



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by R Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3363716

2 Churchill Road, Uxbridge, UB10 0FL

- 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 Piyush Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application ref is 76900/APP/2021/4370.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 2 Churchill Road, Uxbridge, UB10 0FL in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 76900/APP/2021/4370, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing nos; CR1/ELE/005, CR1/ELE/006, CR1/ELE/007, CR1/ELE/008, CR1/SITE/001, CR1/PLN/002.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Churchill Road is located within the 'St Andrew's Park' redevelopment, which was formally the location of the Royal Air Force base in Uxbridge. This residential road primarily consists of two and three storey terraced dwellings with 4 storey flat blocks serving as a bookend to the road. The development has a distinctive architectural style and composition, with a notable feature being two and three storey flat roof projections which are clad in either a grey material or timber on the front and side of the dwellings. The side garden of the appeal dwelling adjoins an

- area of public realm landscaping which provides a softening and open edge to the development site, particularly at the entrance into the estate from Hillingdon Road.
5. The appeal site is prominently located on a corner plot at the end of a short terrace of 5 dwellings, marking the entrance into Churchill Road from Hillingdon Road. The road inclines from Hillingdon Road towards Churchill Road, increasing the visibility of the appeal site from within the wider street scene.
 6. The site is situated within a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) area however, there are no trees in proximity that would be impacted by the proposal. I note that the Council has raised no concerns regarding this matter.
 7. The appeal dwelling features a two storey flat roof projection on the side elevation. The Officer delegated report refers to the space alongside the side elevation of the appeal dwelling and states that *'this space forms a semi public/semi private arrangement to the wider street scene.'* However, from my site visit I noted that the space appears to primarily function as part of a domestic side garden. It is bordered by a maturing hedge and can be accessed via a pedestrian gate located on the side of the property from Churchill Road. Whilst the site is relatively open, and particularly prominent on the approach to the bend and in some wider views, the hedge provides a level of privacy screening around the side garden. Therefore, garden paraphernalia and related activities are less visible from within the street scene.
 8. The proposed extension would encompass a significant proportion of the side garden, however, the public realm landscaping directly next to the site would limit any reduction in the openness of the area and the contribution this makes in enhancing the overall wider character and appearance of the development. Although a further addition to the property its design and appearance would not appear out of keeping.
 9. The proposed extension would be subservient in width, depth, height to the host dwelling. The dwelling and plot are of a sufficient size to accommodate the addition without it appearing disproportionately large and out of place. The proposed side projection on the extension would replicate and align with the existing projection at first floor level in terms of proportion and design. Therefore, the distinctive flat roof projection feature on the side elevation of the dwelling, which is particularly noticeable when entering into the development from Hillingdon Road as the road inclines, would be maintained, albeit in a different way. The proposed matching materials and replicating features would assist in integrating the extension into the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
 10. For the reasons given above, I find that the appeal scheme would not be dominant or visually discordant in terms of its surroundings. It would reflect the surrounding architectural characteristics and distinctive features of the development and would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area or the host dwelling. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policies BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan (2012), DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Development Management Policies (2020) which seek high quality design which enhances local distinctiveness in the area, harmonises with the local context and integrates with the surrounding area.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides clarity.
12. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing building/dwelling is imposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the framework do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. Having considered all matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

R Aston

INSPECTOR