

# DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

50 Fairdale Gardens, Hayes, Middlesex, UB3 3JB

## CONTEXT

The site is located in a cul-de-sac on Fairdale Gardens. The character of the road is mixed comprising 2 and 3 storey detached and semi-detached houses. In the surrounding area, there are many dwellings with loft conversions, rear extensions and double storey extensions that resemble the proposal. The majority of properties comprise of similar build and character aesthetically from a street scene with the exception of No. 44a, the proposal is in line with the general street scene.

The host dwelling adjoins a three-storey no.52 (north) Fairdale Gardens of which is the attached semidetached dwelling. To the south-west are the properties of no. 44, 46 and 48 Mount Road of which comprises a mixture of two-storey and three-storey semi-detached dwellings. The site backs onto no.1, 3 and 5 Silverdale Gardens (south-east) of which are two-storey semi-detached dwellings.

## DESIGN

The proposal has been designed to address the concerns raised in the previous application reference: 47723/APP/2022/1829, dated 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2022. There were three reasons for refusal as follows:

1. The proposed dwelling and landscaping, by reason of its siting, combined height, width and depth including overall design would result in a cramped and contrived form of development that would be incongruous, dominant, overbearing, jarring and visually intrusive. This would negatively impact the relation with the host dwelling, the character and appearance of the Fairdale Gardens cul-de-sac and visual amenities of the streetscene. Therefore, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies D1, D3, D4 and H2 of the London Plan (2021), Policies BE1 and H1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMH 6, DMBH 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14, DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
2. The proposed dwelling, by reason of its siting, combined height, width and depth including overall design would be detrimental to the occupiers of no.44, 46 and 48 Mount Road in terms of sense of enclosure, visual impact, overbearing impact and loss of outlook. Therefore, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies D1, D3, D4 and H2 of the London Plan (2021), Policies BE1 and H1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMH 6, DMBH 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14, DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
3. The proposed development, by reason of the over provision of car parking and layout would result in significant highway and pedestrian safety concerns due to the tight/constrained layout of which would not allow occupiers to safely and securely manoeuvre to and from the site. Therefore, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies D3, D4, T3, T4, T5, T6 and T7 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMH 6, DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMT 1, DMT 2, DMT 3, DMT 4, DMT 5 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

The current proposal has been designed to overcome these reasons as follows:

#### Answering Reason 1)

The combined height, width and depth of the proposal has been significantly reduced and has been appropriately sized in its massing. The front elevation has been setback by 1m, the rear elevation has been brought back by 1m and the side elevation adjacent to the boundary of No.48 Mount Road has been reduced, the height of the proposed dwelling has also been reduced by 0.3m in comparison to the host dwelling. The proposal consists of a reduction in length of the first floor double storey extension, which has been setback by 0.5m from the host dwelling.

In general, the proposal is now more in-keeping with the prevailing character of the area and appears as secondary and subordinate to the host dwelling and ensures the proposed dwelling is sited proportionately from the common boundary and host dwelling.

#### Answering Reason 2)

There would be approx. 25m building to building separation from the rear of the proposed dwelling to the rear of the dwellings along Silverdale Gardens, of which no concerns have been raised.

The Mount Road properties would see the side of the proposed dwelling. No. 44 is noted to have a very large single storey side/rear extension and outbuilding with the parcel in between used as the private amenity space, no.44's viewpoint to the proposed dwelling/forecourt is largely covered by their own outbuilding and the proposed soft landscaping. The proposed dwelling has now been setback from the rear boundary of no.46 & no.48. No.48 is directly in the view of the rear garden, however as the proposed dwelling appears sub-ordinate to the host dwelling and the proposed dwelling has reduced it's massing and is being encompassed on all elevations by the host dwelling, therefore should not be detrimental to these occupiers.

#### Answering Reason 3)

The proposal has reduced the amount of car park spaces to 2 and comprises soft landscaping in lieu of the omitted 2 car park spaces. Each car park space consist of active electric vehicle chargers in line with the London Plan (2021)

## **SUMMARY**

The current design addresses the previous reasons for refusal and as such there is no reason why it cannot more favourably considered by the local planning authority.