6 - 1.7m) and smaller city cars being shorter. Given the height of the proposed windows on the front elevation, there will be sufficient space for natural light to enter the windows without obstruction from any parked vehicle.
- Notwithstanding the above, most vehicles are necessarily heavily glazed, so would not result in the significant blocking of light.
- It is extremely unlikely that vehicles will be parked in the spaces at all times of the day.
- Any 'light spillage' resulting from vehicles using the parking spaces next to the dwelling would:
 - Be transient and temporary
 - Most likely be associated with the occupiers of the dwelling (decreasing the likelihood that anyone is in the property to experience the light spill)
 - Most likely be mitigated or avoided altogether before and after daylight hours, as curtains are likely to be drawn at ground floor level.

The development is therefore considered to result in an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants of the dwellings, and would be accordant with D6 of the London Plan and DMHB 16 of the Local Plan Part 2.

In respect of the provision of adequate external amenity space, the previous Officer's Report stated:

"The Council's Local Plan (2020) Policy DMHB 18 states that new residential

developments should provide an adequate level of private amenity space for occupiers that is good quality and usable. The policy advises that for 2-3 bedroom properties at least 60sq.m of private amenity space should be provided.

The existing dwelling would be a three bedroom property and retain approx. 46sqm of garden. The proposed block plan drawing number PA3-21100-09 states there would be 77sqm of garden however when measured this is not the case. There is shown to be a rear parking space with cycle storage which would not count towards the total useable garden space.

The proposed 2 bed property would have approx. 51sqm of useable rear garden space again failing under the minimum standard. Overall, the proposed development would not comply with Policy DMHB 18.”

The amended proposals at the site remove the rear parking space which was previously proposed within the garden of the 3 bedroom property. As a result, the rear gardens have been reconfigured so that the 2 bedroom dwelling would benefit from 66.3m² of usable garden space and the 3 bedroom dwelling would benefit from 75m² of usable garden space. The development would therefore be compliant with DMHB 18.

Access and Parking

The Council’s refusal of the recent application included a reason for refusal which related to the highway impacts of the development.

The Officer’s Report for the previous application states, in relation to parking provision:

“Given the site has a very poor PTAL rating of 1b, validating the relative isolation of the site from public transport services which gives rise to a higher dependency on the ownership and use of private motor transport and the site is also not within a residents parking management scheme, therefore the Policy DMT 6 range of parking for proposed development is required of 2 spaces per dwelling with curtilage i.e. a total of 4 car parking spaces, these are maximum

standards. However, the applicant is showing 3 car parking spaces for the donor dwelling, two in the front forecourt and one space accessed from Balmoral Drive, contrary to policy DMT6 and therefore not acceptable.”

This matter has been definitively addressed within the revised scheme, which proposes 3 parking spaces (2 for the 3 bedroom dwelling, and 1 for the 2 bedroom dwelling), which accords with the maximum standards.

The Officer’s Report further stated:

“From the limited information provided, the block plan shows 2 car parking bays each for the new and existing donor dwellings located in both the dwellings front forecourts, whilst the donor dwelling is expected to utilise the existing vehicle access/dropped kerb, the vehicle access for the new dwelling is shown to be on the double yellow lines at the corner junction of Shakespeare Ave with Balmoral Drive.

The HA will not support a vehicle crossing within 5m of a junction, in accordance with London Borough of Hillingdon Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover Policy (DVFC) which may be found at (section 3.4). Furthermore, no dimensions have been shown for the parking bays and scaling from the drawing the 2 bays for the donor dwelling are substandard in width, resulting in the bay next to the neighbouring property with insufficient space either side to access the car if the adjacent space/bay was occupied by a parked car. Consequently, the vehicle would have to park in front of the porch entrance (also based on 2.4m width bays) to allow for access to the other car, this would result in total obstruction of the entrance.

Guidance requires that pedestrian entrances/paths should be kept clear of any (including potential) obstruction by at least 1m to maintain unhindered path to and from the building for all pedestrians, people with disabilities especially in case of emergencies to egress safely and quickly, anything less is not acceptable. Under the proposed car parking layout parking bays are shown in front of the donor dwelling’s entrance and any inconsiderate parking by drivers ie vehicles

parked closer side by side and/or closer to the entrance would block pedestrian access in an emergency.”

In order to address these concerns, the revised scheme:

- Proposes that the existing dropped kerb access to the east of the existing dwelling is widened and shared between the two proposed dwellings.
- Demonstrates that the proposed parking bays are of an appropriate size.
- Keeps pedestrian access routes clear of obstruction by at least 1m.

These revisions should overcome the previously stated concerns.

Finally, the Officer’s Report noted that the previous layout would result in cycle parking being blocked by a parking space. The revised scheme ensures that secure and accessible cycle parking spaces for each dwelling are provided.

The revised designs have therefore successfully overcome the previous concerns of the Highway Authority, and there now exists no reason to refuse the scheme on highway grounds. The proposals are therefore compliant with policies DMT 1, DMT 2, DMT 5 and DMT 6.

Other Material Considerations

Housing Land Supply

The Council’s latest published housing land supply position is contained within the ‘5 Year Land Supply Document’ dated March 2023. The Borough is required under Paragraph 78 of the NPPF to demonstrate the Authority’s housing land supply position on an annual basis, so it is clear that this has not been achieved as required.

Paragraph 78 requires that the five year housing land supply position is demonstrated against either the adopted housing requirement from the Development Plan (where strategic policies relating to housing were adopted in the last 5 years) or the Standard Method as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (where the strategic policies were adopted more than 5 years ago).

The London Plan (2021) Policy H1 is the strategic policy which forms the housing requirement for Hillingdon. Whilst this document is less than 5 years old, within 3

months of writing, the London Plan will no longer form the basis for assessing the Council's five year housing land supply position. With this in mind, it is important to examine what the likely position will be in March 2026, when the Standard Method becomes the appropriate benchmark for assessing housing need.

Using the Standard Method and the latest available information on the supply of deliverable housing sites, the Council's housing land supply position as of March 2026 can be calculated.

Component	Note/Calculation	Result
Existing Dwelling Stock	Taken from MHCLG live table 125 on dwelling stock	117,858
Baseline	= 117,858 x 0.008	942.86
5-Year Avg Affordability Ratio	Taken from ONS median workplace-based affordability ratios	12.49
Adjustment Factor	= ((12.49 - 5)/5) x 0.95 + 1	2.42
Annual Requirement	= 942.86 x 2.42	2284.65
Total 5-Year Requirement	= 2,284.65 x 5	11,423.27
Buffered Requirement (5%)	= 11423.27 * 1.05	11,994.43
Deliverable Supply	Taken from the Council's latest published position (March 2023)	7,326
5YLS	= (7,326 / 11,994) x 5	3.05
Undersupply	= 7,326 - 11,994	-4,668

The Council will therefore, on the basis of the latest available information, be unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply in March 2026. On the evidence available at

the time of writing, the Council will only be able to demonstrate a **3.05 year housing land supply**. This leaves a significant shortfall of **4,668 homes**.

Given the extent of the likely shortfall and the imminent timing of the switch-over to the Standard Method as the appropriate method for determining the housing land supply position, this has implications for the determination of the current application, as discussed in the Planning Balance section below.

Ecological Impact

The application site is not subject to any ecological designation such as a SSSI, Ramsar Site, SPA, SAC, SINCR, National or Local Nature Reserve.

The proposed development is not required to deliver a 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This is because the proposals would qualify under the *de minimis* exemption. The Council confirmed this within the Officer's Report for the recently determined application:

"The proposed extensions would measure over 25sqm, however, the application site appears to be laid to hardstanding and as such the development would not impact on site habitat. As such the development appears to be exempt from providing the 10% net gain."

The proposed development will not impact a priority habitat and impacts less than 25 square metres of non-priority onsite habitat and less than 5m for non-priority onsite linear habitats.

Flood Risk

The site lies within Flood Zone 1, which is the category of land in England which is subject to the lowest level of fluvial flood risk.

Air Quality Management Area

The site is located within an Air Quality Management Area, but within such areas non-major development is acceptable without the need for development-specific mitigation.

8. PLANNING BALANCE

8. Planning Balance

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning decisions are made in accordance with the provisions of the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is reinforced by Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Compliance with the Development Plan

The previous section of this Statement assessed the proposed development against the policies of the adopted Development Plan and found that the proposals would be compliant in all respects.

The 'Tilted Balance'

However, when the London Plan turns five years old in March 2026, the Council will be unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, as required by Paragraph 78 of the NPPF. In this scenario, the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within both NPPF1 of the Development Plan and Paragraph 11 of the NPPF indicates that the 'tilted balance' may be engaged. No Footnote 7 policies within the NPPF would provide a strong reason for refusing the development.

Under the provisions of NPPF1 and Paragraph 11 (d) (ii) of the NPPF, permission should therefore be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so **significantly and demonstrably** outweigh the benefits. This requires the impacts of the proposed development to be weighed against each other.

The following assessment demonstrates that the benefits of the scheme are not significantly and demonstrably outweighed by adverse impacts. Consequently, the tilted balance weighs firmly in favour of the proposal.

Both pre-March 2026 and post-March 2026 therefore, the proposal therefore accords with the Development Plan when read as a whole.

Benefits of the Development

The Provision of Housing in a Sustainable Location at a time of Local Need

With a housing land supply of just 3.05 years, the upcoming shortfall against the five-year requirement is not marginal but **substantial and significant**. The Court of Appeal judgment in *Hallam Land Management Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2018]* is a critical consideration in this context, as it establishes that the magnitude of a housing shortfall directly bears on the weight to be given to the benefits of a proposed development.

In this instance, the deficit is 1.95 years, meaning the Council can only demonstrate delivery of approximately 61% of its housing requirement over the next five years. This represents a profound and acute failure to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the area.

In line with the principles established in *Hallam Land*, this is not a situation where the shortfall is minor and the planning balance is finely poised. The sheer scale of the deficit means that the benefits of this proposal, specifically its contribution to boosting the supply of market and affordable housing, should be afforded **very substantial positive weight** in the planning balance. The delivery of new homes in this context is a matter of paramount importance and a significant public benefit.

Economic Benefits

The proposed development will deliver economic benefits, both during the construction phase and over the lifetime of the development.

The construction phase will generate employment opportunities for local tradespeople and contractors, and will create spending in the local economy through the procurement of materials and services from local supply chains. This short-term boost to the local economy is a welcome benefit that should be afforded **moderate weight**.

Over the longer term, the new residents of the development will support the vitality and viability of local services, shops, and facilities in the surrounding area. This increase in local expenditure helps to sustain local businesses and maintain community vibrancy. Furthermore, the development will generate a significant uplift in Council Tax revenue for the local authority, providing additional funding for essential public services. These long-term, sustained economic contributions are a significant benefit of the scheme and should be attributed **moderate weight** in the planning balance.

Social Benefits

Beyond the critical need to boost housing supply, the proposal delivers clear social benefits. The provision of new homes will help to meet identified local housing needs. This allows people to remain in their local area, and supports a balanced and mixed community. This contribution to creating a sustainable and inclusive community is a considerable social benefit that should be afforded **moderate weight**.

Adverse Impacts of the Development

Given that the Applicant's assessment has found that the proposed development would secure satisfactory impacts on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the provision of appropriate amenity for future occupiers, and highway impacts, the Applicant does not identify any adverse impacts of development.

Overall Planning Balance

The above assessment demonstrates that the benefits arising from the development would not be **significantly and demonstrably** outweighed by the adverse impacts, indeed, the reverse is true. The tilted balance therefore swings in favour of the proposed development and the presumption in favour of sustainable development dictates that the application should be approved.

Given that the development would be compliant with the Development Plan when read as a whole, the S38(6) assessment therefore swings in the application's favour and permission should be granted.

9. CONCLUSION

9. Conclusion

This Planning Statement has been submitted in support of an application seeking full planning permission for the “Erection of a 2-bedroom dwelling and associated car parking and amenity space to the side of the existing dwelling involving a part single storey, part double storey extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, and the enlargement of an existing dropped kerb to facilitate vehicular access” at 75 Shakespeare Avenue, Hayes, UB4 0BE.

The Statement has assessed the development proposals against the policies of the Development Plan and has found that the development would accord with the Development Plan when read as a whole.

Planning permission should therefore be granted for the proposed development.



DRIVING DEVELOPMENT

We look forward to helping shape your next project.