



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by V Bond LLB (Hons) Solicitor (Non-Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 DECEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/C/24/3339492

10 Townfield Road, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 2EL

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Preet Sedana against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The notice was issued on 16 January 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of an outbuilding situated on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse (shown in the approximate position hatched in blue on the site plan).
 - The requirements of the notice are: (i) Demolish and remove the outbuilding situated on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse shown in the approximate position hatched in blue on the site plan). (ii) Remove from the land all debris, items, fixtures and fittings, plant and machinery resulting from compliance with points (i) above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirement is: Three (3) calendar months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is varied by the deletion of “Three (3) calendar months” as the period for compliance and its substitution with “Nine (9) months”.
2. Subject to the variation, the appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

The appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application (DPA)

Preliminary Matter

3. The revised National Planning Policy Framework 2024 came into force during the course of the appeal. The revisions made have not had a direct bearing on the issues which are central in this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the street.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end-terrace house which has been extended to the side and rear and is located on a corner plot at the junction of Townfield Road with Fifth Avenue. Dwellings along this street generally have modest front gardens but

corner properties have significantly larger front/side gardens maintaining a sense of spaciousness even in instances where side extensions have been constructed.

6. The appeal outbuilding is, by the LPA's measurements, some 2.7m high, 3.8m deep and 6.4m wide. It sits significantly forward of the building line and has a substantial footprint relative to the area of garden within which it sits. It draws the eye at a significant distance in views from Townfield Road on approach from Sixth Avenue as a visually jarring feature at odds with the established pattern of development and the open character of the street.
7. I acknowledge that some nearby corner properties have built form within the front/side garden including some breaches of the building line. However, these examples are generally modest-sized/fairly well screened. Visually prominent breaches of building lines on corner plots is not characteristic of the street.
8. For the reasons explained the appeal building has a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street. It conflicts with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012). These together seek to ensure that all new development incorporates good design, harmonising with local context including by taking into account established street patterns and building lines and is appropriate to the local area in terms of layout. Policy DMHD 1 does not appear to be directly relevant given that it does not relate to outbuildings.

Other Matters

9. I have considered comments from the appellant that an immediate family member who suffers from learning difficulties uses the outbuilding as a safe environment where carers can visit separate from the main house. I appreciate also that there is insufficient space within the rear garden to provide a separate space for this use. However, I have no detailed evidence supporting the importance of the appeal building in this regard, nor any explanation as to why provision could not be made within the recently extended main dwelling. Concerns as to the Council's handling of the enforcement process are not for me in determining this appeal.

Conclusion on ground (a) and the DPA

10. The appeal development results in material harm to the character and appearance of the street and conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. On the available evidence, no material considerations warrant a decision other than in accordance with the plan. The appeal on ground (a) therefore fails and planning permission will be refused in respect of the DPA.

The appeal on ground (g)

11. The appeal on ground (g) is that the period for compliance (3 months) falls short of what is reasonable.
12. The appellant requests a nine month period referring to the nature of the works and personal circumstances raised in relation to difficulties faced by an immediate family member of the appellant who makes use of the appeal building. Taking into consideration likely timescales for scheduling and carrying out the works, as well as providing a reasonable period for seeking alternative arrangements in respect of the stated family member, a nine month compliance period as suggested would

strike a reasonable balance between bringing the harm to an end and affording an adequate compliance period. The ground (g) appeal succeeds.

Overall conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice with a variation and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

V Bond

INSPECTOR