



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2025

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/F/24/3343125

14 High Street, Harefield, UXBRIDGE, UB9 6BU

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by We Love Coffee against a listed building enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 14 March 2024
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is: without listed building consent the (a) erection of a single storey rear extension to the rear elevation of the listed building; and (b) the erection of an extractor flue at rear elevation of listed building.
 - The requirements of the notice are: (i) demolish and remove the rear extension (as shown in appendix A attached to this notice); (ii) demolish and remove the extractor flue (as shown in appendix B attached to this notice); (iii) make good any openings created in the rear elevation of the listed building following the demolition and removal of points (i) and (ii) above; (iv) remove from the land all debris, items, building materials resulting from compliance with points (i) to (iii) above; (v) remove the metal sheeting and shelf above the door (as shown in appendix C attached to this notice); (vi) remove the glue using a non-abrasive method, so that no residue remains on the surface of the bricks or rendered plinth; (vii) remove any white paint from the brickwork, above the metal sheeting, around the former window opening and around the adjacent door, using a non-abrasive method; (viii) remove from the land all debris, items building materials resulting from compliance with points (v) to (vii) above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
 - The appeal is made on the ground set out in section 39(1) (e) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld. Listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

The Appeal on Ground (e)

2. This ground is that listed building consent should be granted for the matters alleged. The appellant says they only want consent for the outbuilding and will remove the other works. In fact they state the metal sheeting, shelf and flue have already been removed. As I saw the metal sheeting and shelf had gone but the flue had only been reduced in length. In any event the main issue is the effect of the outbuilding on the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.
3. The appellant argues the rear elevation is of low architectural quality and the yard used to be a scruffy open bin storage so is now much improved. In fact the rear is typical of many similar listed buildings that now contain commercial uses. It may well have been altered over the years but it retains its simple London stock brick façade and at least one sash window. It is joined onto a building whose rear has

been disfigured by a large brick staircase covered in pebbledash and is in a service yard which does have many commercial wastebins. However, that just makes the case for protecting what historic character remains all the stronger.

4. The immediate yard behind the building which contains the outbuilding, is also used as a seating area in better weather, and that has, in itself, cleared away the bins and other rubbish, the outbuilding is not integral to any improvements to the yard. It is constructed of timber and plastic cladding and appears to be an ad hoc lean-to which in itself is scruffy and if it was designed, it was with no thought to the listed building to which it is joined. It clearly harms the character of the listed building.
5. In terms of the NPPF the significance of the listed building for this appeal is the survival of its simple rear façade and the lean-to detracts from that and causes less than substantial harm. I agree there must be benefits to the business of extra storage and working space, but it does not have to be in such a scrappy structure. What public benefits there are do not, therefore, outweigh the harm.
6. I shall dismiss the appeal and uphold the listed building enforcement notice in full.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR