



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2026

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003599

24 Sweetcroft Lane, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 9LD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Z Gazi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 13272/APP/2025/1976.
 - The development proposed is retrospective planning application for the retention of a new entrance porch and single storey front projection, providing a uniformed mono-pitched roof to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new entrance porch and single storey front projection, providing a uniformed mono-pitched roof to the front elevation at 24 Sweetcroft Lane, Uxbridge, Hillingdon UB10 9LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13272/APP/2025/1976, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have removed reference to the retrospective nature of the development from my main decision given that this does not form an act of development. Nevertheless, during my site visit, I observed that development has already taken place in line with the submitted plans. I have assessed the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The surrounding area within which the appeal site is situated is predominantly formed of detached, two and three storey properties set within spacious plots. Dwelling designs vary considerably with several examples in the immediate street scene of single storey forward projecting canopy and porch additions, some of which span much of the width of the front elevation.
5. The appeal property itself is a two-storey dwelling with a hipped roof which also accommodates a roof dormer. It is typical of the general scale and appearance of properties in the area. Notwithstanding the development to which this appeal relates, I understand that the dwelling has been previously extended, including through a single storey side extension.

6. Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) (LPP1) relates to the built environment requiring new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment, including through achieving a high quality design in extensions which enhance the local distinctiveness of the area.
7. Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) (LPP2) relates to alterations and extensions to residential dwellings setting out various criteria which proposals will be required to meet. Amongst other matters, the policy sets out that extensions will be required to ensure that they appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height whilst respecting the design of the original house.
8. Specifically in relation to front extensions, Policy DMHD 1 of the LPP2 states that these should be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. The policy sets out that front extensions across the entire frontage will be refused.
9. The appeal development relates to an extension which spans part of the front elevation. It also includes a projecting porch canopy. Together with an existing front projection at the dwelling, this creates a front projection which spans most of the width of the front of the dwelling, albeit notably does not extend across the existing single storey side addition.
10. The appeal development corresponds well to the overall design of the dwelling in both materials and roof design. Despite local concerns, I find that although the porch canopy extends beyond the front building line, its modest height and generally open appearance reduces its overall prominence. When taken in the context of the rest of the dwelling, the appeal development is subordinate and does not significantly alter the overall appearance of the dwelling.
11. The immediate street scene displays a variety of similar single storey front projections. Rather than being more modest in size in comparison to the appeal development, I observed during my site visit that the sizes and designs of the projections vary considerably. The appeal development therefore assimilates well with the overall character of the street scene.
12. Based on the above, the development has an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It therefore complies with Policy BE1 of the LPP1 and Policy DMHD 1 of the LPP2. It also complies with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the LPP2 which collectively require proposals to be well integrated with the surrounding area and harmonise with the local context, including by taking into account the surrounding scale of development.
13. Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) sets out an overarching approach to delivering good design. I find no conflict with Policy D4 of the LP arising from the appeal development.

Conditions

14. Given that the development has already taken place, it is not necessary for me to impose any conditions.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR