

Design & Access Statement

49 Appletree Avenue, Yiewsley, West Drayton UB7 8BY

We refer to a recent refusal of our application Planning Reference 38364/APP/2021/2253.

We have considered the comments set out in the Officer's Report together with the reasons of refusal in order to address these adverse comments.

We also note with interest that it is the council's intention to implement the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, we therefore hope that this obligation would be adhered to in this instance.

Our new proposal is for the erection of a part two storey / part single storey two bedroom attached dwelling house with associated parking.

As mentioned above, we have considered the comments made by the Planning Officer in our previous application and have addressed these comments accordingly as follows:-

1. We have adjusted the parking requirements to reduce the number as requested and given this space back to soft landscaping / planting to ensure a more sustainable form of development & not conflict with Policy T6 of the London Plan (2021)
2. We have adjusted the internal layout to ensure the double bedroom achieves a minimum of 11.5m² of internal space to comply with Policy DMHB16 of Hillingdon Local Plan – Part Two & Table 3.1 of London Plan (2021).
3. We disagree that our proposal would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original house and existing terrace. In fact, to the contrary, the elongation of the existing terrace to form this new dwelling, maintains the same design form, ridge height, low eaves etc as that of the original terrace and common to the area within this form.

Therefore, in our opinion, there would be no necessity to create subordination which would be more alien to the street scene and openness of this external corner site. This view was taken by the Local Authority when we applied for the new dwelling at 16 Birch Avenue, a few years ago. Therefore, the precedence set visually and would therefore harmonise with this external corner.

4. We also question the suggestion that our proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining owner at 16A Birch Avenue (the new dwelling mentioned above). We have indicated on the site plan that the distance between the side of our proposal and the rear elevation is, in fact, over 15m in distance and can confirm that the side flank wall of our proposal does not span the full width of 16A Birch Avenue in fact, it spans the width of the single storey side extension and finishes approximately 4m short of this full width.

We also note that the first floor nearest window is that of an obscurely glazed bathroom window and the furthest window, being the bedroom, has an uninterrupted view along all of the rear gardens of the terrace.

We, therefore, fail to see where this overdominance suggested, is any worse than what this property currently enjoys.

