

**Peter Causer BA (Hons), Dip TP, MRTPI (Ret'd)
Chartered Town Planner**

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Appeal against refusal of planning permission for “Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and front roof lights, erection of additional storey over existing rear outrigger and installation of external staircase, to facilitate the creation of a one-bedroom flat at second floor level.”

at

73 Victoria Road, Ruislip Manor, HA4 9BH.

Statement of case on behalf of
the appellant.

Mr Peter Domb

LPA Ref.: 76505/APP/2022/586

Ref.: Appeals/73VictoriaRd

Date: 22nd September 2022

Peter Causer,
130 Pine Gardens,
Eastcote,
Middlesex,
HA4 9TH

Tel. 07787 984 467
Email. Petercauser@hotmail.co.uk

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Site location and description.
3. The Appeal Proposal and Background
4. Policy background
5. Consideration of the Council's reasons for refusal
6. Conclusions

Appendix 1:-

List of documents accompanying this appeal.

1. Introduction:

- 1.1 The London Borough of Hillingdon (LPA) refused planning permission on 20th April 2022 for development at 73 Victoria Road, Ruislip Manor, HA4 9BH, comprising:-

“Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and front roof lights, erection of additional storey over existing rear outrigger and installation of external staircase, to facilitate the creation of a one-bedroom flat at second floor level.”

- 1.2 The reasons given for refusal were as follows:-

1. By virtue of its siting, size, scale, bulk, massing, height, design and external finish, the proposed additional storey, together with the rear dormer and extended external staircase, would result in a dominant, incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development. The proposal would therefore cause significant harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the host building and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
2. The proposed development, by reason of its proximity, size, scale, bulk, massing, height and design, would cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residential occupiers at numbers 73a and 75a Victoria Road, in terms of outlook, light, overbearing impact and sense of enclosure. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
3. proposed development, by virtue of its poor outlook, poor levels of natural light and inadequate external amenity space provision would result in a substandard form of residential accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future occupants. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DMHB 16 and DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), Policy T5 Of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

4. The proposed refuse and cycle storage provision, by reason of its proximity and siting, would cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring residential occupiers at number 73a Victoria Road, in terms of loss of privacy, noise and disturbance. Also, due to the constrained nature of the site, it is questioned whether the refuse and cycle store could be re-located to an alternative location that would not prejudice the quality of accommodation for existing and future occupiers at the site. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DMHB 11 and DMT 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020), Policy T5 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

2. Site location and description:

- 2.1 The appeal premises are located on the east side of Victoria Road within the Ruislip Manor District shopping centre. The property, which is part of a terrace of similar properties (Nos 51 – 73), constructed as one development during the inter-war period, exists on two floors, plus loft space. The ground floor is in commercial use and the first floor is a 2-bedroom flat with access from a narrow first floor front balcony. This first floor balcony serves all of the first floor flats on this terrace and is the primary access to all of them. The balcony itself, is accessed from one, centrally located, winding staircase. (See photographs). There is additional access to the flats, via open metal staircases, from the rear service road, which runs north-south between the Victoria Road properties and the rear sheds and garages of residential properties on Dulverston Road to the east. In common with the other properties within the town centre, the appeal property has a part single and part two-storey outrigger to the rear, together with an external staircase leading to the existing first floor flat.
- 2.2 Victoria Road, between the roundabout at its junction with Cornwall Road to the south, and Pembroke Road to the north, and beyond to Manor Way, is a thriving District shopping centre. The centre is served by the Ruislip Manor London Underground station (Metropolitan and Piccadilly Lines) and has good bus services to other parts of the borough and west London.
- 2.3 The properties on this stretch of Victoria Road are two and three storey terraced units comprising commercial units on the ground floor with residential above, presumably, originally occupied by the shopkeepers. The three-storey units are located to the south of the appeal premises and to the north of the junction with Linden Avenue. Both sides of Victoria Road benefit from having a rear service road.

- 2.4 The appeal property, No. 73, is located at the point on Victoria Road where the height of the properties steps up from 2-storeys to 3-storeys; No 75 (to the south) being 3-storey.

3. The appeal proposal and background:

- 3.1 The application leading to this appeal was submitted following the earlier refusal of a similar proposal (LPA Ref: 76505/APP/2021/2332) on 14th October 2021. Following that refusal, adjustments were made to the proposed scheme in order to address the reasons given for refusal at that time. The adjustments included a reduction in the height of the flat roof by 350mm, to help reduce the apparent scale/bulk of the extension; the external finish on the walls of the extension (dormer and outrigger extension) was changed from hung plain tiles to white painted render (as specified in the “Revisions box” on the revised drawing A-02 Rev A) to lighten and therefore reduce any visual impact or intrusiveness of the extension. Additional roof lights were proposed within the flat roof over the living area of the new flat, to improve natural light to that living space; and revisions were made to the external stair finish and the balcony barrier rails, to improve their appearance.

The revised application, together with a new Design and Access Statement (Appendix Item 8) was submitted to the LPA on 23rd February 2022. The revised proposal was, disappointingly, refused again and this appeal is in respect of that refusal.

- 3.2 The proposal involves the conversion of the existing roof space for residential use, to include a rear dormer extension and front Velux roof lights, the scheme also includes construction of an additional storey above the two-storey part of the existing rear outrigger, and an extended external staircase in order to enable access to and use of the new space as a self-contained one-bedroom flat at second floor level. A modest external amenity space (Terrace/patio) would be provided at the rear, along with enlarged terrace/patio space for the existing first floor flat. The proposed works are clearly shown on submitted drawing A-02 Rev A.
- 3.3 To summarise, the resulting new flat would comprise a bedroom and a bathroom, located within the converted roof space, with a combined kitchen/living/dining area contained within the extended rear outrigger. The flat would meet the LPA’s adopted internal space standards and would provide good quality living accommodation. There would be an open terrace/patio area above the enlarged terrace/patio (used by the first floor flat), which, itself, would be extended further out over the existing flat roof of the single-storey outrigger (regularising, to some extent,

the existing informal use of that roof area), both to provide more space for the first floor flat and in order to facilitate refuse and cycle storage for both flats. Access would be from the rear, via an external staircase, extended from that which already exists to first floor level. (See photographs)

4. Policy background:

- 4.1 Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) notes that planning law requires planning applications to be decided in accordance with the adopted plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations, of course, include taking account of local area and site characteristics, including, in this case, that the appeal premises are located within a busy District shopping centre; and whether the development would result in any material harm to neighbours or to the street scene.

- 4.2 The LPA has noted the following policies from the Hillingdon Local Plan: Parts One and Two, within its reasons for the refusal of planning permission.

Policy BE 1: “Built Environment”, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012).

This is a general, and wide ranging, policy requiring all new developments to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods, where people enjoy living and working and that serve the long term needs of all residents.

Policy DMHB 11: “Design of New Development”, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

This is a wide ranging design policy setting out the LPA’s aim that all new development should be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design.

Policy DMHB 16: “Housing Standards”, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).

This policy requires all housing development to have an adequate provision of internal space in order to provide an appropriate living environment.

Policy DMHB 18 “Private Outdoor Amenity Space”, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).

This policy requires all new development and conversions to provide good quality and useable private outdoor amenity space.

Policy DMT 5 “Pedestrians and Cyclists”, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020). This policy requires all new development to make safe access for pedestrians and cyclists, including cycle storage facilities.

- 4.3 Section 6 Core Policies - New Homes, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One -Strategic Policies (2012), is not referred to by the LPA in its report on this application (now appeal). In paragraph 6.8 of this section of the Local Plan: Part One, it is set out that the main challenges in relation to meeting housing need in the borough, include: 1) Meeting the requirements for affordable housing and 2) The lack of appropriate forms of affordable type and tenure, particularly intermediate housing.

