



Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 78 Planning Appeal

London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

Appeal By:

Ms Sophia Hawrylczak

Proposal:

Erection of a single storey front, rear and side extension including infill of front porch and patio to rear, following demolition of existing rear conservatory. Conversion of roof space to habitable accommodation including roof extension with conversion of roof from hip to half gable ends, rear dormer and roof lights. Alterations to front driveway, fenestration and materials.

Appeal Site:

43 Rochester Road

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

78160/APP/2024/2562
APP/R5510/W/24/3357815

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This appeal statement is submitted by the London Borough of Hillingdon, as the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in respect of the appeal against its refusal to grant planning application reference 78160/APP/2024/2562, for the erection of a single storey front, rear and side extension including infill of front porch and patio to rear, following demolition of existing rear conservatory. Conversion of roof space to habitable accommodation including roof extension with conversion of roof from hip to half gable ends, rear dormer and roof lights. Alterations to front driveway, fenestration and materials.
- 1.2 The LPA refused planning permission on 19.11.24 for the following reason (as stated on the decision notice):
 - 1.2.1 The proposal, when viewed as a whole, by reason of its overall size, scale, bulk, and design, would result in a prominent and incongruous development that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the wider street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12, and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
- 1.3 The LPA's case is set out in the Planning Officer's delegated report, which should be read in conjunction with this statement. Appendix 1 contains a list of recommended conditions, should the inspector be minded to allow this appeal.
- 1.4 This statement will not repeat the delegated report and will focus on addressing matters raised in the Appellant's statement of case.

2. LPA Comments on Appellant's Statement of Case

- 2.1 Within their statement of case the appellant has raised the following summarised points:
 - The appellant claims the proposed rear dormer window is marginally larger than the approved and would remain proportionate, subordinate, and not visually intrusive.
 - They argue the dormer would not be visible from the public domain due to established trees and would integrate well with the surrounding area, which has similar dormer windows.
 - The appellant suggests that using render for the dormer walls is acceptable given the area's mixed materials palette and proposes submitting materials details post-decision if required.

- They reference the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) to argue that similar dormer windows could be constructed without planning permission.

Taking into consideration these points the appellant believes the proposed scheme to be acceptable. The LPA's responses are set out below.

Impact on Character and Appearance

- 2.2 The appellant asserts that the increase in the dormer's width is minor. However, the cumulative impact of this enlargement, particularly in combination with the proposed materials, would significantly alter the visual balance and harmony of the original dwelling. By extending closer to the side elevations, the dormer disrupts the proportionality and subservience that Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two requires. The increase in the dormer's bulk and massing would result in a dominant feature that detracts from the architectural integrity of the property.

Visibility and Integration with Surrounding Area

- 2.3 The visibility of the dormer from the public domain is not the sole criterion for assessing its impact. The proposed dormer, even if partially obscured, would still be visible from certain vantage points, including public and private views. Its incongruous design and materials would create a discordant element that fails to harmonise with the existing architectural character of the area. The presence of other dormers which are different in design and materials in the vicinity does not justify the approval of a development that exacerbates visual clutter and detracts from the cohesive appearance of the street scene.

Materials and Design

- 2.4 The use of render for the dormer walls would introduce an incongruous element, which does not respect the materiality of the host dwelling or the surrounding properties. The existing character of the area is defined by a consistent material palette, and the introduction of render at roof level would create a stark contrast that undermines the visual coherence of the street scene. The suggestion to address materials post-decision does not resolve the fundamental issue of the dormer's inappropriate design and scale.

Precedent and Permitted Development Rights

- 2.5 The fact that certain developments may be permitted under the GPDO does not negate the need for careful consideration of the specific context and cumulative impact of the proposed development. The proposed dormer fails to meet the high standards of design and integration required by the relevant local planning policies.

3. Other Matters

- 3.1 The officers delegated report and copies of the relevant planning policies (referenced in the delegated report) have been sent separately.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 For the reasons set out in the Officers Delegated report and this statement the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.
- 4.2 In the event that the Inspector considers the appeal should be allowed, and without prejudice to the Council's case, a list of recommended planning conditions is included at Appendix 1.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – The LPA's Recommended Conditions