

Appeal Statement of Case

**58A Station Road, Hayes, UB3
4DF**

Prepared For
Telford Development Ltd

6366
January 2026



bell cornwell
CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS

Bell Cornwell LLP, St Marys Court,
The Broadway, Amersham, Buckinghamshire, HP7 0UT

01494 326277 | info@bell-cornwell.co.uk | www.bell-cornwell.co.uk



CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	THE APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS	4
3	REASON FOR REFUSAL 1	5
4	REASON FOR REFUSAL 2	8
5	REASON FOR REFUSAL 3	10
6	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	11

APPENDIX A: DECISION NOTICE - 69395/APP/2025/797

APPENDIX B: OFFICER REPORT - 69395/APP/2025/797

APPENDIX C: DECISION NOTICE & DRAWINGS – 6935/APP/2023/3436

APPENDIX D: GOOGLE EARTH PHOTOS OF APPEAL SITE



1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Statement of Case ('SoC') has been prepared by Bell Cornwell LLP on behalf of the Applicant, Telford Developments Ltd (hereafter referred to as ('the Appellant') in response to the decision by the London Borough of Hillingdon ('the Council') to refuse planning permission 69395/APP/2025/797 ('the Application').

1.2 This Appeal is submitted pursuant to Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). A copy of the Decision Notice dated 31 October 2025 is provided at Appendix A ('the Decision') and the Officer's Report at Appendix B ('the Officer's Report').

1.3 The Appeal relates to the Proposed Development at 58A Station Road ('the Appeal Site'). The description of development is set out below:

Erection of 2 additional storeys to create a flat at first and second floors above ground floor commercial unit.

1.4 The Application was refused under delegated authority on 20 March 2025 with 3 reasons for refusal. The main issues for consideration through this appeal are:

- Harm to character and appearance of the area (due its location, design, mass and scale);
- Harm to neighbouring amenity (through loss of outlook and overbearance);
- Quality of accommodation for future occupiers (through lack of any private outdoor amenity space).

1.5 This application represents the re-submission of a similar development which was refused by the Council on 4 grounds in 2024 (planning ref. 69395/APP/2023/3436). A copy of the Decision and associated drawings is provided at Appendix C. In response to the decision, the Appellant made the following amendments to the design through this Appeal Scheme:

- Roof design altered from pitched roof to flat roof;



- 1.5m set back introduced from western edge of building;
- Daylight and Sunlight Assessment prepared.

1.6 This Statement should be read in conjunction with the Planning Appeal Form and the various documents and plans submitted to the Council in support of the original planning application, copies of which have been submitted with this appeal.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

1.7 The Appeal Scheme proposes the delivery of a high-quality dwelling within a sustainable town centre location which will contribute towards the Council's housing need.

1.8 To facilitate the delivery of the unit, the Appellant proposes the extension of the existing property through the addition of 2 storeys to the rear, creating a high-quality duplex 1-bedroom property comprising 70sqm gross internal area (GIA).

1.9 Consistent with the neighbouring residential units within the terrace, the proposed unit will be accessed via an external staircase to the rear.

1.10 The proposed materials for the construction of the terrace will reflect the surrounding character, matching the design of the existing building.

Supplementary Drawing

1.11 The Council have noted a discrepancy on the submitted drawings in relation to the 1.5m set back shown on the proposed floorplans. Accordingly, in the interests of clarity the Appellant submits an updated proposed floorplan correcting the drawing to show the 1.5m set back at both first and second floor level (drawing ref. 224/PP/003d).

1.12 Having regard to the judgement in *Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney* (2018), which refined the "Wheatcroft principles" set out in *Bernard Wheatcroft v Secretary of State for the Environment* (1982), the two tests to be considered are the substantive test and the procedural test. In this context, the amended drawing proposes a drawing correction to directly address a discrepancy



raised by the Council. The substantive test is passed. Any third parties that commented on the application will be consulted as part of this appeal. As such, the procedural test is past.



