



Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 78 Planning Appeal

London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

Appeal By:
Blubuild.com Limited

Proposal:
Extension at the front of the property above the shopfront to provide 1 x self-contained flat (Use Class C3) at second floor level and erection of a new three storey building at the rear of the property to provide 2 x self-contained flats (Use Class C3) above an open loading bay with associated bin and cycle store

Appeal Site:
69 High Street, Ruislip

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

1983/APP/2021/550
APP/R5510/W/21/3276477

1. Introduction

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 permission for the Extension at the front of the property above the shopfront to provide 1 x self-contained flat (Use Class C3) at second floor level and erection of a new three storey building at the rear of the property to provide 2 x self-contained flats (Use Class C3) above an open loading bay with associated bin and cycle store.

1.1 The LPA refused planning permission on 15.04.2021 for the following reasons (as stated on the decision notice):

1. The proposed development to the rear of the site, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk and design, would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original property, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF. The proposed boundary treatment and gates would serve to significantly further erode and detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2020) and the NPPF.
2. The proposed front extension, by reason of the design and use of materials of the rear elevation, would result in an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original property and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF. The proposed development fails to safeguard existing trees of merit within the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Policies DMHB 6, DMHB 11 and DMHB 14 of the adopted Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

3. The proposed development by reason of the siting of the bedroom windows at first and second floor levels would be detrimental to the amenities of 1 and 3 Midcroft by reason of actual and perceived sense of overlooking of the private amenity spaces and loss of privacy. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).
 4. The proposal, by reason of the siting of the first floor kitchen/dining/living room windows and the use of enclosed private amenity space with high boundary treatment would result in the provision of habitable rooms with very poor levels of outlook and limited levels of natural lighting that would result in a substandard form of living accommodation and reliance upon artificial means of lighting which would fail to satisfy sustainability and energy efficiency objectives and would be to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policies D6 and SI2 of the London Plan (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 appellant, in the appeal statement states the site has the potential to make a modest but valuable contribution to the housing supply within the Borough. However, this does not outweigh the harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020), Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 For the reasons set out in the delegated report, the Council considers that proposal would be unacceptable. 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 3.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Planning Officer's Delegated Report

Appendix 2 – The LPA's Recommended Conditions