
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by **D Boffin BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI, Dip Bldg Cons (RICS), IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/C/24/3337144

Neyland Court, Pembroke Road, Ruislip, HA4 8NQ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the 1990 Act).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Madhukumar Suchak of Anslip UK Limited against an enforcement notice (EN) issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The EN was issued on 14 December 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the EN is: Without planning permission, the development of a car port to the rear of Neyland Court, Pembroke Road, Ruislip, HA4 8NQ.
 - The requirements of the EN are:
 - (i) Demolish and remove the car port to the rear of Neyland Court, Pembroke Road, Ruislip HA4 8NQ as shown on the approximate position outlined in blue on the attached plan.
 - (ii) Remove from the land all debris, items, building materials to include plant and machinery and fittings resulting from compliance with point (i) above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: 3 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (b) of the 1990 Act. 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 1990 Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the EN is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the appeal was lodged. However, the sections relevant to the appeal have not materially altered. As such, I do not consider that it is necessary to seek the further views of the parties. I am required to consider the appeal on the basis of the current Framework.

The ground (b) appeal

3. Ground (b) is that those matters mentioned in the alleged breach have not occurred. I acknowledge that the appellant states that the dimensions of the carport contained within the planning officer's report are false. Nevertheless, the ground (b) appeal is whether as a matter of fact a car port has been erected to the rear of Neyland Court.
4. Furthermore, there is no dispute that a car port has been erected to the rear of Neyland Court. Therefore, even though the dimensions cited in the planning officer's report appear to be based on inaccurate plans a car port has been erected to the rear of Neyland Court and the appeal on ground (b) fails.

The ground (a) appeal and deemed planning application

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
- The effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is formed of a block of flats, Neyland Court, and a car park to the rear of it. The car port is located within the car park, and it adjoins the boundary with dwellings that front onto Brickwall Lane. The site falls outside of, but adjacent to the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (RVCA) and the Midcroft Ruislip Area of Special Local Character (MRASLC).
7. The area immediately surrounding the appeal site is characterised by variety in the age, scale and massing of the buildings. Nevertheless, the predominant building materials of red brick, render and tiles provide homogeneity to its character and appearance. From my observations and the evidence before me I consider that the significance of the RVCA is largely derived from its medieval core, the architectural quality of its buildings and the verdant spaces between those buildings. The highway network within and adjacent to the RVCA allows the significance of that heritage asset to be experienced in views through, into and out of it. Views into the RVCA can be gained when approaching the junction of Pembroke Road with the High Street while travelling along Pembroke Road. This part of Pembroke Road forms part of the setting of the RVCA as it allows for an appreciation of the architectural quality and the verdant spaces that form part of its significance. As a result, that setting makes a positive contribution to the significance of RVCA.
8. MRASLC is a non-designated heritage asset and its significance appears to be derived from its verdant appearance of suburban housing on tree lined roads and mature landscaping within garden areas. That significance is mainly experienced when travelling through it. There are only a limited number of glimpse views from Pembroke Road into MRASLC and those views do not provide an appreciation of that significance. In my judgment, therefore this part of Pembroke Road does not form part of the setting of MRASLC. The development therefore has no impact on the significance of MRASLC.
9. The car port has been constructed from metal poles and has corrugated metal sheets to form a very shallow mono-pitched roof. It has a relatively large footprint of 15 metres (m) in length by 5m in depth. The appellant states that its height is 2.4m rising to 2.6m. Even though, the car port is located to the rear of Neyland Court part of it is visible in views along the access road from Pembroke Road and Station Approach. In those views the materials used appear incongruous given the homogeneity of the predominant building materials. Moreover, the carport is visible from the upper floor flats of Neyland Court and its overall size combined with its materials highlights its incongruity in those views.

10. Nevertheless, the views along the access road do not include views into the RVCA therefore the ability of the viewer to understand and appreciate the heritage asset's significance from Pembroke Road is unaffected by the development. As such, there is no impact on the contribution that setting makes to its special interest/significance. Yet, whilst the significance of the designated heritage asset is preserved the incongruity of the car port, described above, harms the character and appearance of the area.
11. Consequently, in this respect the development does not comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1- Strategic Policies (HLP) and Policy DMHB11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (DMP) which state, amongst other things, that all new developments should achieve a high quality of design, make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of materials and ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes. It also does not comply with paragraph 135 c) of the Framework which states, amongst other things, that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Living Conditions

12. The car port has been constructed immediately adjacent to the boundary treatment that bounds the rear gardens of dwellings that front onto Brickwall Lane. The car port traverses across the whole width of the rear garden to 6 Brickwall Lane (No 6) and partially across that of 4 and 6A Brickwall Lane (Nos 4 and 6A). At 2.4m high the top part and roof of the car port projects above the brick wall that forms the largest part of that boundary treatment. But there is trellis and vegetation above that brick wall. I acknowledge that the rear gardens to No 6 and 6A are relatively short and that when the vegetation is not in full leaf the top part and roof of the car port is highly likely to be visible from those rear gardens.
13. Nonetheless, the visible part is seen in the context of the boundary treatment and, notwithstanding my finding above, given that context it is likely that it is not experienced as oppressive in views from Nos 4, 6 and 6A. As such the outlook enjoyed by the occupiers of those adjacent properties is not adversely impacted.
14. The occupiers of the upper floor flats that face the car port can see it when they look out of their rear facing windows. However, notwithstanding my findings with regard to the character and appearance of the area, the car port is some distance from those windows, and it is below the cill levels of those windows. Therefore, it is likely that it is not experienced as oppressive in views from those upper floor flats. The outlook enjoyed by the occupiers of them is not adversely impacted.
15. Consequently, in this respect the development complies with DMP Policy DMHB11 which states, amongst other things, that development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity of adjacent properties.

Other Matters

16. The references to other development plan policies have been noted. However, the development plan policies to which I have referred are considered the most relevant to this appeal.

Planning balance and conclusion – the ground (a) appeal

17. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. I have found that the development conflicts with HLP Policy BE1 and DMP Policy DMHB11 regarding the character and appearance of the area. These policies are consistent with the Framework and that conflict has full weight.
18. I have also found that the development complies with DMP Policy DMHB11 regarding the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Nonetheless, that compliance is a neutral matter in the planning balance.
19. The appellant has stated that the car port protects cars parked within that section of the carpark from bird and tree debris. However, there is little to indicate that similar benefits could not be achieved from a structure that would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, those benefits do not outweigh the conflict with the development plan policies. As such, I find the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. I conclude that the appeal on ground (a) and the application for deemed planning permission should fail.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the EN and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.

D Boffin

INSPECTOR