



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3362918

1 York Villas, Ashfield Avenue, Feltham, Hounslow TW13 5BB

- 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 Martin and Lang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/3224.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing derelict store building and construction of new two storey dwelling house.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 1, 1A and 2 York Villas, with specific regard to light, outlook, privacy, and noise and disturbance and for the occupants of 1 and 1A York villas, outdoor space; and
- Whether the proposal would be acceptable for the living conditions of the future occupants of the proposal, with specific regard to the standard of accommodation and noise and disturbance.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. Ashfield Avenue comprises primarily detached and semi-detached dwellings of mixed ages and designs. Despite the varied appearance of the dwellings on Ashfield Avenue, there is a consistency in their materials, general height, and set back from the road behind a small front garden. Most houses have a driveway which offer glimpse views into a large rear garden. Nearest to the appeal site, a police station stands at the end of Ashfield Avenue, which has a simple form and

boxy appearance. The rear of the police station bounds the appeal site, with a single storey building, garages and vehicle parking.

5. Nos 1 and 2 York Villas are semi-detached and appear to be amongst the oldest dwellings on Ashfield Avenue. No 1A is accessed to the rear of the property, down a gravel driveway. The gravel driveway is shared between No 1, No 1A, and the appeal site, which is to the rear of York Villas. The rear garden of 2 York Villas is separated by a fence. The area to the rear of No 1 and 1A is open and is highly visible from the road given the width of the driveway. The rear area forms an L shape around the garden of No 2 and has an existing outbuilding on part of the site, which is not easily visible from the road given its position behind a fence.
6. The proposal would introduce a two storey building behind York Villas, eroding the glimpse views into the rear. The resulting building form would be highly visible behind York Villas given the openness of the driveway. Development to the rear of properties is not common on Ashfield Avenue, therefore the introduction of built form behind existing dwellings would be a departure from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
7. Bricks, render and tiled roofs are the predominant materials used throughout Ashfield Avenue, with smaller details in other materials. The proposal would introduce a large expanse of composite boards to upper part of the dwelling, including the roof. This element would be particularly noticeable when viewing the site owing to its elevated position on the façade. The appellant has contended that the materials could be altered, however has not provided an alternative. I do not have a condition before me to secure different materials, and in any case, I have considered the proposal on the evidence before me. As such, the materials identified on the proposed elevations would be an incongruous addition within the street scene.
8. The gabled element of the front elevation would be the most visible from Ashfield Avenue and would be largely symmetrical. As discussed, there is variety in the appearance buildings on Ashfield Avenue, therefore the placement of the windows on the front elevation would not stand out as being an incongruous feature within the street scene
9. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, introducing building to the rear of residential dwellings which would be against the prevailing pattern of development. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (Local Plan) which seeks to ensure that all new developments respond to the character of the area.

Living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers

10. While the written evidence before me suggests that the appeal site is not used as a rear garden by the occupants of Nos 1 and 1A, during my site visit it was evident that it provides a contribution to the outdoor area associated with the existing dwellings. There is no existing boundary separating the appeal site and outdoor area in association with No 1 or 1A. There was some outdoor furniture and toys within the appeal site, as well as an area used for growing plants, and bin storage. As such, even if the appeal site is not formally a rear garden, it forms part of the area used by the neighbouring occupants.

