



**London &  
South East  
Planning**

International House  
36-38 Cornhill  
London  
EC3V 3NG  
**0208 914 7900**  
[info@lseplanning.com](mailto:info@lseplanning.com)  
[www.lseplanning.com](http://www.lseplanning.com)

## Response Statement

### **Permission Refused for:**

Proposed 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 works.

### **Address:**

54A Copperfield Avenue, Uxbridge, UB8 3NX

### **LPA Reference:**

65765/APP/2025/2605

### **PINS Reference:**

6004076

### **Dated:**

March 2026

## **Contents**

|                                                   |               |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>1. Introduction</b>                            | <b>Page 3</b> |
| <b>2. Response to Council's Statement of Case</b> | <b>Page 4</b> |
| <b>3. Response to Third Party Representation</b>  | <b>Page 6</b> |
| <b>4. Conclusion</b>                              | <b>Page 7</b> |

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1.** This Response Statement has been prepared on behalf of the Appellant, in reply to the London Borough of Hillingdon's Appeal Statement and the third party representation submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above referenced appeal.
- 1.2.** The appeal relates to the refusal of planning permission for the proposed erection of a hip-to-gable roof extension including 2x front dormers and 1x rear dormer, to convert the existing studio flat into a 2 bedroom (3 person) flat including associated parking, landscaping, bin and cycle store works at 54A Copperfield Avenue, Uxbridge, UB8 3NX (LPA reference: 65765/APP/2025/2605)
- 1.3.** The application was refused on 9 December 2025 for the following reason: "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, semi-detached 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)."
- 1.4.** The Appellant's case is set out in full in the Appeal Statement of Case submitted to the Inspectorate in January 2026, and this Response Statement should be read alongside that document. This statement does not repeat the appellant's case in full but responds directly to the points raised by the Council and the third party, and highlights matters that the Council's statement has not addressed.

## **2. Response to Council's Statement of Case**

- 2.1.** The Council's appeal statement is notably brief and does not advance any new reasoning beyond that set out in the delegated officer's report. It largely reproduces, verbatim, the language of the officer's report and does not engage with the substantive arguments raised in the Appellant's Statement of Case. The Council has had the opportunity to consider those arguments and respond to them in detail, but has not done so. The Inspector is respectfully invited to take note of this, as it leaves the appellant's case on a number of important points unanswered.
- 2.2.** The Council maintains that the proposed roof alterations would result in an awkward, top-heavy combination of roof extensions that would appear out of character with the street scene. The appellant does not accept this assessment. As set out in the Appeal Statement, the proposal has been carefully designed to align with the existing ridge height, roof pitch and materials of the host dwelling. The two front dormers are articulated as separate, subordinate elements set within the roof slope, and the hip-to-gable conversion has been conceived to improve the coherence and legibility of the building rather than to increase bulk indiscriminately. The Council's appeal statement does not identify any specific design deficiency in the scheme, nor does it explain with any precision how or why the proposed elements would fail to integrate. In the absence of that analysis, the assertion of harm lacks the evidential basis necessary to justify dismissal of the appeal.
- 2.3.** The Council repeats its assertion that there remains a strong character of front gabled roof forms along Copperfield Avenue. The appellant's case has already addressed this in detail through documentation of the streetscene in their Appeal Statement. That evidence demonstrates that the roovescape of the street is in practice defined by considerable variation, encompassing a wide range of dormer arrangements, ridge heights, roof profiles and gable configurations, including properties that depart markedly from the chalet bungalow typology referenced by the Council. The Council does not address this evidence in its appeal statement and does not explain why its characterisation of the street as having a consistent or uniform roof form should be preferred over the documented character of the street.
- 2.4.** Critically, the Council's appeal statement makes no reference whatsoever to the decision at No. 7 Copperfield Avenue (application reference 28341/APP/2024/1452), which was granted planning permission in August 2024 for works directly comparable to those proposed here, including a hip-to-gable roof alteration, two front dormers and a rear dormer exceeding two thirds of the roof width. This decision is a material consideration of significant weight, given that it concerns the same street, the same policy framework, and the same Council. In granting that permission, the Council acknowledged that Copperfield Avenue is characterised by properties with gable roof forms, and concluded on that basis that the hip-to-gable alteration would not be harmful to the character of the area. The Council further accepted that the two front dormers would sit comfortably and inconspicuously within the front roof slope, and that the enlarged rear dormer, though slightly exceeding two thirds of the roof width, was acceptable on balance given its subservient positioning and the existing examples of wider rear dormers already visible within the street.
- 2.5.** The Council's failure to address this precedent, or to explain why a materially different conclusion should be reached in the appeal case, is a significant omission. Consistency in decision-making is a well-established material consideration, and where a local planning authority has accepted a form of development in a closely comparable situation, it is incumbent upon it to explain why that approach is not followed in a subsequent case. No such explanation has been offered. The appellant's position is that the reasoning applied at No. 7 is equally applicable here, and there is no planning justification set out in the Council's appeal statement for departing from its own recent approach.
- 2.6.** The Council's case rests substantially on the contention that the proposal would unbalance the semi-detached pair. The appellant's position on this is that the appeal property and its neighbour at No. 54 no longer read as a matched or symmetrical semi-detached pair, as a result of the

significant historic alterations and extensions that have been carried out to both properties over time. The existing baseline is therefore already one of asymmetry, and that asymmetry is not a consequence of the appeal proposal. The proposed roof alterations would, if anything, assist in establishing a clearer and more purposeful architectural identity for No. 54A as a distinct residential unit in its own right. The Council does not address this point in its appeal statement.