2 THE APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The Appeal site comprises the central building of a terrace of three properties. At ground floor, each terrace benefits from a commercial unit with residential properties on the floors above. Access to the commercial units is via Station Road.
- 2.2 Access to the residential properties is via an external staircase to the rear, with the front doors of each property located on the rear elevation of the terrace at first floor.
- 2.3 General paraphernalia associated with the residential properties is noticeable on the terraces, alongside plant and duct work associated with the ground floor commercial properties.
- 2.4 Further to the grant of planning permission in 2023 (ref. 69395/APP/2022/3825), a rear dormer and two roof lights have been constructed.
- 2.5 Over the course of several years, the rear of the terrace has been extended considerably (please refer to Appendix C), including substantial extensions at ground floor.
- 2.6 The surrounding area, reflective of the town centre location, is mixed in character. There are several examples of extensions within the area to the rear of properties.
- 2.7 The rear of this part of Station Road is characterised mainly by residential properties with the scale, character and design of the built form having evolved over proceeding years to form a combination of rear extensions to existing buildings and purpose-built residential dwellings.

Planning History

- 2.8 A comprehensive review of the London Borough of Hillingdon's online planning database has been undertaken. A full list of the planning history is attached as Appendix C.



3 REASON FOR REFUSAL 1

- 3.1 Reason 1 relates to the Appeal Scheme's impact on the local character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 3.2 The Appeal Site is located outside of a Conservation Area and does not contain any listed buildings. The Site is located within the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Church, the Church of St Anselm. The Council conclude within section 7.2 of their Officer Report that there would be no harm to the significance of setting of this heritage asset.

Visibility from Public Vantage Points

- 3.3 Views of the Appeal Site and proposed extension from public vantage points are mostly (and in some cases entirely) obscured by intervening built form and vegetation.
- 3.4 Owing to the level differences, extensive vegetation and boundary wall, the extension would not be visible from the Grand Union Canal Walk. Similarly, the extension would not be immediately visible from Station Road or St Anselms Road.
- 3.5 To the northeast of the site, at the junction between Station Road and St Anselms Road, there may be a glimpse of the extension visible. However, this visibility would be limited (seen between the gap between St Anselm's Church and 56 Station Road).
- 3.6 When experienced in the context of the wider roof context in that location, there is not considered to be any impact to the existing character in this regard.
- 3.7 The proposed extension is not considered to be a visually incongruous addition when viewed from the street scene or public vantage points.

Impact to Character of Front Elevation

- 3.8 The Appeal comprises the central property of a terrace of 3 buildings. When viewed from the street scene on Station Road, there is an element of uniformity to these



properties, all benefiting from ground floor commercial frontages with residential accommodation provided within the storeys above.

- 3.9 In terms of materials, the ground floor frontages are similarly uniform in appearance, with a brick facia and gable end roof defining the floors above. This established uniformity when seen from public vantage points will not be altered as a result of the Appeal Scheme.

Impact to Character of Rear Elevation

- 3.10 The rear character of the Station Road terrace has developed over several years, as demonstrated by the planning history within Section 2 of this Appeal Statement.
- 3.11 The rear of the Appeal terrace, as is evident from the photos taken by the Appellant submitted alongside the planning application, is less ordered, characterised by the residential properties located at the upper floors, their access to the front of their properties via the existing external staircases, external amenity and the plant and duct work that serves the ground floor commercial properties.
- 3.12 The Appellant disagrees that “the development would appear as disproportionate and out of place within its surrounding area and runs contrary to the characteristic urban grain of the area.”
- 3.13 In terms of the urban grain and character of the wider areas, it is considered that there is significant variation. To the south of the site lies a 2-storey building of flat roof construction. To the west of the site lies a residential 3 storey building with a hipped roof and car park served from Walters Close. To the north lies St Anselm’s Church which is Grade II listed. The wider area varies between semi-detached and terraced properties and commercial development.
- 3.14 When considering the urban environment and the existing situation, the presence of the proposed extension is not considered to cause any visual harm.



- 3.15 Overall, the proposed extension will contribute to the established variation of built form and is not considered to introduce any new elements that are so incongruous as to warrant refusal in design terms.
- 3.16 Accordingly, the Proposed Development is considered to comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies, Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the London Plan.



4 REASON FOR REFUSAL 2

- 4.1 Reason 2 concerns the Council's view that the Appeal Scheme would cause an unacceptable loss of outlook and be excessively overbearing to the occupiers of numbers 56A, 58A, 60A and 60B Station Road.
- 4.2 The occupiers of 56A, 58A, 60A and 60B Station Road comprise 4 flats that occupy the second and third floors of the terrace. All properties benefit from double aspect properties with an east / west orientation, with each property benefiting from a view over the high street along Station Road. As such, none of the properties rely on the view looking to the rear.
- 4.3 There would be a separation distance of approximately 7m from the edge of the Appeal Scheme to the edge of the elevations of the existing properties on Station Road.
- 4.4 Furthermore, the proposed height of the extension would align with the height and window alignment of 56A, 58A, 60A and 60B, with the highest point of the roof significantly lower than the roof ridge of the main terrace.
- 4.5 As such, when experienced from these properties, there would be no sense of overbearance or "being looked down onto".
- 4.6 No windows are proposed within the rear elevation looking onto the Station Road dwellings at first floor level (see drawing 224/PP/005a). As such there would be no direct overlooking in this regard.
- 4.7 A single window is proposed at first floor level on the rear elevation. However, this serves a hallway. As such, there would be no direct overlooking from a habitable room.
- 4.8 In light of the surrounding urban environment and considering the findings of the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report which confirms that there would be no noticeable reduction to the current levels experienced, it is not considered that the Appeal Scheme would cause any undue harm to the amenity of these properties in relation to outlook or overbearance.



- 4.9 Should the Inspector disagree with the Appellant, a planning condition that obscures the windows could be proposed, noting that all habitable rooms benefit from at last two aspects as a result of the proposed window arrangement.
- 4.10 The Proposed Development will protect the amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies DMHB 11, of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), and paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF (2023)



5 REASON FOR REFUSAL 3

- 5.1 Reason 3 relates to the lack of amenity space provided for the new dwelling.
- 5.2 The Appeal Site is located within a PTAL location of 5 (with 6b defined as most accessible and 1a being the least), along a Secondary Shopping Area within Hayes Town Centre.
- 5.3 The site therefore benefits from an excellent level of public access connectivity and is well served by a wide range of social infrastructure including (specifically in reference to public green space) Lake Farm Country Park and Barra Hall Park.
- 5.4 Given the urban town centre location in this instance and the access to nearby parks, the lack of private amenity space is not considered to unduly harm the living conditions of occupiers within the proposed dwelling which is well served by accessible public green spaces in the vicinity.
- 5.5 The proposed dwelling comprises a 1 bedroom, 2-person property of 70sqm. The minimum spaces standards as contained within London Plan Policy D6 prescribes a minimum space standard of 58sqm for a 1 bedroom, 2-person property split across two floors. Accordingly, the proposed dwelling significantly exceeds this minimum standard by 12sqm and will deliver a very high quality of internal accommodation.
- 5.6 Moreover, considering the size of the proposed property, it is therefore likely to be occupied by a single person or couple as opposed to a larger family who are often most in need for private amenity space.
- 5.7 Overall, given the Site location, the access to nearby public green spaces, and the significant size of the proposed dwelling, the Appeal Scheme is considered to deliver a high quality of living accommodation, in accordance with Policy DMHB 18 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and paragraph 135 (f) of the NPPF (2024, revised 2025).



6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The Appeal Scheme proposes the delivery of a high-quality dwelling within a sustainable town centre location.
- 6.2 The Appeal Site is not located within a conservation area, does not contain any listed buildings and the rear of the site is well screened from public vantage points.
- 6.3 The surrounding architectural character is varied, reflecting the mix of uses within the town centre. Whilst the extension introduces additional mass at this location, this is not considered to present any harm, proposing additional massing that is appropriate within this urban location.
- 6.4 As demonstrated by the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report, there will be no harm to neighbouring amenity in relation to daylight and sunlight.
- 6.5 There will be no direct overlooking to neighbours and by virtue of the scale, bulk and siting of the proposed dwelling, combined with the dual aspect of the neighbouring properties, the extension will not appear as visually overbearing.
- 6.6 Overall, the Appeal Scheme is considered to fully comply with the Development Plan. Accordingly, it is requested that the appeal be allowed and planning permission granted.