



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3365916

30 Hampton Road West, Feltham, Hounslow TW13 6AY

- 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 Mohammad Manzoor Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2023/3312.
 - The development proposed is described as a retrospective application for the current use as Showroom for Displaying, Buying and Selling Motor Vehicles on the Ground Floor with Office / Store on the First Floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Based on the evidence before me and observations at my site visit, the development has commenced and use of the premises as a showroom for displaying motor vehicles has begun. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - The supply of housing within the Borough;
 - Highway Safety; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

4. The appeal site 30 Hampton Road West comprises a two storey, semi-detached building which is located within a row of similar properties, containing a range of commercial uses including a convenience store, and a car showroom. On the other side of the appeal site is Enterprise Car Hire and a row of shops. Whilst the area is predominantly commercial, there are a number of residential properties close by.
5. The proposal seeks to change the use of the appeal premises from a laundrette to a showroom for the display and sale of motor vehicles.

Housing Supply

6. I understand from the evidence before me that the upper floor of the appeal premises was previously used as a flat. The plans submitted indicate that this is used as a store/office for the ground floor commercial use. Whilst the appellant disputes that there would be a reduction in residential accommodation, as the flat was previously occupied in association with previous use of the commercial premises. However, I have no substantive evidence to support this claim. Based on the evidence supplied by the Council this accommodation is currently registered for Council Tax purposes as a flat.
7. Therefore, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I therefore find that the use of this accommodation for commercial purposes result in the loss of a housing unit. This is in conflict with Policies SC1 and SC3 of the Hounslow Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (the HBLP) and Policies H1 and H10 of the London Plan 2021.

Highway Safety

8. The appeal site is located off the A312, Hampton Road West, which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network. It is a busy, dual carriageway and also a Red Route.
9. There is an access to Enterprise and a row of shops to one side of the appeal site, and a further dropped kerb to the front of 34-36 Hampton Road West. Whilst I note there are existing businesses close by, which include a car sales site and car hire site, these are existing and long-standing uses which have their own accesses already established. Although the appellant states that there are existing access points and dropped kerbs, these are not associated with the appeal site.
10. There is currently no dropped kerb which serves the appeal site, and the appeal scheme does not include any proposals for new or revised access arrangements. As such it is unclear whether the site can be accessed safely by both vehicles and pedestrians. Furthermore, no details have been provided regarding how vehicles will be manoeuvred around the site. Although I accept that the use is likely to be small-scale and would only generate traffic movements associated with the operation of the business. There would nevertheless be a material change from its former use.
11. I observed at my site visit parked cars in front of the appeal premises, with some encroachment onto the adjacent access road which serves Enterprise and the row of shops. This is likely to cause conflict with traffic turning off the busy A312 and into this access road. Additionally, immediately to the front of the appeal site is a footpath and there is also a nearby pedestrian crossing. Therefore, given the high levels of pedestrian traffic at this location, vehicles accessing and exiting the site, as well as the manoeuvring within the site would create conflict with vulnerable road users including pedestrians and cyclists.
12. For these reasons, I find that the development compromises pedestrian and vehicle safety within the site and immediate surrounding area and disrupts the free flow and safe movement of traffic along this designated Red Route. Thus, it is contrary to Policies CC2 and EC2 of the HBLP and Policies T2 and T4 of the London Plan. Together these policies seek to ensure development is designed to be safe, accessible, and supportive of walking and cycling, while also minimising

harm to the transport network and mitigating cumulative impacts on public health and road safety.

Living Conditions

13. Policy EQ5 of the HBLP states that the Council will seek to reduce the impact of noise from aviation, transport and noise-generating uses, and require the location and design of new development to have considered the impact of noise, and mitigation of these impacts, on new users and surrounding uses according to their sensitivity.
14. The application form indicates that the hours of opening are between 08:00 to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday, between 09:00 to 17:30 hours on Saturdays and that the premises does not operate on a Sunday. I understand from the evidence before me that the use commenced in 2023. In this regard the appellant states that no complaints have been made by local residents and that the use is compatible with existing uses already in the area.
15. However, whilst the use of the premises for car sales would be a different type of use, the area already contains a number of similar uses and has a busy commercial feel. Therefore, subject to the imposition of planning conditions to control the opening hours of the appeal premises, I am satisfied that the development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to noise and disturbance. Thus, there is no conflict with Policy EQ5 of the HLP and Policies D13 and D14 of the London Plan, which seek amongst other things, to ensure that development considers the impact of noise and mitigates any impacts.

Conclusion

16. Whilst I have found that the development does not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to noise and disturbance, the development causes harm to the supply of housing within the borough and highway safety. Therefore, the development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight which indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR