



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2026

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2026

Appeal Ref: 6011782

25 Stirling Road, Hayes, Hillingdon UB3 3AH

- 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 M Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application reference is 54287/APP/2026/672.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension, double storey side extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural and preliminary matters

2. The appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading. The Council has, however, referred to it as part single, part two-storey front, side and rear extensions, together with alterations to the roof and front porch, and the removal of the chimneys and a garage. From my inspection of the plans, I consider that the Council's description more fully reflects the development sought. I have assessed the appeal scheme on that basis.
3. A new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 17 August 2026. It replaces the previous version to which the evidence refers. The Framework is a material consideration, and I have taken it into account. It does not raise any new matters that are determinative of the outcome of this appeal.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached, mainly two-storey dwelling on a residential street along which two-storey semi-detached houses predominate. It has a prominent front gable, hipped roof and single storey projections at the side and rear. Like several properties along Stirling Road, No 25 has been extended and externally altered. I also saw that building works were underway at the time of the site visit. Consequently, there is some variety to the existing built form within the street scene and the local area to which the site belongs.

6. The proposal is to substantially enlarge the dwelling with sizeable extensions on three sides and alterations to its roof form. The additional two-storey front gable, extensive side and rear enlargements and broad crown roof would significantly change the scale, proportions and architectural composition of the existing house.
7. That the central porch would be flanked by front gables would introduce some general symmetry to the principal elevation. Matching external materials would also provide a degree of visual cohesion to the appearance of the scheme. However, these features would not overcome the substantial increase in the dwelling's scale and bulk that is proposed. Furthermore, the new side extension would not be appreciably set back or set down from the main house and it would not read as a subordinate addition. These are specific requirements of Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (LP Part 2), with which the proposal would conflict.
8. The proposed roof would be no taller than the existing ridge and the flat central section would be largely concealed when viewed from ground level by the adjacent roof slopes. The adjoining two-storey houses would also limit views of its scale and depth to short sections of Stirling Road. However, the considerable scale of the new roof could not reasonably be described as subservient to that of the existing roof, nor would it be confined to the rear roof only. Both are requirements of roof extensions under LP Part 2 Policy DMHD 1. Furthermore, the enlarged roof would contribute to the substantial increase in the dwelling's scale and bulk.
9. The proposal also includes a single storey rear extension that would lengthen a rear addition that has recently been permitted. LP Plan Part 2 Policy DMHD 1 states that single-storey rear extensions to detached houses on plots at least 5 metres wide should not exceed 4 metres in depth. Whether or not the proposal would exceed this threshold, the supporting text to this policy establishes a presumption against further extensions to existing extensions.
10. I acknowledge the generous size of the plot, the retained garden space and the separation that would remain between the enlarged dwelling and neighbouring properties. As a result, the finished dwelling would not appear cramped in terms of layout nor relate unsatisfactorily with the buildings on either side of the site. However, the proposal would still be disproportionately large and bulky relative to the host dwelling.
11. I have also taken into account the recent planning permission for rear extensions and a front porch at No 25. However, the proposal would involve substantially more extensive additions and alterations, particularly to the front, side and roof. The earlier permission is therefore different to the proposal before me, which has been assessed on its own merits.
12. I saw that properties along Stirling Road vary in size and general appearance, partly due to various extensions that have taken place. In particular, No 20 has two prominent front gables, while other properties, including Nos 50 and 63, demonstrate differing building proportions and roof forms. However, none of these examples replicate the scale and bulk of the proposal and so are not directly comparable with the development sought.
13. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling by overwhelming its design and proportions and by failing to maintain a subordinate relationship between the

extensions and the existing building. Notwithstanding the architectural variety along Stirling Road, the resulting size and bulk would also make the dwelling appear overly dominant and obtrusive within the street scene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the local area.

14. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with LP Part 2 Policy DMHD 1, particularly its requirements in relation to the scale and subordination of extensions, front and side additions and large crown roofs. It is also contrary to LP Plan Part 2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan. Together, these policies seek, amongst other things, to secure appropriately designed development that respects the character of existing buildings and their surroundings.

Planning balance and conclusion

15. Policy DP3 of the Framework requires development to respond appropriately to its context. It also states that proposals should be refused where, without clear justification, they conflict with explicit design standards in the development plan. I have taken account of the appellant's arguments concerning the submitted design, generous plot size and varied character of properties along the street. However, these considerations do not provide clear justification for the proposal's departures from LP Plan Part 2 Policy DMHD 1. The development would therefore conflict with Policy DP3 of the Framework.
16. Policy DP3 of the Framework therefore indicates that the proposal should be refused. This is a circumstance expressly recognised by Policy S4 of the Framework as one in which adverse effects are likely to substantially outweigh benefits. In this case, I find that the significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area would substantially outweigh the limited benefits of the proposal.
17. The development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations sufficient to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR