



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3362358

15 Orchard Avenue, Feltham, Hounslow TW14 9RD

- 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 Ms Dharamjit Sarkaria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2023/1691.
 - The development proposed is described as the use of the existing garage as a gym, and a dropped kerb to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the use of the existing garage as a gym, and a dropped kerb to the front of the property, at 15 Orchard Avenue, Feltham, Hounslow TW14 9RD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2023/1691, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan number PP-12191985v1, the existing and proposed floor plans, and the layout of proposed dropped kerb plan at 1:200 scale.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the safety and convenience of highway users.

Reasons

3. The host comprises one half of a semi-detached pair, which has a shared driveway between it and the neighbouring semi-detached house at No 13, leading to their set back garages. The Council raises no objection to the use of the host's garage as a gym. Given that it would utilise an existing building for purposes incidental to the main dwelling, I agree that it would be acceptable.
4. The scheme would involve the loss of an on-street parking bay where the proposed crossover would be. However, the crossover would enable access to the host's existing hard surfaced forecourt, thus providing conveniently located off-street

parking for the occupants. As depicted on the layout plan, there would also be appropriate 2.4 metre x 2.4 metre pedestrian visibility splays in both directions, along with a 1.2 metre wide path to the front door. The Council raises no objection to the proposed access and crossover. Given my findings above, and that Orchard Avenue is a quiet residential road, neither do I.

5. The layout drawing depicts that the existing dropped kerb between Nos 13 and 15 would be 'made redundant'. However, in her statement of case the appellant clarifies that whilst it would become redundant for her use, it would remain in place. On that basis, the occupants of No 13 would retain unfettered access to their garage.
6. Thus, as a result of the proposal, both the host and No 13 would still have access to off-road parking spaces and, although a single parking bay would be removed, there would not be a significant net impact on on-street parking demand. Moreover, I have no cogent evidence that this is an area which suffers from significant parking stress.
7. For these reasons, the scheme would not harmfully affect the safety or convenience of highway users, and it would not conflict with those parts of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 - 2030 Policy EC2 which require proposals to avoid adverse impacts on the transport network, and to ensure that sufficient car parking is provided.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework 2024. As well as the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
9. The Council has also suggested a condition requiring that external materials shall match those in the existing building. On the basis of the existing and proposed floor plans, the garage doors would be removed and replaced by a single door and a wall. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area, I agree that the suggested condition is necessary.
10. Summing up, irrespective of the appellant's personal circumstances, the proposal would not harmfully impact the safety and convenience of highway users, and the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR