



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2026

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002720

48 Raleigh Avenue, Hayes, Hillingdon UB4 0EE

- 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 Ved Khanna against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 36035/APP/2025/1938.
 - The development proposed is two storey side/rear extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side/rear extension and single storey rear extension at 48 Raleigh Avenue, Hayes, Hillingdon UB4 0EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 36036/APP/2025/1938, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 'Proposed Site Plan Ground Floor'; 'Proposed Site Plan First Floor'; 'Proposed Floor Plans' all referenced 03.2025.027 Rev. A; and Proposed Elevation A1 & A2'; Proposed Elevation B & C'; 'Proposed Elevation D'; 'Proposed Elevation A1' (showing the proposed roof plan) all referenced 03.2025.031 Rev. A.
 - 3) The external materials of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first-floor windows on both side elevations have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that are less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which they are installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the windows are installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Preliminary Matters

2. The evidence before me suggests that the appellant presented various revisions to the Council during the application process. Email correspondence provided within the evidence demonstrates that the appellant's agent agreed to an extension of time, in part to allow re-consultation on the amendments shown on the 'Revision A' drawings.

3. Elsewhere within the statement, the appellant refers to these revisions as being the final scheme subject to the appeal. The appellant's case is also based on discussion around these plans, with specific reference to measurements shown on the 'Revision A' plans. I have therefore assessed the appeal scheme based on the 'Revision A' plans, the scheme upon which the Council made its decision.
4. It is suggested that the officer report accompanying the decision includes several factual errors, including relating to measurements. Nevertheless, I have assessed the proposal based on the submitted plans and my own site observations.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached two storey property with a hipped roof. The surrounding area is primarily residential with semi-detached dwellings of a similar appearance to the appeal property. Nevertheless, there is variance within the street scene which diminishes a strict uniformity to dwelling appearances, including through existing two storey side extensions.
7. The distance between the appeal property and the neighbouring property, 50 Raleigh Avenue (No 50), is uncharacteristically spacious in comparison to the relationship between most properties along the road. This is partly facilitated by the tapered size of the appeal site, which widens towards the rear. No 50 is one of the properties within the street scene which has an existing two storey side extension.
8. Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) (LPP1) relates to the built environment requiring new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, including through achieving a high quality design in extensions which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area.
9. Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) (LPP2) relates to alterations and extensions to residential dwellings setting out various criteria which proposals will be required to meet. Specifically in relation to side extensions, the policy sets out amongst other matters that two storey side extensions should be set back a minimum of 1 metre behind the main front elevation. The accompanying justification text to the policy outlines that this requirement is to provide definition between the original house and the extension. Similarly, it is suggested that ridges should be lower than the main ridge to ensure that the addition reads as a subordinate element.
10. The appeal proposal demonstrates both a set back from the main building line and a dropped ridge line when compared to the existing dwelling. The proposal would therefore distinctly read as a subservient and unobtrusive addition to the main dwelling. Although the proposal would be visible in the street scene, it would conform with the general pattern and rhythm of development along the street, particularly noting that the adjacent neighbour at No 50 already exhibits a side and rear extension of a broadly similar form and massing.
11. On this basis the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore

comply with Policy BE1 of the LPP1 and Policy DMHD 1 of the LPP2. It would also comply with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the LPP2 which collectively require proposals to be well integrated with the surrounding area and harmonise with the local context, including by taking into account the surrounding scale of development.

12. Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) sets out an overarching approach to delivering good design. Policy D3 of the LP, amongst other matters, states that development proposals should deliver buildings which positively respond to local distinctiveness, including through their layout, scale and appearance. I find no conflict with Policies D3 or D4 of the LP arising from the appeal proposal.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has listed various other planning applications and appeal decisions as well as personal circumstances which they consider justify the appeal proposal. Notwithstanding that I have limited details in respect to these, I have found the appeal scheme acceptable on its own merits. It is therefore not necessary for me to consider these matters further.

Conditions

14. I shall impose a condition specifying the relevant drawings to provide certainty for all parties. A condition requiring materials to match the existing dwelling is necessary in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area. A condition is also necessary to ensure that the proposed first floor side windows are obscurely glazed in the interests of protecting neighbouring living conditions.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR