



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2026

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003983

58 A Station Road, Hayes, Hillingdon UB3 4DF

- 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 Raj Pandher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 69395/APP/2025/797.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “development of a flat at first and second floors above ground floor commercial activity”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has submitted an amended floorplan as part of the appeal process, amending the set back from the rear boundary of the site. While the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, the revised floorplan is consistent with the submitted elevations and addresses the discrepancy between the floorplan and elevations identified by the Council. In this context, and given that the Council and interested parties have had the opportunity to comment on the revised floorplan, I do not consider that any party would be prejudiced by my acceptance of the revised plan. I have, therefore, had regard to it in determining the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area;
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of 56A, 58A, 60A and 60B Station Road, with particular regard to outlook; and
 - whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with regard to outdoor space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property comprises a commercial unit extending across the majority of the depth of the site at ground floor level with residential use above on the Station Road site frontage. The property forms part of a terrace with neighbouring properties also comprising commercial uses at ground floor level and residential above. While the Station Road frontage of the terrace is broadly uniform, to the rear there is more variation, including as a result of extensions and plant associated with the commercial units. Notwithstanding this, there is an evident consistent form to the terrace with built form only extending above a single storey in height at the Station Road frontage.
5. The property is located within an area which has a varied character resulting from a range of uses and buildings of varying scales and architectural styles. During my site visit I observed examples of the built form of the area having evolved over time, including through extensions to existing buildings as well as new buildings.
6. The appeal proposal would introduce 2 storeys of additional built form above the existing single-storey element of the property at the rear of the site. The materials would reflect those used in the existing building and surrounding area and access would, consistent with neighbouring dwellings, be via an external staircase. Nevertheless, even though the proposal would not alter the established uniformity of the Station Road frontage, it would depart from the consistent form of the terrace, appearing incongruous as a result of its height considerably greater than that of the rear elements of adjoining properties.
7. There would be limited visibility of the proposal from public vantage points, including along the Grand Union Canal Walk, as a result of the existing built form in the surrounding area and vegetation. Nonetheless, it would be visible from private vantage points and in some views from Station Road. In these views, the proposal would appear incongruous by reason of its siting at odds with the prevailing pattern of development.
8. For these reasons, although the appeal property is not located within a Conservation Area and is not listed, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would, therefore, be contrary to the relevant provisions of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (adopted 2012) (the LPP1), Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (adopted 2020) (the LPP2) and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 (the LP). Among other things, these policies seek development which improves and maintains the quality of the built environment, harmonises with and enhances local context and is well integrated with the surrounding area.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

9. 56A, 58A, 60A and 60B Station Road benefit from a reasonably open outlook to the rear, notwithstanding the built development at ground floor level and associated plant. Established vegetation extending above the built form adds a verdant quality to this outlook. The proposal would, through the introduction of additional built form, impinge significantly upon this outlook, eroding its openness

and obscuring the established vegetation from some views from Nos 58A, 60A and 60B.

10. Moreover, the proposed building would, by reason of its scale and proximity to Nos 56A, 58A, 60A and 60B, appear unduly dominant in views from the rear of these dwellings, thereby appearing overbearing. Consequently, even though the dwellings are dual aspect, their outlook would be significantly diminished as a result of the proposal, to the detriment of the living conditions of occupiers. This is irrespective of the precise separation distance between the appeal proposal and Nos 56A, 58A, 60A and 60B, its height considerably less than that of the existing building and the alignment of windows consistent with those on the existing building.
11. The proposal would also be located close to, and visible from, dwellings on Walters Close. However, development would be sited such that it would be experienced in the context of the existing built form on Station Road and not form an overly dominant part of views from these dwellings. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of dwellings on Walters Close.
12. A single window is proposed on the elevation of the dwelling facing No 58A. This window would serve a hallway. As such, the proposal would not result in overlooking of No 58A from any habitable room. In any event, the use of obscure glazing, which could be secured by condition, would ensure that the privacy of occupiers of No 58A is not eroded by the proposal.
13. There is no dispute between the parties that, on the basis of the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Impact Assessment, satisfactory daylight and sunlight provision would be retained for neighbouring properties.
14. Nevertheless, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of 56A, 58A, 60A and 60B Station Road, with particular regard to outlook. In this regard, it conflicts with the relevant provisions of Policy DMHB 11 of the LPP2 and Policy D3 of the LP. In summary, these policies seek development which delivers appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity and does not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties.

Living conditions of future occupiers

15. Policy DMHB 18 of the LPP2 requires that all new residential development provides good quality and usable outdoor amenity space in accordance with the standards set out in Table 5.3. For 1-bedroom flats a minimum requirement of 20sqm is identified in Table 5.3. No outdoor space is proposed as part of the development.
16. The appellant highlights that the appeal site benefits for access to nearby public green spaces including Lake Farm Country Park and Barra Hall Park. Nonetheless, the availability of public outdoor space does not entirely compensate for a lack of private outdoor space as public and private spaces are, in my experience, suitable for different uses. In this context, I am not satisfied that the lack of private outdoor space is justified, irrespective of who may occupy the proposed 1-bedroom dwelling.

17. For these reasons, even though the dwelling would provide internal space in excess of the minimum standard set out in Policy D6 of the LP, I conclude that the proposed development would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with regard to outdoor space. As such, it is contrary to the relevant provisions of Policy DMHB 18 of the LPP2.

Other Matters

18. The appeal site is located close, and forms part of the setting of, the Grade II listed Church of St Anselm. Mindful of the statutory duty set out in section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving its setting. The setting of the listed building predominantly comprises built development of varying architectural styles and ages, including the appeal property. This setting contributes positively to the significance of the listed building. Although the proposal would introduce additional built development into the setting of the listed building, it would be visually separate from the listed building and seen in the context of the adjacent built form. Accordingly, I consider that the proposed development would preserve the setting of the listed building and the contribution this makes to its significance.
19. The appeal site is also located close to a locally listed building, the Old Crown Public House. The building fronts onto Station Road and its setting largely comprises built development. This setting contributes positively to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). By reason of the siting of the proposal to the rear of the existing built form fronting Station Road, I consider that it would preserve the setting of the NDHA and the contribution this makes to its significance.
20. My attention is drawn to comparative improvements made as part of the appeal proposal relative to a previous planning application made at the property. However, I must make my decision on the basis of what is before me not the respective merits of any alternative scheme.
21. I acknowledge the local support for the proposal and afford this moderate weight in favour of the proposal. The absence of technical objections is a neutral factor in my determination of the case.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

22. The appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. It would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. As such, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole.
23. However, the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, with the Council confirming that supply currently stands at 2.5 years. In these circumstances, paragraph 11d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is engaged.
24. There would be a variety of benefits to the scheme, including the provision of a new dwelling on previously developed land in a town centre location which would exceed internal space standards and contribute to the stock of smaller homes. There would also be economic benefits during construction and following occupation. Nevertheless, given the limited scale of the proposed development,

the contribution to housing supply and other benefits would be relatively limited in extent. I afford them moderate weight in the balance.

25. Balanced against this, the Framework makes clear at paragraph 135 that development should add to the overall quality of the area and create places which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. For the reasons set out in relation to the main issues, I find that the proposal would fall wholly short of these expectations of the Framework.
26. Consequently, in this case, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh these benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.
27. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR