



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2026

by **JJ Packman MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6005191

19 Elgood Avenue, Hillingdon, Northwood, HA6 3QL

- 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 Sanjay Raizada against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 18301/APP/2025/2883.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and proposed dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character; and
 - the health and long-term retention of an established hedge and TPO protected tree.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located within the Copse Wood Estate Area of Special Local Character, a neighbourhood characterised by large houses set upon spacious plots with landscaped frontages and clear visual gaps between adjacent properties. This pattern of development and the relationship between dwellings helps define the distinctive verdant, suburban character of the local area.
4. The host dwelling, which is detached, has been significantly altered and extended over time. It nonetheless retains a moderate degree of separation from neighbouring properties, with a particularly important gap above the garage at first-floor level. Boundary planting and mature vegetation within the frontage further reinforce the leafy character of the street scene.
5. The proposed first floor extension would occupy much of the open gap above the garage between the appeal property and neighbouring dwelling at No 21 Elgood Avenue ('No 21'). The new vehicular access would introduce additional hardstanding together with a dropped kerb.

6. The appellant asserts that because the extension would be positioned above the footprint of the existing garage and below the ridge of the main roof, it would reduce its visual dominance. They have also drawn my attention to the relatively generous spacing between dwellings on this part of the estate and to the slightly wider plot occupied by the host property.
7. However, the appeal site is within an area where the separation between neighbouring dwellings forms an important part of the prevailing pattern of development. Although the proposed extension would not in itself dominate the property, it would nonetheless significantly reduce the remaining separation gap between it and No 21. When taken together with the cumulative alterations already carried out to the dwelling, this would increase the width and massing of built form across the plot and erode the spatial qualities that contribute to the character of the area.
8. In support of the scheme, the appellant has drawn my attention to examples of similar extensions elsewhere within the estate. However, I found none to be directly comparable in terms of context, scale, design or character. As such, I have considered the scheme on its own merits.
9. For these reasons, I find that the proposed extension would significantly diminish the open gap between neighbouring properties and thereby fail to respect the established pattern of development that defines the Area of Special Local Character. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), Policies DMHB 5, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020), and Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) which collectively seek, amongst other things, good design and the preservation of special character.

Impact on an established hedge and TPO protected tree

10. The scheme was not accompanied by a detailed arboricultural assessment. As a consequence, the Council has raised concerns regarding the effect of the proposed driveway and dropped kerb on the established hedge which runs across the site frontage and a TPO-protected Plum tree which lies on the adjacent plot at No 21.
11. I recognise that no technical details have been provided to demonstrate the precise relationship between the proposed works and the root protection area of the tree and that there is some uncertainty regarding the impact on the established hedge. However, I nonetheless consider there to be a reasonable prospect that adequate technical information could be provided and an acceptable form of development achieved subject to appropriate safeguards secured via condition. In these circumstances, I do not find that this matter weighs decisively against the proposal.
12. In light of the above, I conclude that the scheme would not conflict with Policies DMHB 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020), which collectively seek, amongst other things, the protection of trees and landscape features that contribute to the character of the area.

Conclusion

13. Although I have concluded that there is no harm in respect of the main issue relating to the established hedge and tree, I am nonetheless satisfied that the harm

identified in respect of the main issue relating to character and appearance is sufficient to still justify dismissal of the appeal.

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

JJ Packman

INSPECTOR