

DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

Select an Option

1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	☐
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	☐
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	☐
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	☐
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL

6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	☐
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	☐
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	☐
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	☐

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	☐
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	☐

COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses	☐
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	☐
14.	Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use.	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	☐
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	☐
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	☐

CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS

18.	ADVERTISMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	☐
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	☐
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	☐
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	☐
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	☐
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	☐
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	☐
25.	WORKS TO TREES	☐
26.	OTHER (please specify)	☐

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

Item No.	Report of the Head of Development Management and Building Control	
Address:	26 MOUNT PLEASANT RUISLIP	
Development:	Conversion of roof space to habitable use, including the construction of a rear dormer, installation of two front roof lights, and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with new gable end window	
LBH Ref Nos:	58370/APP/2025/649	
Drawing Nos:	26MP-2656 M4P-01197418 26 001	
Date Plans received:	07-03-25	Date(s) of Amendments(s):
Date Application valid	07-03-25	

1. CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Site and Locality

The application site comprises a detached dwelling located on the western side of Mount Pleasant.

The application site is located within a Critical Drainage Area, as identified in the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for Hillingdon.

To the west, the rear of the site backs onto the rear gardens of 19 and 21 Hillcroft Crescent. 29 and 31 Mount Pleasant are located to the east, on the opposite side of the road.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, comprising primarily of two-storey detached dwellings.

1.2 Proposed Scheme

Planning permission is sought for the conversion of roof space to habitable use, including the construction of a rear dormer, installation of two front roof lights, and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with new gable end window

1.3 Relevant Planning History

58370/APP/2024/3195

26 MOUNT PLEASANT RUISLIP

Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2no. front roof lights, conversion of roof from hip to gable ends (x2) with new gable end window, amendments to fenestration, following the conversion of first floor hipped roof to flat roof (Application for a

Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development).

Decision: 30-01-2025

Refused

58370/APP/2003/1130

26 MOUNT PLEASANT RUISLIP

ERECTION OF A PART SINGLE STOREY, PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Decision: 04-07-2003

Approved

Comment on Planning History

The planning history for the site is listed above.

2. Advertisement and Site Notice

2.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: Not applicable

2.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

3. Comments on Public Consultations

6 neighbouring properties and the South Ruislip Residents Association were consulted on the application by letter dated 20-03-2025.

The consultation period expired 10-04-2025.

No representations have been received.

4. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 16 Housing Standards

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 1 Managing Transport Impacts

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMEI 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality

LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF12 -24 NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places

5. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main considerations are the design and impact on the character of the existing property, the impact upon the streetscene and the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE:

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that development should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) seeks a quality of design in all new development that enhances and contributes to the area in terms of form, scale and materials; is appropriate to the identity and context of the townscape; and would improve the quality of the public realm and respect local character.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that new development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that alterations and extensions to dwellings should not have an adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, and should appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

With regard to rear extensions Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

vii) flat roofed two storey extensions will not be acceptable unless the design is in keeping with the particular character of the existing house.

With regards to roof extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that:

- i) roof extensions should be located on the rear elevation only, be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds the average width of the original roof. They should be located below the ridge tiles of the existing roof and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line;
- ii) the Council will not support poorly designed or over-large roof extensions including proposals to convert an existing hipped roof to a gable;
- iii) raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported;
- iv) all roof extensions should employ appropriate external materials and architectural details to match the existing dwelling;

The proposed rear dormer would extend across the full width of the dwelling for a total of 6m, and be approximately 3.7m in depth. The dormer would be 2.7m in height, sitting just below the proposed main ridgeline of the gable end roof. The roof conversion from hip to gable end would maintain the existing maximum ridge height of 7.8m. The proposal would include two roof lights on the site frontage, two rear-facing windows and two new side-facing windows. To facilitate the conversion of the roof from hip to gable, it is proposed that part of the existing two-storey rear

extension be converted to a flat roof.

Combined with the two hip to gable end roof extensions, the rear dormer would excessively extend beyond two-thirds the width of the original roof slope. It would also fail to retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line. The combination of the excessively sized hip to gable roof conversion and the overly large rear dormer would overly extend the original property, detracting from its character. The application is thereby directly contrary to Policy DMHD 1, and it is considered would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the existing building, especially when considering the subsequent conversion of the two-storey rear extension to a flat roof, which is discussed below.

While overly large dormers are apparent within the character of the area due to the application of permitted development, the proposal is still contrary to Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan, and it is not considered that the development could be built under permitted development as previously considered under 58370/APP/2024/3195.

The applicant's planning statement identifies a number of properties along Mount Pleasant that have had similar hip-to-gable conversions and large rear dormers approved, and therefore, they argue that the proposal will not impact the character of the area. While Officers accept that similar roof forms and dormers do form part of the character of the surrounding area, this does not mitigate the harm to the character and appearance of the property. Further, all of the provided examples with similar hip-to-gable conversions and roof extensions (No.s 28, 40, 42, 12, 25 & 29) differ from the application property in that they have not been extended with two-storey extensions where the application property has been. It is also noted all of these examples were approved under permitted development except for one property where no record of planning permission for the works was found.