Given that these challenges are flagged-up in the Local Plan, it might be argued that opportunities (even small opportunities such as the current appeal case) to provide suitable affordable, intermediate housing ought, perhaps, to be examined more sympathetically.

- 4.4 The LPA also makes reference to the following London Plan (2021) Policies within the reasons given for refusal:-
Policy D1: London’s Form, Character and Capacity for Growth.
Policy D3: Optimising Site Capacity through the Design led approach.
Policy D4: Delivering good design.
Policy T5: Cycling

- 4.5 I note that the LPA does not make reference to policies within Chapter 4: Housing of the London Plan.
It is noted that London Plan Policy H2: Small Sites, encourages boroughs to significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meeting Londoners’ housing needs through, inter alia, diversifying the sources, locations, type and mix of housing supply. Developable space above shops in accessible shopping centres would appear to represent a good opportunity in this respect.

In the supporting paragraphs, the Plan continues that increasing the contribution to housing supply by the use of small sites is seen as a strategic priority. Paragraph 4.2.2 of the Plan lists a number of planning policy objectives including, “Increasing housing provision in accessible parts of outer London to help address the substantial housing need in these areas and deliver market homes in more affordable price brackets.”

Whether or not Hillingdon is currently meeting its housing targets, it seems to me that, in the interests of London and the UK as a whole, opportunities, such as this, to provide smaller, more affordable units of residential accommodation (flats) in what is

clearly a very accessible location with excellent services should not be ignored and turned away.

4.6 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The LPA does not refer to any specific NPPF policies within the reasons given for refusal and, indeed, the NPPF tends not to be prescriptive in the detail of local decision making. Nevertheless, the NPPF is, of course, an important part of our planning process.

Section 2 of the NPPF 2021 considers the matter of Achieving Sustainable Development. Paragraph 11 refers to the important concept of there being a Presumption in favour of sustainable development. In particular, sub paragraph 11d) ii explains that, where there are no relevant development plan policies, sustainable development proposals should be approved, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

In this context, it is noted that the LPA's Development Plan appears to contain no clear policies specific to, or relevant to, residential developments above shops in town centres. It is argued that the benefits of providing a much needed residential flat in this sustainable town centre location are clearly apparent. Further, it is considered that any perceived adverse impact of the development would be minor, within this town centre context. Therefore, it is considered that the benefits of providing a new flat in this location would not be significantly or demonstrably outweighed by adverse impacts and, accordingly, I consider that permission should be granted.

Section 7 of the NPPF 2021 considers the matter of ensuring the vitality of town centres. Paragraph 68 f), in particular, recognises that residential development often plays an important role in ensuring the vitality of town centres and encourages residential development on appropriate sites. I would consider the appeal site to be an "appropriate" site for the type of residential accommodation proposed.

Section 11 of the NPPF 2021 addresses the need to make effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses. Paragraph 120 d) and e) supports opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises.

I would note too, that the provision of smaller, one-bedroom, accommodation in town centre locations, such as the appeal site, meets a clear and growing need, especially for younger people within the population, and can help to reduce the pressure for the conversion, and therefore the loss, of good-sized family houses into two or more

smaller flats elsewhere, perhaps in quieter residential areas. There is an increasingly desperate need to provide housing for all sectors of the community within the UK, and town centre sites, such as this, have an important role to play, not least in helping to reduce the pressure for development on Green Belt land and other green field sites.

It is perhaps surprising that the LPA does not appear to have a policy encouraging the provision of sustainable residential accommodation above shops within town centres such as Ruislip Manor.

5. Consideration of the Council's reasons for refusal:

5.1 Reason 1.

By reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk, massing, height, design and external finish, the proposed additional storey, together with the rear dormer and extended external staircase, would result in a dominant, incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development. The proposal would therefore cause significant harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the host building and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

5.2 Response:

This reason seeks to address the LPA's concerns about the design of the proposed development in the context of the building itself and the character of the locality.

To paraphrase, this reason asserts that the proposal is inappropriate and excessive; that it would be a dominant, incongruous and visually obtrusive form of development and would cause significant harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the host building and the surrounding area. That is the LPA's assessment of the proposal and, while I, of course, respect their right to hold that, arguably, subjective opinion, I cannot agree it, nor can I agree with the conclusion that the extension would cause the extensive harm they attribute to it.

At this point, I would like to correct an apparent mistake in the case officer's report on the application, at section **7.2 Impact on the street scene**. The case officer appears to have misunderstood some of the detail of what is now being proposed. The report on the application records, in the 7th paragraph, on

page 11, that the harm caused to views of the rear of the property, from the rear of properties fronting Dulverston Road, would be heightened by the proposed use of tile cladding on the walls of the extension. It is pointed out that while tile cladding was proposed in the first application, in order to lighten the appearance of the extension, the proposed facing materials have been changed to white painted render. This was made quite clear in the Revisions box on the drawings submitted with the second application. This mistake was possibly just a “cut and paste” error but it is also possible that the case officer had not fully read the submitted revised drawing.

Regarding the harm that the LPA alleges would be caused to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the host building and the surrounding area, I believe the LPA has significantly overstated the case. While I would agree that the terrace of shops (51 – 73), with flats over, has a charm and cohesiveness when viewed from the Victoria Road frontage, as is frequently the case, the appearance from the rear belies the promise of the frontage. As is clear from the application drawings, the proposed extension would really only affect the rear of the building so the attractive Victoria Road frontage would remain intact and unaltered, save for two Velux windows set within the front roof slope.

In my opinion, the rear of the property and indeed the rear of the entire terrace (51 - 73) is functional, rather than of any significant character or architectural merit and is, not infrequently, cluttered by outbuildings of various shapes and sizes along with such items as garden type furniture and washing lines on the flat roofs. I do not believe that the proposed extension would cause such harm to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the building and the local area as to justify refusal.

It is significant that the appeal property is located at the southern end of the terrace (51 – 73) and lies adjacent to No 75, which, itself, is part of a terrace of larger, 3-storey, buildings. Any assessment of the visual impact, in terms of the size, scale, bulk, massing and height, of the proposed extension to No 73 should therefore be seen in the context of its position in respect of its larger neighbour.

In my opinion, what is being proposed at No 73 represents a natural, perhaps ultimately inevitable, extension of the property, enabling a viable use of the currently under-used loft space above the main part of the building and by continuing above the existing 2-storey outrigger, maintaining its style and form, would enable the provision of a good quality residential unit.

I cannot agree with the LPA that the proposal would be incongruous, nor that it would be obtrusive or dominant. In fact, I

would suggest that it is likely, in time, that the remainder of the terrace will be similarly extended. That, in my view, would not be a bad thing as it would enable the provision of further much-needed residential accommodation within this accessible and sustainable town centre location.

In my view the LPA's opposition to the development is somewhat misplaced. While the LPA may consider the proposed extension to be excessive and therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area, I cannot agree that any such perceived harm could be any more than minimal. In my opinion any such minimal harm would be more than outweighed by the benefits to be obtained for the town centre and the local community by the provision of a much-needed good quality residential unit within this accessible and sustainable town centre location.

5.3 Reason 2.

The proposed development, by reason of its proximity, size, scale, bulk, massing, height and design, would cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residential occupiers at numbers 73a and 75a Victoria Road, in terms of outlook, light, overbearing impact and sense of enclosure. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two -Development Management Policies (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

5.4 Response.

This reason seeks to address the LPA's concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the amenities of neighbours; specifically, outlook, light, overbearing impact and sense of enclosure.

Clearly, any extension above the existing outrigger would be close to, and therefore visible, to residents of neighbouring flats. Whether that would amount to material harm to residents' living conditions is, to my mind, doubtful, particularly when one considers that this is a town centre location. In such locations, the standards expected in "normal" residential streets and areas are seldom, if ever, fully met. People who choose to live in flats above shops in town centres, such as Ruislip Manor, do not, in my experience, expect to have unrestricted views, and a degree of enclosure together with all that goes with it, is part of living in a dense urban environment. Such inconveniences are, effectively, a trade-off against the convenience of living in a location which is

well served by public transport and the close availability of shops and other services.

I would note that the NPPF and the London Plan encourage the provision of flats above shops, both because they are sustainable locations and because they provide life and viability for town centres. Such locations also offer valuable opportunities to provide sustainable accommodation for, particularly, younger people.

Any minor harm to the living conditions of neighbours must surely be viewed in the context of the expectations of town centre dwellers and indeed within the context of providing additional, much needed, residential accommodation within an accessible and sustainable location.

5.5 Reason 3:

The proposed development, by virtue of its poor outlook, poor levels of natural light and inadequate external amenity space provision would result in a substandard form of residential accommodation to the detriment of the amenity of future occupants. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies DMHB 16 and DMBH 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), Policy T5 Of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

5.6 Response:

This reason seeks to address the LPA's concerns about the quality of the accommodation for future residents of the proposed flat, which the LPA deems to be substandard and to the detriment of future occupiers.

Firstly, I would note that the proposed flat fully meets the LPA's adopted internal space standards.

As regards issues about light, outlook and amenity space; once again, the LPA appears to be applying the same standards as it would to a development in a suburban residential street; partly, I would suppose, because it has no specific policies for this type of residential development within town centres.

I must therefore emphasise that the appeal site is located above a shop within a busy town centre where "normal" residential standards are not entirely relevant, or indeed achievable. That does not mean that additional living accommodation (flats) should not be provided in such locations, but it does mean that policies

should perhaps be applied with a degree of flexibility. The maxim, “Each case on its merits” should be applied.

People choose to live in such town centre locations because they are convenient for their lifestyle at the particular stage of their lives that they find themselves in. They do not usually expect unrestricted views or garden amenity space. The application which has led to this appeal has (after the first refusal) improved the internal lighting conditions for the flat by the addition of roof lights above the living/dining room area. The balcony/terrace areas, as proposed, would provide a sitting out area for residents and space to store refuse bins and bicycles. In the context of locally available outdoor amenity space, I would note that there is a good local park (Shenley Park) nearby, in Shenley Avenue; about the same walking distance away as Ruislip Manor Station.

In my experience, this proposed town centre flat would provide a good standard of living accommodation within a very sustainable location with good public transport links and good access to shops and other services. In my view, the benefits of providing a good quality flat within such a location, outweigh any minor inconveniences which may be perceived. In this instance, the opportunity should be taken to provide this much-needed and affordable residential accommodation.

5.7 Reason 4:

The proposed refuse and cycle storage provision, by reason of its proximity and siting, would cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring residential occupiers at number 73a Victoria Road, in terms of loss of privacy, noise and disturbance. Also, due to the constrained nature of the site, it is questioned whether the refuse and cycle store could be re-located to an alternative location that would not prejudice the quality of accommodation for existing and future occupiers at the site. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DMHB 11 and DMT 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020), Policy T5 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

5.8 Response:

This reason seeks to address the LPA’s concerns about the location of the proposed refuse and cycle storage arrangements, which it considers would be harmful to the residential amenities of neighbours at 73A Victoria Road, in terms of loss of privacy and noise and disturbance.

Once again, I must emphasise that the appeal site is set within a town centre location where space is at a premium and densities

are high. Inevitably, in such conditions, privacy is not as easy to maintain as it would be in a suburban residential street. Similarly, with high density levels, some degree of noise and disturbance might reasonably be expected from time to time.

Regarding the privacy issue, it is perhaps worth noting that the Primary access to all of the existing first floor flats on this stretch of Victoria Road is via a centrally located stairway from Victoria Road (See photographs) to a narrow front balcony where all residents and visitors, of necessity, pass very close to the main front windows of other flats. This clearly represents some loss of privacy but it is nevertheless the existing situation here and is not uncommon in town centre living such as this.

Many of us will have lived in flatted accommodation in busy areas at some time in our lives. In these circumstances, privacy levels are not always at an optimum level and similarly, noise and disturbance, from time to time, can reasonably be expected. I have to say, this is part of urban living and residents of such flats are fully aware of this when they choose to live in such locations.

Town centres are seldom the quietest places but they are usually, as in this case, conveniently located for transport and other services. Many people value such things above privacy and peace and quiet and they choose to live there. It is, of course, important that the accommodation itself meets reasonable standards and I believe the accommodation proposed here is of a good standard.

Regarding any possibility of locating the refuse and cycle storage facilities at ground level on the site, existing buildings would, in this case, prevent this. I can understand that, particularly for refuse storage, it might be preferable to find space at ground floor level, but cycle storage, in my view is better located at balcony level for security. The proposed refuse storage facility would adequately contain refuse and, as in many such town centre locations, residents will, I'm sure, make it work.

6. Conclusions:

- 6.1 The policies referred to by the LPA in the reasons for refusal are, by and large, general boroughwide policies. The standards they seek to achieve are good standards, such as might be expected to be applied within the normal suburban residential areas which predominate in the borough. However, the appeal site is within a busy and vibrant town centre location where different conditions and expectations prevail. In the absence of specific policies covering residential developments in town centres, those general boroughwide policies ought perhaps to be applied more flexibly. Residents living in flats above shops in town centres, I'm sure, do not expect there to be provision of garden space or open views; and they recognise that there will, from time to time, be some degree of disturbance. That, I have to say, is an inevitable part of town centre living and many people, particularly the young, choose to live in such places.
- 6.2 In my opinion the LPA has applied its general, boroughwide policies rather too rigidly in this case. In that sense, I believe that the LPA has strayed from one of the fundamental principles of good planning practice, which is to consider each case on its individual planning merits, taking proper account of specific site circumstances. In this case, we are dealing with a residential development above a shop within a busy town centre location, not an extension to a house within a suburban residential street.
- 6.3 In my opinion this proposal represents a sustainable form of development, which would provide an additional unit of residential accommodation, of good standard, in a town centre location, well served by public transport, shops and other services. I cannot accept that the proposal would cause sufficient harm, let alone material harm, to neighbours, the existing building or to the surrounding area such as to outweigh the significant benefit of the provision of a good quality flat in a very sustainable location. More residential accommodation is clearly needed in London, especially for smaller, affordable flats, and locations such as this, above shops within established shopping centres, provide a good opportunity to help meet the demand.
- 6.4 As noted within the Policy background section of this Statement, both the London Plan and the NPPF support the principle of providing residential accommodation within town centres and above shops, recognising the clear need for such, perhaps more modest, accommodation to meet the needs of certain sectors of the community. Young people, in particular, are struggling to find affordable accommodation in London and opportunities, such as this proposal, should not be ignored.

- 6.5 In the light of the foregoing arguments, the Inspector is respectfully requested to allow this appeal and to grant planning permission to the proposed development, enabling the provision of a good quality and much-needed unit of affordable residential accommodation in this very sustainable town centre location.

Appendix 1: List of Documents accompanying this Appeal.

Item number	<u>Item</u>	Sent to PINS	Sent to LPA
1	Planning application forms	Yes	No*
2	Planning decision notice dated 20.04.2022	Yes	No*
3	Drawing A – 01 Existing plans and elevations	Yes	No*
4	Drawing A – 02A Proposed plans and elevations	Yes	No*
5	Drawing A – 03 Proposed bins and cycle storage	Yes	No*
6	Drawing A – 04 Location plan	Yes	No*
7	Drawing A – 05 Site/Block plan	Yes	No*
8	Design and Access Statement	Yes	No*
9	CIL questions form, submitted with the application.	Yes	No*
10	Photographs of the appeal property and locality.	Yes	Yes

* LPA already has this document

