



Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Section 78 Planning Appeal

London Borough of Hillingdon Appeal Statement

Appeal By:
Mr Michael Greenwald

Proposal:
Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 3 front roof lights

Appeal Site:
40A Windmill Hill

Our Ref:
Your Ref:

15193/APP/2021/2180
APP/R5510/W/21/3288792

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 15193/APP/2021/2180, for the conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 3 front roof lights.
- 1.2 The LPA refused planning permission on 22.07.2021 for the following reason (as stated on the decision notice):
 - 1.2.1 The roof alteration/extensions, by reason of the size, scale, bulk, and design of the rear dormer window would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original property and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would 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).
- 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 proposed development does not cause unacceptable visual harm to the property or the adjoining area.
 - The proposed development would not be visible from the main front streetscene and would only be visible from the rear communal area and the neighbouring rear gardens.
 - The proposal would provide a higher standard and larger living accommodation for residents.
 - Similar schemes and rooflights have been approved planning permission in the area.

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

- 2.2 The proposed development is not in keeping with the character and appearance of the area for reasons set out in section 1.2.1 of this report, as well as the delegated officers report and decision notice.

2.3 The established roof forms within the immediate area are traditionally pitched with gables or hips that are unaltered and have uninterrupted roof slopes. This forms a strong characteristic and makes positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area. The rear of the property is highly visible from the rear gardens and windows of overlooking properties and the proposed boxed dormer window would appear incongruous in this context.

2.4 The appellant has advised and provided photographs of similar schemes have been approved in the area:

- 103A Manor Way (73413/APP/2017/4563) - Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 front rooflights
- 99A Manor Way (74306/APP/2018/3937) - Conversion of roof space to include a rear dormer and 2 front rooflights
- 130 Manor Way (20988/APP/2011/2829) - Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 3 front rooflights

The schemes listed above were approved prior to adoption of the London Plan (2021) and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020). The London Plan is part of the development plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon and seeks to achieve accessible, sustainable development of high-quality design. The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies seek to ensure quality and good design, minimising adverse cumulative impact on the local character and appearance. The proposed development falls short of the key standards in the plans. The failings are set out in the refusal reason outlined in section 1.2.1 of this report.

Additionally, the approved schemes (mentioned above) is on a different roads to the appeal site, as such their street scenes and character are different and therefore the types of development which are acceptable on each respective road varies.

Overall, for the reasons mentioned above the referenced schemes are not considered to be comparable and therefore should not be taken into consideration when determining the acceptability of this appeal.

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