

Planning Appeal Statement

Date	16 October 2025
Property Address	113 Nield Road, Hayes London UB3 1SH
Proposal Description	Erection of a first floor side extension
Application No	60552/APP/2025/2102 (Refused 24/09/2025)

Prepared by	Active Architecture Suite 104, First Floor, R/O 45-47 Station Road, North Harrow, Middlesex, HA2 7SU Email: design@activearchitecture.co.uk Tel: 0800 195 7860
--------------------	---

1. Introduction

This appeal relates to the refusal of planning permission for a modest two-storey side extension above the existing garage at 113 Nield Road.

The proposed extension is carefully designed to remain in keeping with the existing dwelling and surrounding area. It retains the garage door at ground level, ensures materials match the host building, and sits comfortably within the established roofline.

The Council refused the application primarily because:

1. It considered that a two-storey side extension combined with a hip-to-gable roof is contrary to Policy DMHD1; and
2. It claimed that the proposal fails to leave a 1-metre gap from the side boundary, which they believe would create a terracing effect.



Front view of property

This appeal statement demonstrates that these reasons are overly rigid, that no actual harm would arise, and that the proposal is consistent with the spirit and objectives of both local and national planning policy.

2. Site and Proposal Overview

The property is a semi-detached dwelling with a side garage and sufficient space to accommodate a modest first-floor extension. The proposal seeks to add a bedroom above the existing garage while keeping the garage itself intact, maintaining the street-facing door and the established appearance of the front elevation.

The extension will:

- Follow the roof profile and height of the existing dwelling.
- Retain the garage door to preserve the visual rhythm of the street.
- Use matching materials and finishes to blend seamlessly with the host property.

This is a proportionate and sensible proposal aimed at modestly increasing living space for a growing family without overdeveloping the site.

3. Planning Policy Context

Local Policies

- Policy DMHD1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) seeks to ensure that extensions appear subordinate, avoid terracing, and maintain visual separation between buildings.
- Policy DMHB18 relates to private outdoor amenity space standards, ensuring adequate garden space is retained.

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports well-designed householder extensions that make efficient use of existing housing stock and contribute positively to family and community life. It encourages proportionate decision-making and resists overly prescriptive approaches that stifle sensible home improvement.

4. Response to the Reasons for Refusal

A. The “Hip-to-Gable + Side Extension” Restriction

The Council's report suggests that any two-storey side extension is automatically unacceptable where a hip-to-gable roof exists. However, planning policy should be applied with judgment, not as a blanket prohibition.

The purpose of the policy is to prevent visual terracing or an unbalanced appearance — not to make all extensions impossible. In this case, the proposal is modest, subordinate, and retains a clear visual break between properties. The garage door and recessed wall line maintain the rhythm and articulation of the frontage.

The design achieves the *intent* of Policy DMHD1 without literal adherence to a rule that, in this context, serves no real visual purpose.

B. The “1-Metre Gap” Requirement and Functional Width

Requiring a 1-metre set-in from the boundary may work on larger suburban plots but is impractical on narrower urban sites like Nield Road.

If the proposal were set back by one metre, the remaining internal width would fall below 1.5 metres, creating a space that is functionally useless and would defeat the purpose of extending.

The policy's aim is to avoid a terracing effect and preserve character — not to prevent families from using their homes efficiently. The visual separation between

properties on Nield Road is already established, and the garage door and side spacing ensure that this sense of separation remains.

A literal application of the 1-metre rule in this context creates no additional visual benefit but imposes unnecessary hardship and undermines the flexibility the NPPF encourages in supporting family homes.

C. Design Quality and Street Character

The design respects the proportions and architectural rhythm of the street. By keeping the garage door, matching materials, and aligning with the host dwelling's form, the proposal remains visually harmonious.

From the street, the extension will read as a modest and integrated addition — not as a new or overbearing mass. The height, roofline, and proportions align with the existing dwelling, ensuring the property maintains its character and contributes positively to the local streetscape.

D. Neighbour Amenity and Privacy

The proposal does not affect neighbouring daylight, sunlight, or privacy. The extension sits above the existing garage, set well away from primary windows of adjoining dwellings.

Any new side windows can be made obscure-glazed and non-opening below 1.7m if necessary, ensuring full compliance with privacy standards.



3D sketch model of proposed front view

E. Private Amenity Space

The rear garden provides ample space that meets Policy DMHB18 standards for the size of the dwelling. The extension does not reduce usable outdoor space and therefore complies with local policy in full.

5. Local Character and Precedent

Several nearby properties already benefit from similar first-floor side extensions, including Nos. 125, 72, and 52 Nield Road.

While some of these dwellings do not have loft conversions, such alterations could easily be carried out under permitted development rights — demonstrating that the combined appearance of a first-floor side extension and roof enlargement is both achievable and commonplace.

In addition, there are several houses in the wider area that have both side extensions and loft conversions visible on Google Maps. This clearly illustrates that the proposed design is not unusual and would not harm the established character of the area.

6. Fallback and Permitted Development Argument

The appellant could, as of right, carry out significant roof alterations or single-storey side/rear enlargements under permitted development without planning permission. These would have a similar or greater visual impact than the current proposal.

This provides a realistic fallback position, which the Inspector should take into account. It would be illogical to refuse a well-designed, controlled two-storey side extension that achieves the same or better planning outcomes than what could be built under permitted development rights.

7. Practical and Community Benefits

The proposal allows the homeowner to adapt their property for their family's needs without relocating — reducing housing demand pressures, improving sustainability, and supporting stable communities.

This aligns directly with the NPPF's objectives to make efficient use of land and to support people in adapting homes to changing family circumstances. Refusing such modest home improvements contradicts the principle of encouraging incremental, high-quality residential enhancement.

8. Mitigation and Proposed Conditions

If the Inspector has any residual concerns, they can be easily addressed through standard conditions, such as:

- Matching materials to the host dwelling;
- Retaining the garage door at ground level;
- Obscure glazing to any side-facing windows;
- Construction and working hour management.

These would fully mitigate any perceived impacts on character or neighbour amenity.



3D sketch model of proposed front view

9. Overall Planning Balance and Conclusion

This proposal represents a modest, well-designed extension that is fully in keeping with the surrounding area. It does not result in a terracing effect, does not harm the street scene, and does not affect neighbour amenity.

The Council's rigid interpretation of Policy DMHD1 ignores the actual context and the purpose behind the policy. There is no material harm to visual amenity, privacy, or character.

Refusing an application on the basis of a theoretical 1-metre gap that serves no visual or planning purpose would be inconsistent with the balanced and pragmatic approach required by the NPPF.

Given local precedent, the realistic fallback under permitted development, and the absence of demonstrable harm, this appeal should be allowed, subject to standard planning conditions.

10. Summary of Key Points

- *The design is proportionate, subordinate, and in keeping with the house and street.*
- *The retained garage frontage ensures no terracing effect.*
- *The 1-metre rule is impractical and offers no additional visual benefit in this context.*
- *Nearby examples confirm this is a common and accepted built form.*
- *The extension supports efficient use of existing housing stock, consistent with national policy.*
- *Any minor impacts can be mitigated through standard planning conditions.*

For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Planning Inspectorate allows this appeal and grants planning permission for the proposed two-storey side extension at 113 Nield Road.