



Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning  
Act 1990 (as amended)

# London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

**Appeal By: Mr Faisal Ali**

**Proposal: Erection of a hip-to-gable roof extension including 2x front dormers, 1x rear dormer, to convert existing studio flat into a 2 bedroom (3 person) flat including associated parking, landscaping, bin and cycle store works.**

**Appeal Site: 54A COPPERFIELD AVENUE  
HILLINGDON**

**Our Ref:  
Your Ref:**

**65765/APP/2025/2605  
6004076**

# 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 permission for the erection of a hip-to-gable roof extension including 2x front dormers, 1x rear dormer, to convert existing studio flat into a 2 bedroom (3 person) flat including associated parking, landscaping, bin and cycle store works.
- 1.2 The LPA refused the for the following reason (as stated on the decision notice):

The proposed roof alterations and extensions, by reason of their siting, bulk, design and appearance would fail to successfully integrate and harmonise with the architectural composition of the existing dwelling and would unbalance the semi detached pair of dwellings. The development would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the building, semidetached pairing, street scene and surrounding area and would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
- 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. A copy of the delegated report is provided at Appendix 1.
- 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 The appellants have provided an appeal statement which argues that the proposed development represents a carefully designed and proportionate roof extension to an existing dwelling that has already been subject to substantial alteration over time. The appeal scheme would remain subordinate to the host building, would make efficient use of the existing residential site, and would provide improved accommodation that better meets identified housing needs. The Council's assessment significantly overstates the visual impact of the proposal and fails to properly reflect the established character of Copperfield Avenue, which is defined by variation and diversity in roof forms rather than uniformity. The street accommodates a wide range of roof profiles including gable conversions, varied dormer arrangements, and differing ridge heights. The limited visibility of the appeal property from wider public views, combined with this varied roofscape, confirms that the proposal would not result in material harm to the character or appearance of the street scene or surrounding area.
- 2.2 The original property was a gable fronted bungalow which has been extended to the side and rear by way of a hipped roofed side extension, rear and side dormers and single storey rear extensions. The immediate area is characterised by similar gable fronted bungalows, many of which have been extended by way of side dormers constructed as permitted development. The Council considers that there remains a strong character of front gabled roof forms. The proposal would result in the hipped roof being extended into a gabled roof form and the insertion of 2 large front box dormers. The existing modest rear dormer would be replaced by a larger box dormer. The proposal would conflict with the requirements of Policy DMHD1 in terms of the hip to gable roof extension and large front box dormers. This extension would significantly alter the appearance of the property when viewed from the street scene adding significant bulk and massing at roof level. This combination is worsened by the existing and proposed extensions at the property and the resultant plethora of roof forms created. The combination fail to successfully relate and integrate, resulting in an awkward, top heavy and poorly designed combination of roof extensions that would appear fundamentally out of character in the context of the street scene and surrounding area. Other examples of side extensions, even those which include roof additions, along Copperfield Avenue are more carefully designed and considered, relating closely to their neighbour to ensure a sense of balance from the front and do not significantly distract from the character of the street scene and context of the area as a whole.
- 2.3 The Council maintains that overall, the roof alteration/extensions, by reason of the design of the front hip to gable end and the size, scale, bulk, and design of the front dormer windows would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area.

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 For the reasons set out in the delegated report and this statement, the Council considers that the proposed. The Inspector is therefore respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal.
- 3.2 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 2.

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Planning Officer's Delegated Report

Appendix 2 – The LPA's Recommended Conditions

## Appendix 2 – Suggested conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan references:

302\_P1 Rev A 303\_P1 Rev A; 304\_P1 Rev A; 305\_P1 Rev A; 306\_P1 Rev A; 300\_P1 Rev A; 301\_P1 Rev A and 308\_P1 Rev A.

REASON To ensure the development complies with the provisions of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020), and the London Plan (2021).

4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of accessible covered and secure cycle storage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall not be occupied or brought into use until the approved cycling facilities have been implemented in accordance with the approved plan, with the facilities being permanently retained for use by cyclists.

REASON To ensure the provision and retention of facilities for cyclists to the development and hence the availability of sustainable forms of transport to the site in accordance with Policies DMT 5 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).