Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 October 2026

by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/R5510/C/26/3377323
Appeal B Ref: APP/R5510/C/26/3377324
18 Ivy House Road, Ickenham, Uxbridge UB10 8NE

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeals are made by Mr Ashid Sakaria (Appeal A) and Mrs Dhaneshwari Sakaria (Appeal B) against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The notice was issued on 2 December 2025.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the installation of an external insulating render to all elevations of the dwelling, together with alterations to fenestration, at a property located within the Ickenham Conservation Area.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
  - (i) Remove the external insulating render from all elevations of the dwelling and reinstate wall finishes to match the original dwelling in appearance and profile, including pebbledash texture, colour and detailing as shown on appendix A and B attached;
  - (ii) Remove the dark window frames from all elevations and reinstate window frames to match the original style, profile, materials, colour and detailing used in the original dwelling as shown on Appendix B attached;
  - (iii) Remove from the land all debris, materials and waste resulting from compliance with (i) and (ii) above.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: six (6) calendar months after the notice takes effect.
- The appeals are proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Appeal on ground (f)

2. The appeal on ground (f) is made on the basis that the steps required by the notice to be taken exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control or to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such breach.

3. The purpose of the notice is to remedy the breach of planning control, which is the installation of insulating render and alterations to the windows. The requirements to remove the render, restore the original wall finishes, remove the window frames and reinstate window frames to match the original ones are consistent with remedying the breach of planning control.

4. The appellants suggest there are alternative steps that would address the breach. These are, firstly, that rather than removing the insulated render, which could damage the original building, pebble dashing could be added to it. Secondly, they suggest that rather than removing the dark coloured window frames, they could be painted white.

5. However, as there is no appeal on ground (a), I am unable to consider the planning merits of these suggestions insofar as whether they would address the harm to the Ickenham Conservation Area resulting from the unauthorised works, or indeed whether other properties nearby have undertaken similar works. Instead, I can only consider whether adding pebble dashing and painting the window frames would achieve the purpose of the notice, which is to remedy the breach of planning control. Clearly adding pebble dashing and painting the window frames white would not result in the removal of the insulating render or the dark coloured window frames.

6. As such I consider that the requirements of the notice are not excessive to remedy the breach of planning control. Therefore the appeals on ground (f) fail.

Appeal on ground (g)

7. The appeal on ground (g) is made on the basis that the period specified in the notice in accordance with section 173(9) of the Act falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.

8. The appellants state that eight months is a more reasonable time frame, due to the need to, broadly, find a builder, schedule the work and undertake the work. They also suggest they will need to find alternative accommodation while the works are carried out.

9. I see no reason why the six month compliance period given on the notice would not be sufficient for the works to be completed and there is no substantive evidence before me to support the appellant's suggestion. Moreover, I would consider it unlikely that alternative accommodation would be needed, given the render is on the exterior of the building and individual windows can usually be swapped over promptly.

10. Therefore the appeals on ground (g) fail.

Other Matters

11. I understand the unauthorised works were undertaken to provide better insulation for a frail and elderly relative living at the property. However there are alternative methods to improve the insulation of a house, and in any case the colour of the window frame would have no effect on this.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeals should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR