



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2026 by F Bradford BA (Hons) MRTPI

Decision by N Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001414

6 North Avenue, Hillingdon, Hayes, UB3 2JE

- 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 MD Azad Ali Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 69570/APP/2025/2091.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part single storey, part double storey side extension, part first floor rear extension including chimney removal works; hip to gable end loft conversion with rear roof extension (involving conversion of roof space to habitable use) and installation of two roof lights to front slope with addition of porticos in existing porch.
-

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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey, end-of-terrace property. Despite the addition of porches and one rear dormer to other dwellings in the terrace, the terrace retains uniformity with regularly positioned windows and consistent roof slope. The character of the street is mainly that of similarly styled terraces.
5. The Council and appellant agree that the part double storey side extension and part first floor rear extension are acceptable as this has been previously granted planning permission under reference 69570/APP/2022/3401, although this permission has expired in the intervening period. I see no reason to disagree with this assessment.
6. The hip-to-gable roof extension would result in a gable end wall being formed to the site of the existing house. This would lead to the hipped roof of the side extension. Although a hipped roof would be retained, it would be connected to the gable wall of the host and the strong lines of the existing roofscape would be eroded. The loss of this legibility and the introduction of a gable wall would result in the roof

extension appearing as substantial additional bulk to the host dwelling. This would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the existing terrace.

7. The proposed rear dormer would occupy over two thirds of the roof. Whilst it would be set down from the original roof ridge, in from the sides and up from the eaves in accordance with policy DMDH1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (HLP2), these set ins would not mitigate its occupation of a large part of the roof. Furthermore, although the dormer would not be readily visible from North Avenue, it would be apparent from the public realm between dwellings on Orchard Road as well as by the occupants of adjacent private neighbouring properties. The dormer would as such appear as a dominant addition to the host dwelling and wider terrace, eroding the legibility of the original roofscape and undermining both the uniformity and visual quality of the area.
8. Policy DMHD1 of the HLP2 sets out that front extensions should be minor and not alter the appearance of the house, and those extending across the entire frontage will be refused. The portico and porch would stretch the full width of the dwellinghouse, inclusive of the side extension. By virtue of its extent and design with fussy portico features and lack of rhythm of the windows, it would appear as a substantial and incongruous addition to the host dwelling.
9. Although the use of materials matching would create a sense of visual coherency between the host dwelling and proposed extensions, this would not in itself overcome the harm arising from the proposal.
10. For these reasons, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. I therefore find conflict with Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which, among other things, aim to ensure that development is of high quality design, harmonises with the local context and has a satisfactory relationship with the existing dwelling. I further find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) where it seeks to achieve high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

N Bowden

INSPECTOR