- 2.7.** The Council also does not address the appellant's argument regarding the limited visibility of the appeal property within the street scene. As demonstrated in the Appeal Statement, and supported by the 3D street scene visual at drawing reference 1223-PLA-307\_A, the property occupies an end position within the cul-de-sac and the projecting form of the existing front gable effectively screens the proposed roof alterations in wider views along Copperfield Avenue. The proposed changes would be largely imperceptible from the majority of public viewpoints along the street. This is a material consideration that the Council raised no response to, and it directly undermines the assertion that the proposal would result in significant harm to the visual amenity of the street scene.
- 2.8.** Finally, the appellant draws attention to the positive planning balance that the scheme represents. The proposal would facilitate the conversion of an existing studio flat into a two-bedroom, three-person flat, improving the quality, functionality and long-term adaptability of the residential accommodation on site. The NPPF places significant weight on the delivery of housing that meets identified needs, and within Hillingdon there is well-established demand for modest family-sized accommodation. The Council's officer report itself confirmed that the proposal would comply with the nationally described space standards, that the flat would be dual-aspect with adequate natural light and outlook, and that there would be no unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. The sole objection was on design grounds. The housing benefit of the scheme is therefore a material consideration that weighs in favour of the proposal and which must be placed in the balance by the Inspector.
- 2.9.** With regard to cycle storage, the appellant notes that this matter was raised in the officer's report but was not pursued as a formal reason for refusal. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the submission and approval of covered and secure cycle storage details prior to occupation. The appellant does not object in principle to a condition being imposed on those terms, should the Inspector be minded to allow the appeal, and considers this to be a proportionate and reasonable means of addressing the matter without it forming a basis for dismissal.

### **3. Response to Third Party Representation**

- 3.1.** One third party representation has been submitted to the Inspectorate by a neighbouring resident. The appellant has read the comments carefully and responds to the points raised below.
- 3.2.** The representation raises concerns of a general nature regarding the planning history of the property and the wider building, and makes observations about the use of retrospective planning applications across the borough more broadly. The appellant notes that these concerns relate to matters of planning history, enforcement and wider policy rather than to the design merits of the current appeal proposal. The Inspector is required to determine this appeal on its planning merits, assessed against the relevant policies of the development plan and material considerations. The sole ground of refusal relates to the alleged impact of the proposed roof alterations on the character and appearance of the building and street scene, and it is that question which falls to be determined.
- 3.3.** The representation does not raise any specific objection to the design or appearance of the proposed roof extensions, nor does it identify any harm to the third party's own amenity, outlook, daylight or privacy arising from the proposal. In the absence of any design-based objection from the third party, the representation does not lend additional weight to the Council's case on the issue in dispute.
- 3.4.** The appellant also notes that some of the comments within the representation relate to works at other parts of the building or to the conduct of other parties. These are not matters that are before the Inspector in the context of this appeal, and the appellant does not consider it appropriate to respond to them in detail here. The current proposal is assessed on its own merits as a full planning application for a roof extension to an existing residential flat, and it is on that basis that the Inspector is respectfully asked to reach a conclusion.

## **4. Conclusion**

- 4.1.** The Council's appeal statement does not advance any substantive new argument beyond the officer's report. It does not engage with the appellant's detailed case on the character of Copperfield Avenue, does not address the directly comparable precedent at No. 7 Copperfield Avenue, does not respond to the evidence of limited visibility from the street, and does not address the existing baseline condition of the semi-detached pair. These are all points of material planning significance that the Council has had the opportunity to address and has not.
- 4.2.** The third party representation raises concerns about planning history and enforcement matters that are not relevant to the design merits of the appeal proposal and does not identify any specific harm arising from the proposed scheme.
- 4.3.** The proposed roof alterations represent a proportionate and carefully considered form of development that would not result in material harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair, or the wider street scene. The proposal is consistent with the design policies cited by the Council in its reason for refusal, and is directly supported by the Council's own decision at No. 7 Copperfield Avenue. The housing benefit arising from the upgrade of an existing studio flat to a two-bedroom unit is a positive consideration that carries material weight in favour of the scheme.
- 4.4.** For all of these reasons, the appellant respectfully requests that the Inspector allow this appeal and grant planning permission for the proposed development.