



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2026 by R Higgins

Decision by T Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001832

1A Roseville Road, Hillingdon, Hayes UB3 4QX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Maneet Singh Batra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 1142/APP/2025/1826.
 - The development proposed is a 1st floor side and part rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The host dwelling is a semi-detached property situated on a predominantly residential street characterised by pairs of semi-detached houses set back behind front gardens, many of which have been converted to parking areas. The spacing between the pairs of dwellings, combined with the generous setbacks, creates a pleasant and open street scene. There is clear evidence of development along the road, primarily to the rear, including at the host property, which has already benefited from several additions.
5. At ground-floor level, the existing side projections at both the host property and the neighbouring dwelling (No. 2) currently preserve a sense of separation between the two houses at first floor level. The proposed extension would substantially erode this visual gap. Even though the buildings would not physically connect, the reduced spacing would create the impression of a continuous frontage, shifting the appearance from the established open, semi-detached rhythm of the street toward something more akin to a terraced form.
6. The host property has been extended several times previously, including a ground-floor side and rear extension, a first-floor rear extension, and a hip-to-gable conversion with a rear dormer. These cumulative alterations have noticeably increased the scale and massing of the dwelling. Introducing further built form

would intensify this effect, resulting in a property that appears disproportionately enlarged and overdeveloped.

7. The neighbouring property, as mentioned by the appellant, features a two-storey side extension however this property sits in a materially different context. As the end property in the row, positioned beside an access lane, it benefits from a more open setting that reduces the visual impact of additional built form. The property has also not been subject to a dormer window or a hip-to-gable extension, meaning it is materially different to the host dwelling of the proposed development. Therefore, the neighbouring example cannot reasonably be used as a direct comparison for the proposed development. Additionally, Policy DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (Adopted 2020) (HLP: Part Two - DMP) makes it clear that where hip to gable roof extensions exist two storey side extensions will not be supported.
8. The proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policies DMHD1 and DMHB 11 of the HLP: Part Two – DMP as well as Policy D3 of the London Plan (Adopted 2021). These policies, amongst other things, collectively seek to ensure new development respects the design of the original dwelling, maintains visual separation between dwellings and protect established street patterns. It would also not comply with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that developments that are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachel Higgins

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

T Law

INSPECTOR