



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2026

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 October 2026

Appeal Ref: 6013858

88 Stormount Drive, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 1RH

- 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 Shammi Kohli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 38576/APP/2026/583.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a first floor side and rear extension above the existing ground floor footprint, construction of a ground floor rear extension, installation of rooflights, and erection of a front porch, together with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side and rear extension above the existing ground floor footprint, a ground floor rear extension, rooflights and a front porch, together with associated internal alterations, at 88 Stormount Drive, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 1RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 38576/APP/2026/583, 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: 88ST-001-2026, 88ST-002-2026, 88ST-003-2026, 88ST-004-2026, 88ST-005-2026, 88ST-006-2026, 88ST-007-2026, 88ST-008-2026, 88ST-009-2026, 88ST-010-2026, 88ST-011-2026, 88ST-012-2026, 88ST-013-2026, 88ST-014-2026, 88ST-015-2026, 88ST-016-2026 and 88ST-023-2026.
 - 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 first floor side extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until its side facing windows as depicted on drawing number 88ST-013-2026 have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the windows shall be retained as such thereafter.

Procedural Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework was published in August 2026 ('the Framework'). Having regard to the main issues in this appeal, there are no substantive differences between it and the now superceded version which was in place at the time of the Council's decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The houses in Stormount Drive and nearby roads are typically two storeys high and arranged in groups with a similar typology. In contrast, and as illustrated by plan no. 88ST-023-2026 and Figures 4 to 6 of the statement of case ('SoC'), the host and its semi-detached neighbour have a different style and appearance compared to the buildings either side. As a result, notwithstanding their prominent siting opposite the junction with Conway Drive, they are not viewed as part of a continuous, cohesive row in the streetscene.
5. The proposed side extension would slightly exceed half the width of the original property, and its front face would not be set back. In these regards, it would not appear entirely subordinate to the host, and it would not fully comply with Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) ('HLP2') Policy DMHD 1.
6. However, the side extension would be faced with matching materials, and its form, proportions and fenestration would respect the host. As a result, it would assimilate well with the existing building, and it would not significantly disrupt the balance and architectural composition of this semi-detached pair. As illustrated by plan no. 88ST-023-2026, its ridge would reflect the ridgeline at 86 Stormount Drive, and a significant gap to that building would be retained at first floor level. Moreover, as demonstrated by the examples in Schedule B of the SoC, the Council has permitted various side extensions in the surrounding area, not all of which are set back from the host's front face, and some of which exceed half its width.
7. I have no reason to disagree with the Council that the proposed porch, which would be a fairly modest feature, or the rear extensions, which would be set down and largely concealed from the public realm, would be appropriately designed.
8. For all these reasons, the scheme would integrate well into the streetscene, and it would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
9. Amongst other things, and in broad terms, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012), and HLP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12, set out a need for high quality design, which takes account of townscape character, and which harmonises with its context having regard to matters such as scale, height, plot coverage and materials. The scheme would not conflict with their approach and, notwithstanding the slight conflict with HLP2 Policy DMHD 1, it would accord with the development plan when considered as a whole.
10. Neither would it conflict with the Framework's stance in Section 14 for proposals to respond to their context, and to create visually attractive, distinctive and characterful development which maintains a strong sense of place.

11. I have considered suggested conditions against the tests at Policy DM6 of the Framework. 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 protect the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the extensions are faced with matching materials.
12. Finally, to protect adjacent occupiers' living conditions, a condition is necessary, as suggested in the Council's delegated report, requiring that the first floor side extension's side facing windows are obscurely glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres.
13. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR