



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3366324

5 Crowland Avenue, Hillingdon, Hayes UB3 4JN

- 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 Surinder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 48814/APP/2025/525.
 - The development proposed is described as an “Erection of a single storey rear extension, and a first floor rear extension.”
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice as it more accurately reflects the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is situated at the western end of Crowland Avenue, forming part of a pair of semi-detached houses on the northern side of the street. It lies within a residential street characterised by similar semi-detached properties of comparable scale and design, contributing to a consistent and coherent street scene. 5 Crowland Avenue (no 5) has been subject to a number of extensions. In addition to a full-width single-storey rear extension and a large rear dormer, there has also been a hip-to-gable roof extension and a porch to the front elevation.
6. To the west, 1 and 3 Crowland Avenue (no 1 & no 3) have also undergone a number of alterations and extensions. Looking eastward from the rear of no 5, the view opens up to a more uniform row of semi-detached homes. In this direction, the building line remains largely intact, with most properties displaying modest single-storey rear additions while retaining their original first-floor rear elevations and roof

profiles. The original design and form of the properties generally remain identifiable, contributing to the overall uniformity of the street scene.

7. When viewed cumulatively with the existing alterations at no 5, the proposed extensions would fail to appear subservient to the original dwelling. Instead, they would result in a visually dominant form that would undermine the character and appearance of both the host property and pair of semi-detached properties it forms part of, as well as the wider area. While the single-storey rear extension has been approved under a previous application and may be acceptable in isolation, its combination with the proposed first-floor addition and the existing rear dormer would create excessive bulk, scale, and massing relative to that of the existing building. The resulting built form would span three storeys, an extent of development not mirrored in neighbouring properties. Moreover, the proposal would further project beyond the existing ground-floor extension, exceeding the depth of any comparable extension visible in the immediate vicinity.
8. While I acknowledge the inclusion of various design features, such as the matching roof form, materials, and positioning, and accept that the proposal may meet certain individual design criteria, these elements do not sufficiently mitigate the overall harm arising from the cumulative scale of development. Nor would the removal of the existing rear canopy structure meaningfully reduce this impact. Taken as a whole, the scheme would result in a visually dominant and incongruous addition that fails to respect the established character and appearance of both the host property and the wider area. Although the proposed extensions would not be widely prominent within the street scene, they would nevertheless be partially visible due to the gap between the appeal site and no 3. Furthermore, the harm caused by the proposal would be clearly apparent from neighbouring properties.
9. The appellant has suggested that a similar scale of development could be implemented through permitted development rights. However, I have been provided with limited details regarding what such a fallback scheme would entail. Consequently, I have attached little weight to this argument. Similarly, whilst certain existing elements at no 5 may have been constructed under permitted development rights or granted planning permission individually, this does not justify the harm resulting from the cumulative impact of existing and proposed additions.
10. I have had regard to the developments cited by the appellant at 163 Botwell Lane (no 163) and no 1. However, each application must be assessed on its own merits, with regard to the specific context and the cumulative impact of development. From the information before me, the single-storey rear extension at no 163 does not appear to project to the same depth as the appeal proposal. Furthermore, no 163 is located on a different street with distinct characteristics. Properties on that side of Botwell Lane appear to be built in closer proximity to one another, thus reducing the visibility of rear additions within the street scene. Similarly, the development at no 1 differs in that the dwelling does not feature dormer windows and would have been assessed within a different policy context, both at national and local level. Therefore, I conclude these developments are not directly comparable to the current proposal, so I have given them minimal weight in my recommendation.
11. It has also been put to my attention that the development would retain adequate garden space, maintain parking provision, and protect the living conditions of neighbouring properties, with the appellant also noting the absence of objections from nearby residents. However, the Council raised no concerns regarding these

matters and they are neutral considerations, weighing neither for nor against the proposal. Additionally, the appellant's view that the proposal complies with other development plan policies or certain paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is also a neutral matter and does not alter my overall assessment of the proposal. I have sympathy with the appellant's desire for much-needed additional living space. However, I find that the harm caused to the character and appearance of the property and its surroundings would outweigh that benefit.

12. Given the above, the proposed development would cumulatively cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (Adopted 2012) and Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (Adopted 2020). Amongst other things, these policies require development to ensure there is no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area, be subordinate and respect the design of the original house, and harmonise with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. There are no material considerations, which indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Edwards

INSPECTOR