The context of the application property therefore differs significantly with the existence of the two-storey rear extension which has already substantially altered the bulk and form of the original dwelling. When considering the hipped-to-gable roof conversion and overly large dormer in combination with the existing two-storey extension, it is considered they would cumulatively result in the additions and alterations to the original dwelling being overly dominant and bulky. The original appearance and character of the dwelling will be unduly harmed by the cumulative effect of the large extensions, and would be further harmed by the introduction of a flat-roofed two-storey element as discussed below. It is therefore considered that the application has not justified the clear departure from Policy DMHD 1, and the hip-to-gable conversion and erection of the rear dormer would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

The conversion of the double-storey rear extension from a hipped roof to a flat roof is not supported. Policy DMHD 1 is clear that flat-roofed two-storey extensions are not acceptable unless they would be in keeping with the character of the particular existing house. Flat roofs do not form part of the character of the existing building, and therefore, the proposal to convert the two-storey extension to a flat roof would be contrary to Policy DMHD 1. It is considered that the flat roof would appear bulky, overly dominant on the rear of the dwelling, and out of keeping with the character of the area, which would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

The applicant's planning statement states that there are flat-roofed dormers and ground-level extensions in the area that the two-storey extension would be similar to, and the extension would have a low profile. The planning officer disagrees with this assessment as there is a clear difference in the visibility and visual effects of a dormer which is set within an existing roof form or a ground-

level extension vs a two-storey rear extension, and a two-storey extension inherently does not constitute a low profile. The planning statement also identifies an existing two-storey flat roofed extension at 55 Mount Pleasant. It is noted that this development precedes digital planning records, and its planning permission would have been granted under a significantly different policy context. Therefore, limited weighting of the development as precedent can be applied. Further, No.55 is located over 130m away from the application site and therefore does not contribute to the immediate visual character and appearance of the site. Therefore, the application has not justified the clear departure from Policy DMHD 1, and the conversion to a flat roof would result in undue harm to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

Overall, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area as well as detract from the character and appearance of the original property. As such, the development is contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One (2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). This forms a reason for refusal.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY:

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that development must provide deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity.

Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) states that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved and there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that development proposals do not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

The development would reduce the extent of bulk experienced by neighbouring properties by reducing the depth of the dwelling at roof level. While the hip-to-gable conversion will increase the bulk of the roof at the point of conversion, there are no habitable first-floor windows in the flanks of either No24 or No28 Mount Pleasant that would be impacted by the increase in bulk. It is therefore considered that there would be no undue bulk, outlook or daylight access-related harm to the residential amenities of the adjacent properties.

Two new upper-floor flank windows are proposed to face No24; however, these are specified to be obscure-glazed and would serve non-habitable rooms, thereby avoiding any overlooking and harm to the privacy of No24.

No harm would befall No17 or No19 Hillcroft Crescent to the rear of the property due to the separation distance from the extension.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, loss of outlook, loss of privacy or sense of enclosure, in compliance with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020).

LIVING CONDITIONS:

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) states that development must provide deliver appropriate

outlook, privacy and amenity.

Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) states that housing development should have a high-quality design and provide adequately sized rooms.

Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - 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.

All the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the extension, would be provided with acceptable internal floor areas for habitable living.

However, Bedroom 2 in the converted roofspace would not be provided with any direct outlook and would rely on two roof lights for daylight access as well as a limited sense of outlook. This lack of outlook is considered to result in unacceptable living conditions for a primary habitable room that would harm the residential amenity of future occupiers.

All other habitable rooms would be provided with adequate outlook and daylight access.

Therefore, the proposal would result in substandard onsite living conditions for future residential occupiers through a lack of provision of outlook and is not in accordance with Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D3 and D6 of The London Plan (2021). This forms a reason for refusal.

PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE:

Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) requires all new residential development to provide good quality and useable private amenity space in accordance with Table 5.3.

The retained private amenity area would exceed 100 sq. m. and therefore would meet the requirements of Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

HIGHWAY SAFETY AND PARKING:

Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) require the Council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

Policy DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that all development is in accordance with the car parking standards set out in Appendix C, Table 1 unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network.

As no changes to onsite parking or access are proposed, there are no envisaged highway-related implications or demands imposed on this application.

The development would be in accordance with Policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

SUSTAINABLE WATER MANAGEMENT

Policy DMEI 10 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) seeks to ensure that developments make adequate provision for controlling and reducing surface water run-off rates.

The application site is located within a Critical Drainage Area; however, as the development would occur entirely above existing hardstanding, it would not result in the creation of any new impervious areas. Given the scale of the development and that no increase in impervious areas are proposed, it is not considered reasonable to require a Sustainable Water Management Scheme for the proposal. If approval were to be recommended, an informative would be attached.

CONCLUSION:

The application is recommended for refusal.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development by reason of the excessive hip to gable conversion, overly large rear dormer, and conversion of the two-storey rear extension to an incongruous flat roof, would be unduly prominent, visually incongruous, and unsympathetic to the original architectural composition of the host dwelling, resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the original dwelling that would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the immediate street scene and surrounding area. The proposal thereby fails to comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One- Strategic Policies (2012), and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

2. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal

The proposed development, by reason of the lack of direct outlook for the new bedroom in the roof conversion, would result in substandard living conditions that would harm the residential amenity of future occupiers of the site. The proposal thereby fails to comply with Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DMHB 16 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

INFORMATIVES

1. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
2. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below,

including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan (2021) and national guidance.

DMHB Design of New Development
11

DMHB Housing Standards
16

DMHB Private Outdoor Amenity Space
18

DMHD 1 Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

DMT 1 Managing Transport Impacts

DMT 2 Highways Impacts

DMEI 10 Water Management, Efficiency and Quality

LPP D3 (2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach

LPP D6 (2021) Housing quality and standards

NPPF12 NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places
-24

Standard Informatives

1. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).
2. The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance..

Part 1 Policies

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11 Design of New Development

DMHB 16 Housing Standards

DMHB 18 Private Outdoor Amenity Space

DMHD 1	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
LPP D3	(2021) Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
LPP D6	(2021) Housing quality and standards
NPPF12 -24	NPPF12 2024 - Achieving well-designed places

Contact Officer:	Mitchell Heaven	Telephone No:	01895 250230
-------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	--------------