11. The proposed dwelling and associated garden would occupy a large amount of the rear area of Nos 1 and 1A and would result in only a small outside area remaining for the occupants of the existing dwellings. This small outside area would be insufficient for the neighbouring dwellings and would leave limited space for the occupants to grow plants, play with toys and sit outside, which would be expected of a rear outdoor area.
12. The outlook for the occupants of York Villas is relatively open to the rear, owing to the neighbouring police station stepping down to only a single storey near to the appeal site, and the distance of dwellings beyond the rear boundary. The proposal would introduce a two-storey built form near to the rear of the existing dwellings, which would appear to be a similar height to York Villas. The scale of the proposal, together with proximity to York Villas would erode the existing outlook for the existing occupants and would have a harmful impact on the outlook for the occupants.
13. The proximity of the proposal to York Villas would also give rise to privacy concerns. I acknowledge that the proposal would have obscure glazing on the largest windows on the front elevation which would mitigate overlooking between the proposal and the windows of Nos 1 and 1A. However, the large window serving bedroom 1 of the proposed dwelling would be located near to 2 York Villas. Despite the viewing angle, given the relative height, there would be a perceived sense of overlooking of the occupants of 2 York Villas, both from the rooms in the rear of the dwelling and the associated rear garden and windows.
14. The introduction of a dwelling to the rear of York Villas would introduce noise and disturbance within close proximity of the existing dwellings. I have not been provided with details of any boundary treatments between the existing and proposed properties which would act as screening for both noise and general activity that could result in disturbance. Although the driveway is shared at present, the introduction of a family dwelling would result in use of the driveway being intensified. Given that the driveway runs very near to 1 and 1A York Villas, the noise and disturbance would be particularly harmful to the occupants of these dwellings, particularly as it is likely to be used for the parking of vehicles in the absence of any other controls.
15. Although the proposal would be near the existing dwellings, given the orientation of York Villas, the amount of light entering into York Villas is likely to be maintained, particularly given the relative height of the proposal compared to the police station buildings.
16. The appellant notes that no objections were received in respect of the planning application. Despite this, my findings above lead me to conclude that the proposal would have a negative impact on the living conditions of the occupants of 1, 1A and 2 York Villas with regard to light, outlook, privacy, noise and disturbance, and outdoor space. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies CC2 and SC5 of the Local Plan, which collectively seek to provide adequate outlook, minimise any overbearing impacts and provide adequate levels of privacy, amongst other aims.

Living conditions of future occupiers

17. The proposed dwelling would be adjacent to an active police station, with the car park and garages nearest the appeal site. The police station is likely to generate a significant amount of noise and disturbance as part of its daily operational activity.
18. The proposal includes a large window at first floor level, which would be the main window for bedroom 2. Although most of the window would be below the top of the garage block, the occupants of this bedroom would be particularly susceptible to the noise and disturbance generated through normal day to day operational activity from the police station. This would have a negative impact on the living conditions of the future occupants of the dwelling and has the potential to negatively impact the operational activity of the police station in the future. Another dwelling, 32A Hanworth Road, is also near to the police station car park, however it does not appear to have any windows which face the police station and would therefore not be as impacted by noise and disturbance as the future occupants of the proposal.
19. As discussed, the main window for bedroom 2 would face the police station, however it would be largely below the top of the garage block. The bedroom would also be served by two high-level windows on the rear elevation; however, these would not provide an outlook when standing within the bedroom. Given the proximity of the rear of the garage block, the outlook of those in bedroom 2 would be severely restricted, and the light entering the bedroom would also be severely limited.
20. The proposed kitchen would be beneath bedroom 2, and the impact of the proximity of the garage block would be increased at ground floor level. The ground floor would be largely open plan; therefore, some light would reach the kitchen from the living room. However, the height of the garage block combined with the distance between the kitchen window and the wall would limit the light reaching the kitchen window and would be an oppressive outlook for the future occupants of the dwelling.
21. The garden space would be split between an area to the front of the proposal and an area accessed from the living room. The grassed area to the front of the proposal would be an open area, which would be overlooked by the occupants of 1, 1A and 2 York Villas. Despite this, the area accessed from the living room would form a courtyard style area which would offer an element of privacy. As such, the proposal would provide an acceptable amount of outdoor area.
22. The proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the future occupants, with specific regard to the standard of accommodation and noise and disturbance from the neighbouring police station. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies SC5 and D13 of the Local Plan, which together seek to ensure that established uses can continue to operate and ensure that new development provides high quality accommodation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

23. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR