



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2026 by F Bradford BA (Hons) MRTPI

Decision by N Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001249

113 Nield Road, Hayes, Hillingdon UB3 1SH

- 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 Mr Arvind & Mrs Dina Vaghela against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 60552/APP/2025/2102.
 - The development proposed is a proposed First Floor side extension over existing garage space.
-

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 issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupants with regard to outdoor amenity space.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. Nield Road is characterised predominantly by semi-detached dwellings which, while not identical, display a strong overall sense of architectural cohesion. The dwellings within the same typological group as the appeal are broadly similar in their proportions, form and stylistic references, drawing on an Arts and Crafts influenced Metroland style. Common features such as bay windows, front gables, tile-hanging, and enclosed porches with brick arches contribute to a clear and legible architectural rhythm. Although individual properties exhibit variation through more recent alterations, the established pattern of development has not been disrupted. The consistency in building form and massing contributes to a positive character. There is a notable lack of two storey side extensions within the group, and this leaves ample space between homes at first floor level.

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey, semi-detached dwelling and it is similar in form and style to that of its neighbours. The proposed development would introduce a two storey side extension. Whilst the roof would be set down from the existing ridge, the extension would be flush with the front elevation of the host dwelling. It would span the full width of the plot and reach the shared boundary with 115 Nield Road.
6. Whilst the roof ridge would be subordinate to the main dwelling; it would feature a crown roof, and this would not reflect the form and design of the existing dwelling. This, in conjunction with the proximity of the extension to the boundary for full two storey height would result in a cramped appearance and reduce the gap at first floor level that is a feature of the locality.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. I therefore find conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One (HLP Part One), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020) (HLP Part Two), and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021). These policies, among other things, aim to ensure that development is of high quality design, harmonises with the local context and that extensions achieve a satisfactory relationship with the host dwelling. I also find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) which promotes well designed places through developments being sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed development would result in marginal loss of an area of outdoor hardstanding. This area is located between the rear elevation of the existing ground floor garage, side elevation of the host dwelling and the shared boundary.
9. Given the siting of this area and the extent of the remaining outdoor amenity space provided within the garden, it is unlikely that this area provides a usable or preferred area of outdoor space for the occupants. As such, whilst the proposed development would result in a very small reduction in the total garden space, I am satisfied that the occupants of the appeal dwelling would retain an ample amount of garden space for their outdoor enjoyment.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupants of the dwelling due to inadequate provision of outdoor space. I therefore find no conflict with Policy DMHD 1 of the HLP Part Two which aims to ensure adequate garden space is retained following the extension of dwellings. I also find no conflict with the Framework where it seeks high standards of amenity for future occupiers.
11. Within their decision, the Council have referred to Policy DMHB 18 (Private Outdoor Amenity Space). Having reviewed this policy, it appears to relate to new residential development as opposed to the alteration and extension of existing dwelling. Whilst the Policy wording does contain minimum garden sizes for new dwelling which could be used indicatively, the proposed development is already covered by the provisions of Policy DMHD 1 for this matter.

Other Matters

12. The Framework encourages the effective use of land and this primarily relates to the provision of new homes. Whilst I acknowledge the personal circumstances of the appellant and their wish to provide enlarged living accommodation, the development and its harm would be permanent. Therefore, such personal circumstances can be attributed only limited weight.
13. The use of the appellant's proposed conditions would not overcome the harm to character, and appearance as identified above.

Similar development

14. I have had regard to the examples of similar forms of development put forward by the appellant. Although I recognise similarities between Number 72 Nield Road (No 72) and the appeal site, I do not have any evidence on when this extension was permitted nor the Policy context in which it was. Indeed, the extension to No 72 highlights the harm that can be caused to the street scene through the construction of a two storey height extension on the side boundary and this is therefore not a strong reason for permitting further development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
15. Number 125 (No 125) Nield Road appears to have undergone a two storey side extension. Whilst I recognise similarity to the appeal scheme being a two storey side extension, I again do not have any evidence on when this extension was permitted nor the Policy context in which it was.
16. The appellant has referenced Number 52 Nield Road as having a similar two storey side extension to that proposed. However, when I viewed this property, there were no extensions to the property similar to the appeal scheme that were visible from the street.

Fallback

17. The appellant has brought to my attention that they would be able to carry out various roof, side, and rear single storey extensions under permitted development and these alterations would have an equal if not worse visual effect than the proposal. I acknowledge this position; however, I have no scheme before me to consider. As such, I attribute this position insignificant weight within this recommendation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to accord with the development plan and that the harm caused by the proposed development would not be outweighed by the appellant's fallback position, personal circumstances or by the presence of similar development. Accordingly, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

N Bowden

INSPECTOR