



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/R5510/C/24/3336820

105 Church Road, HAYES, UB3 2LE

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Raminderjit Singh against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The notice was issued on 7 December 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the development of part single storey side extension, part two storey side extension with canopy to front wall, and part single storey rear extension ("the breach").
 - The requirements of the notice are (i) Demolish the part single storey, part two storey side extension (incorporating front facing wall of over 2m in height indicated yellow on attached plan) coupled with a front canopy and single storey rear extension, approximate position hatched purple on the attached plan. (ii) Remove from the land all debris, waste, building materials, plant equipment and machinery resulting from the works carried out in compliance with above requirement (i) OR (iii) amend the development to form compliance with the details submitted with approved planning permission reference 34823/APP/2022/1572, mainly the approved elevations drawing labelled SINGH/PLAN/002/REV-B. (iv) Remove from the land all debris, waste, building materials, plant equipment and machinery resulting from the works carried out in compliance with above requirement (i).
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: 3 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f), (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.
 - A similar appeal has been made by Mrs Ravinder Kaur (3336821).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R5510/C/24/3336822

105 Church Road, HAYES, UB3 2LE

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Raminderjit Singh against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The notice was issued on 7 December 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the development of a single storey front extension with canopy ("the breach").
 - The requirements of the notice are (i) Demolish the single storey front extension with canopy approximate position hatched orange on the attached plan. (ii) Remove from the land all debris, waste, building materials, plant equipment and machinery resulting from the works carried out in compliance with requirement (i)
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) 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.
 - A similar appeal has been made by Mrs Ravinder Kaur (3336823).
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/R5510/C/24/3336824

105 Church Road, HAYES, UB3 2LE

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- The appeal is made by Mr Raminderjit Singh against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The notice was issued on 7 December 2023.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the development of outbuilding ("the breach").
- The requirements of the notice are (i) Demolish the outbuilding approximate position hatched green on the attached plan. (ii) Remove from the land all debris, waste, building materials, plant equipment and machinery resulting from the works carried out in compliance with requirement (i).
- The periods for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (d), (f) 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.
- A similar appeal has been made by Mrs Ravinder Kaur (3336825).

Appeal D Ref: APP/R5510/C/24/3336826

105 Church Road, HAYES, UB3 2LE

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Raminderjit Singh against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The notice was issued on 7 December 2023.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the development of a front boundary wall comprising panels exceeding one (1) meter in height ("the breach").
- The requirements of the notice are (i) Remove the front boundary wall with panels and sliding gate approximate position indicated in black attached plan. (ii) Remove from the land all debris, waste, building materials, plant equipment and machinery resulting from the works carried out in compliance with requirement (i).
- The periods for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) 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.
- A similar appeal has been made by Mrs Ravinder Kaur (3336827).

Decisions

Appeals A (3336820) and B (3336822)

1. The notice for appeal A is corrected by deleting (i) from requirement (iv) and substituting (iii). Subject to that correction the appeals are allowed, the enforcement notices are quashed and planning permission is granted on the applications deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended) for the development already carried out, namely the development of part single storey side extension, part two storey side extension with canopy to front wall, and part single storey rear extension (notice A) and the development of a single storey front extension with canopy (notice B), at 105 Church Road, Hayes, UB3 2LE as shown on the plans attached to the notices.

Appeal C (3336824)

2. It is directed that the enforcement notice is varied by: deleting requirement (i) and replacing it with "*(i) replace the outbuilding with one shown as 'Option 01' on 'drawing 02-04 P1'*". Subject to this 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.

Appeal D (3336826)

3. It is directed that the enforcement notice is varied by: adding to the end of requirement (i) the words “*and replacing them with boundary treatment shown in ‘Option 04’ on ‘drawing 02-05 P1’, but with brick pillars either side of the pedestrian gate as shown on the second option on ‘drawing 02-05A P1’*”. Subject to these variations, the appeal is dismissed and 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.

Appeals 3336821, 3336823, 3336825 and 3336827

4. The appeals are dismissed and any planning applications deemed to have been made are refused.

Preliminary Matters

5. I shall correct the notice in Appeal A where requirement (iv) refers to requirement (i) when it should refer to requirement (iii). This is not a substantive change and it does not cause injustice to either party.

The Appeal on Ground (d)

6. Appeal C carries a ground (d) appeal that the outbuilding was constructed more than 4 years ago. However, the Council’s 2022 streetview photograph shows it was not there then, so it cannot be 4 years old.

The Appeals on Ground (a)

7. The four notices attack separate parts of an overall development of 105 Church Road. The house is one of a pair of semis which stands in a plot on the corner with Compton Road. There is thus, more space around it than usual. The whole area is characterised by housing of many different types and there is no particular style evident in the locality. No105 has certainly been enlarged quite considerably and very much stands out in the streetscene. However, there is an interesting history which explains much of what has been going on.
8. Originally the modest semi had a hip to gable extension and a large rear dormer. The result of that, which was permitted development at the time, created an unsightly and looming dominant end to the house, quite at odds with its neighbour and others in the area. Subsequently planning permission was granted for a side and rear extension which would serve to reduce the impact of the stark gable wall and provide a 2 storey side element, set back and below the roof line and a single storey rear extension that ran the full width of the ground floor. This would undoubtedly have improved the aesthetics of No105 to the benefit of the streetscene. However, what was built was different in that the side extension was 40cm wider than granted, the eaves to the rear sloping roof were higher than approved, a porch and canopy were added to the front and a small, single storey side extension was tacked onto the new two storey side extension in order to house a central heating boiler.
9. In addition a large outbuilding was constructed in the rear garden, which because this is a corner plot, extends in front of the front garden of the nearest house in Compton Road and so is visible from its front garden. This building is too tall to be

permitted development. Also a 2m high wall and metal fence has been erected around the curtilage of the property with a large metal gate giving access onto Compton Road close to the junction and a smaller metal pedestrian gate onto Church Road.

Notices A and B

10. Firstly the main dwelling. In my view, as it stands the house is an improvement over the original house (with the dormer etc). The extra size of the 2 storey side extension is neither here nor there. I cannot see that removing it would lead to any improvement in the streetscene as it doesn't cause any harm. Similarly the front canopy would seem to be unexceptional. The neighbour doesn't have one, but even so it does not cause any harm. I noted other examples in the area of unbalanced front canopy developments and they did not stand out as intrusive. The porch element would be permitted development without the canopy. As noted above there is no particular design style to the area which accommodates a wide variety of housing types. The eaves of the rear roof of the extension are marginally higher than the main eaves of the house but that tends to make the extension appear subordinate to the main roof and also hides a bit more of the unsightly dormer flank. On balance I do not think this causes any harm.
11. The additional single storey side extension is clearly a small add-on. It is constructed of different materials and is a very modest scale compared to the main extended dwelling. It houses the boiler and looks like a small boiler room. It could be replaced by a similar sized outbuilding, close to but not joined to the house, but I am not sure what advantage that would provide. It is hardly noticeable, especially as it is screened by part of the 2m side wall that is not affected by notice D. It follows that the matters alleged in notices A and B are not contrary to policies DMHD1, DMHB 11 and 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan. Consequently, I shall quash notices A and B grant planning permission for the developments as constructed.

Notice C

12. Notice C concerns the outbuilding. I agree that its position forward of the neighbour in Compton Road is unfortunate, especially as the rear wall facing their garden has not been finished but remains bare breeze block. However, Class E of Part 1 of Schedule 4 of the GPDO allows a building with eaves up to 2.5m in height and the appellant has proposed various alternative options which would be permitted development. Option 01 on Plan 02-04 P1 would seem the most obvious and low-key alternative as it reduces the eaves height to 2.5m and has a flat roof. I shall vary the requirements to enable that option to be created but otherwise dismiss the appeal and uphold the notice.

Notice D

13. Notice D deals with the front wall. This comprises 2m tall elements with infill metal panels and the 2 gates mentioned earlier. The notice requires the wall, panels and sliding gate to be removed but does not mention the pedestrian gate. The appellant argues that the gates are not mentioned in the allegation so are not included. But the requirements specifically require removal of the sliding gate and it is not unreasonable to therefore assume the reference to wall in the allegation includes the sliding gate. However, the pedestrian gate is not referred to

anywhere and I agree therefore it is stretching things to infer that gate into the allegation.

14. I agree with the Council that the wall and metal panels along the frontage are entirely out of character with the immediate area and along with the 2m brick side wall along the Compton Road frontage give a high security aspect to the whole plot that is quite unsettling. No reason has been given why the house needs to be surrounded by tall walls and gates, other than personal preference and I agree the front wall needs to go. However, the appellant has pointed out that they can build a 1m wall and to remove it entirely is excessive. Various options have been suggested, several involving retaining the metal fence panels but removing several of the uprights so they are more visually porous. However, they would still retain the fortress-like appearance so that option 04 on drawing 02-05 P1 would be a reasonable requirement, although retaining the brick pillars either side of the gate would be aesthetically more pleasing and I shall vary the requirements accordingly.
15. Interestingly none of the alternative options mention the sliding gate. This provides vehicle access to the paved front garden which is used for parking. The Council are concerned about pedestrian safety if the parking is retained as vehicles will cross the footpath and enter the road very close to the junction. However, there is no proposal for a dropped kerb nor reference to creation of an access. I don't think the Council can prevent the use of the front garden for parking, nor those cars from driving over the pavement to reach the road as long as no development is involved. Option 04 mentioned above does not include any sliding gate but it seems to me there is nothing to prevent a 1m tall gate, however it opened, from being installed as permitted development. I shall therefore retain the requirement to remove the existing gate but make no reference to a replacement. It will be up to the appellant to decide how to replace the existing gate with one that is permitted or leave a gap.

Conclusion

16. I shall quash notices A and B and grant planning permission for the extensions to the house. I shall uphold notice C and vary the requirements to enable a smaller outbuilding to be built and I shall uphold notice D but vary the requirements to enable the wall to be retained at 1m high. I shall dismiss all the subordinate appeals to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR