



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MISEP, CEnv

Decision by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002684

15 Rusdene Road, Eastcote, Hillingdon HA5 1SW

- 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 Kamini Thayalanayagam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 63838/APP/2025/1660
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of rear canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi detached dwelling located on a residential road. The types of properties in the vicinity vary but are predominantly suburban houses, many of which have been extended, with long and relatively spacious rear gardens. The appeal property includes a single storey rear extension which is not an uncommon feature in the area.
5. The proposed development is for the erection of a canopy attached to the existing single storey rear extension. I am aware that this proposal follows a previously refused scheme for a larger canopy. The canopy would sit below the eaves level of the existing extension and in line with the top of the rear door frame and would be constructed of timber posts and a translucent perspex style flat roof. The National Planning Policy Framework requires development to be well designed.
6. The canopy would extend further into the garden than other rear extensions in the locality and when combined with the existing extension would significantly exceed the suggested depth of 3.6 metres for rear extensions on wider plots set out in Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LP).

7. The height, flat roof and openness on three sides would help to minimise the visual bulk of the structure. However, whilst no internal floor area would be added, the canopy would be a significant structure and the depth and width of the proposed addition would overly extend the rear of the property. The introduction of a flat roof structure adjoined to the existing pitched roof rear extension would be visually distinctive, but in an awkward way that would appear at odds with the established character of the dwellings in the surrounding area where extensions tend to have a simpler and coherent form. Although the proposal would be to the rear of the property and not visible in the public realm, it would be evident in private views from neighbouring rear gardens. In any event, development should respect its local context and character.
8. The materials have been chosen to be lightweight, providing weather protection whilst still allowing natural light onto the outdoor patio. However, the existing building features tile hanging, cream painted render and an existing extension in red brick. The proposed materials would not match the existing dwelling style and the use of perspex would be at odds with the high quality materials used in the dwelling and the rear extension. The proposed canopy would detract from the appearance of the rear of the dwelling and appear discordant.
9. The appellant contends that the canopy would be inherently reversible and would not permanently alter the host dwelling. Whilst this may be the case, it does not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that has been identified.
10. On this basis, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. This would be contrary to Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the LP which seek, amongst other things to ensure that development is designed to a high quality and well integrated with the surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. The proposed scheme is intended to provide safe and comfortable outdoor space for elderly family members and a sheltered area for children. Therefore, I have had regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. The duty includes having regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and advance equality of opportunity between those sharing relevant protected characteristics and those who do not. Whilst I am mindful of the needs of the family members, it has not been demonstrated that the scale and location of the proposal would be specific to their needs, or that they could not be met by a less harmful scheme. Thus, the PSED considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified, and following careful consideration of these matters, I am satisfied that the impact of dismissing this appeal is proportionate and justified.
12. There is reference to permitted development rights which allow houses to be extended by 6 metres in certain circumstances. However, there is no dispute that the proposal requires planning permission, and I have dealt with the scheme on that basis.
13. I note that the Council states the proposed development is acceptable with regard to a number of planning matters including living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. This lack of harm carries neutral weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR