



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2026

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010820

17 Abingdon Close, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 0BU

- 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 Ares Dildar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 19996/APP/2026/767.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and a part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and a part first floor rear extension at 17 Abingdon Close, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 0BU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19996/APP/2026/767, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2026-25-01-Rev A, 2026-25-02-Rev A, 2026-25-03-Rev A, 2026-25-04-Rev A, 2026-25-05-Rev A, 2026-25-06-Rev A and 2026-25-07-Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the arboricultural method statement, protective fencing, ground protection measures and tree protection plan as detailed in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement Ref: AAAIA17AB by Allarboriculture.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the impact on protected trees.

Reasons

3. The houses on Abingdon Close are set back from the highway on large plots, typically behind open or landscaped front gardens and trees. This spacious, verdant and sylvan character continues to the rear, where tall trees often form a backdrop to the buildings in the streetscene. These features all contribute to the area's locally distinctive character.

4. The proposed extension would project to the rear into the host's garden, thereby closer to two Cedar trees, which fall within Area 1 of Tree Preservation Order Number 45. They are identified as T4 and T5 in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement by Allarboriculture ('the AIA'). Given their height, form and species, I agree with the AIA that, having regard to BS:5837:2012, they are of moderate quality and of landscape value; and they make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The Council states that, having regard to levels and the trees' root protection zones ('RPZ'), it is not satisfied T4 and T5 would not be harmed; and that trees in front of the building, which are identified as T2 and T3 in the AIA, could also incur damage to their lower branches in the absence of suitable protective fencing.
6. For my part, whilst the extension would intrude slightly into the RPZ of T4, as identified in the AIA, it is stated that, adopting a precautionary approach, all work here would be carried out using a no-dig foundation design, with excavation undertaken using hand tools or air spades, and that the construction would comprise mini piled foundations and a suspended beam/slab. Protection measures would also be put in place, as detailed in the AIA, to limit ground compaction close to T4 and T5.
7. Similar ground protection measures would be provided on the front driveway to limit the impact on T1, T2 and T3, and T2 and T3 would also have protective hessian wrapped around their stems. From my on-site observations, given the height of their canopies, I consider that, with due care and attention, the risk of significant damage to the lower branches of T2 and T3 would be low.
8. Thus, notwithstanding the existing roughly 0.8 metre step in levels across the rear of the site, subject to compliance with the measures outlined in the AIA, the risk of significant damage to these protected trees would be low, and the character and appearance of the area would not be harmed.
9. Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) ('HLP2') states that development will be expected to retain existing trees, and that where a proposal could affect them, it should be accompanied by an appropriate tree survey, including an arboricultural method statement and protection measures. For the above reasons, the scheme, which was accompanied by the AIA, would not conflict with that approach, nor with the broadly similar stance in Policy G7 of the London Plan 2021 ('LP').
10. As I have found that the risk of significant damage to these trees would be low, and that the character and appearance of the area would not be harmed, the scheme would not conflict with HLP2 Policy DMHB 11, or with LP Policies G5 and G6 which seek to protect trees for their urban greening and biodiversity value. Neither would it conflict with National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') policies which recognise the benefits of trees, including the important contribution that they make to the character and quality of urban environments.
11. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested against the Framework's tests. In addition to the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. To ensure good design and to protect the character and appearance of the host and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be carried out using matching materials.

12. Finally, for the reasons set out above, a condition is also necessary requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the measures set out in the AIA.
13. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR