



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 11 June 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3363560**

**15 Rushdene Road, Eastcote, Hillingdon, HA5 1SW**

- 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 Mrs Kamini Thayalanayagam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref is 63838/APP/2025/44.
  - The development proposed was described as '*Retention of existing front canopy*'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front canopy at 15 Rushdene Road, Eastcote, Hillingdon, HA5 1SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 63838/APP/2025/44, and the plans submitted with it.

### Procedural Matters

2. The banner heading above quotes the description of development that was given on the application form. As retention is not an act of development, my formal decision refers simply to the erection of a front canopy.
3. The application was made retrospectively and at the time of my visit the development was complete.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

### Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a two-storey, semi-detached property within a residential neighbourhood comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached, single and two-storey dwellings dating largely from the early to mid-part of the last century. Along with its attached neighbour at No 13, the property comprises a mix of red brick and render and is a typical example of its time with a prominent front two-storey bow window and gable feature. Nevertheless, both dwellings have been modified over time including each with a side hip-to-gable roof change and single-storey side extensions which, in the case at No 13, projects forward and wraps around the dwelling's front elevation as a porch extension with a tiled roof over.

6. The canopy at No 15 is constructed as an open sided timber frame with a lean-to tiled roof over. It projects approximately 2m forward and measures around 4.8m wide, spanning part of the dwelling's original front elevation over the front door and up to the front bay, and across the front of the side extension.
7. Projecting front extensions and porches are not unusual along Rushdene Road. Contrary to the Council's assertions, I found the lean-to roof style to the front of the property to be characteristic of the area; some being original features on some properties with others seen as obvious later alterations. Whilst the style of the canopy at No 15 does not directly mimic the alterations at No 13, I found there to be a reasonably pleasing balance to the semi-detached pair as a result when viewed head-on, including when seen in the vista along The Chase, directly opposite the site.
8. I note the roof tiles used do not match those on the dwelling's main roof, but their red tone complements the dwelling's brickwork at ground floor and is reflective of tile hanging that can be seen on other properties nearby. The colour used is not alien in its setting. The Council correctly observes that the lean-to roof does not integrate with the roof form of the dwelling's side extension. However, the canopy effectively screens sight of the side extension, including its roof. Also given the recessed position of the dwelling, being set behind a hard-surfaced frontage, the relationship between both roofs is not overtly seen from the public domain as visually unappealing or harmful.
9. Overall, I am satisfied that the canopy is appropriately subordinate in scale and respectful of the dwelling's original character. As such I find no harm to the character or appearance of No 15 or the wider street scene. Accordingly, there is no conflict with Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 or DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) which between them, and amongst other things, seek to ensure new development is of a high standard that respects the design of the original property and harmonises with local context. For the same reason I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed. As the development has taken place, I have no reason to impose any conditions.

*John D Allan*

INSPECTOR