



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 7 May 2025 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEEMA, CEnv

**Decision by** M Clowes BA (hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date:** 19 September 2025

---

**Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/Z/25/3363684**

**92 - 94 Windmill Road, Brentford TW8 9NA**

- 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 Niraj Manglam (London Private Hospital) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref is P/2024/3140.
- The development proposed is described as 'the installation of a high level western side sign, eastern side car park sign, replacement southern front main entrance fascia sign and two southern front projecting signs to the building, erection of a totem sign within the site's south eastern corner raised planter and repainting of the building's southern front window/ door frames and main entrance shopfront frames with pearl gold (RAL 1036).

---

**Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/Z/25/3363719**

**92 - 94 Windmill Road, Brentford TW8 9NA**

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
- The appeal is made by Mr Niraj Manglam (London Private Hospital) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref is P/2024/3093
- The development proposed is described as 'the installation of a high level western side sign, eastern side car park sign, replacement southern front main entrance fascia sign and two southern front projecting signs to the building, erection of a totem sign within the site's south eastern corner raised planter.

---

## Decisions

### Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a high level western side sign, eastern side car park sign, replacement southern front main entrance fascia sign and two southern front projecting signs to the building, erection of a totem sign within the site's south eastern corner raised planter and repainting of the building's southern front window/ door frames and main entrance shopfront frames with pearl gold (RAL 1036) at 92-94 Windmill Road, Brentford TW8 9NA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/2024/3140, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

### Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and express advertisement consent is granted for the installation of a high level western side sign, eastern side car park sign, replacement southern front main entrance fascia sign and two southern front projecting signs to the building, erection of a totem sign within the site's south eastern corner raised planter at 92-94 Windmill Road, Brentford TW8 9NA in

accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/3093, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

### **Appeal Procedure**

3. 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.

### **Preliminary Matters**

4. As set out above, there are 2 appeals on this site. One seeks planning permission for advertisements and the painting of the window and door frames, and the other seeks express consent for a number of different types of advertisements. I have considered each appeal on its individual merits, but the cases are dealt with in a single decision letter to avoid unnecessary duplication. I have determined the appeals on the basis of the evidence presented.
5. For both appeals, in the banner headings above I have used the description of the proposed development/advertisements used by the Council on its decision notices and provided by the appellant in his appeal forms as it provides the detail needed to fully understand the proposals.
6. The appellant has confirmed that the Council's reference to plan 'PARK 8 (in) (Rev A)' is in error and this plan does not form part of the planning application.
7. As Appeal B relates to a refusal to grant express consent for advertisements, I have had regard to Section 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (the Regulations). This limits my considerations to those relating to amenity and public safety. In relation to the advertisement consent appeal only, regard does not need to be had to the development plan. I have taken the relevant policies into account as a material consideration. However, they have not by themselves been determinative in respect of Appeal B.

### **Main Issue**

8. The Council has not raised any objections to the proposed adverts on highway safety grounds. Based on the evidence before me and my site visit, I have no reason to reach a contrary view. Therefore, the main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposed advertisements on the amenity of the building and local area.

### **Reasons for the Recommendation**

9. The appeal site is located on Great West Road at the junction with Windmill Road, close to the M4 flyover. It comprises a smart, newly constructed, mixed-use building with a commercial use in the single storey wing and residential uses in the remainder of the multi-storey building. The area has an active and mixed character, arising from the well-trafficked road and variety of residential and commercial uses in the vicinity.
10. The proposal in both appeals is for the erection of a number of external advertisements on the host building and within its grounds. Appeal A also proposes the repainting of the appeal building's southern front window/door frames and main entrance shopfront frame in a pearl gold colour to match the proposed signage.

11. The details presented indicate that the proposed fascia sign above the main entrance would be a projecting box style sign. The Council considers this to be acceptable and I have no reason to disagree that this form of sign would not be appropriate in this location. All of the proposed signs would have a similar form and contain lettering identifying the name of the business operating from the site only. In this regard they would have a simple design.
12. The proposed western side elevation wall mounted sign, although fairly large, would not appear excessively sized or out of proportion when viewed in the context of this elevation or the building as a whole. The eastern side elevation sign is proposed to direct goods deliveries to the building and its scale would be mitigated by the size of the elevation as a whole which includes a projecting overhang above.
13. The two proposed projecting signs on the front elevation would be located above the large windows and the wide spacing between them would mean they would not dominate the building. The pavement is also reasonably wide in this location so the signs would not feel overbearing for pedestrians. I therefore do not agree they would disrupt the design of the building or harm the amenity of the area.
14. The proposed totem would be visually prominent in the wider street scene. However, the design and size of the proposed totem is considered appropriate given the large scale of the building and the mixed character of the area. Whilst there are a number of utility boxes on the pavement near the proposed location for the totem, the sign would be positioned behind a small retaining wall, which would separate it from the pavement and prevent it from feeling cluttered. I saw on my site visit the neighbouring car dealership has a number of large advertisements, including a totem sign such that this specific type of advertisement would not appear out of place in this context. The proposed totem would be consistent with the other proposed signage in colour, quality and use of materials and would be viewed against the backdrop of the much larger building.
15. I am advised that the proposed totem sign would be located in an area to be landscaped. I have not been provided with details of any approved landscaping scheme. Only a small area of planting would be lost by the placement of the totem sign and planting could still occur around it. It has not been demonstrated that any impact on amenity, ecology and appearance would be significant.
16. The building currently features black and dark grey framed windows and doors. Respraying the ground floor southern windows and doorframes in a gold colour would differentiate between the ground floor commercial use and the remainder of the building. Whilst the pearl gold colour would stand out from the paint scheme of the rest of the building, it would complement the proposed signage and be consistent across the ground floor. Even if the building could be considered to have a uniform design, it would not be particularly unusual for a ground floor premises to have a different colour treatment to upper floors in a multi-use building. The colour is not particularly bright or offensive and I do not believe it would harm the appearance of the rest of the building.
17. In respect of Appeal A, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the amenity of the building or wider area. It would therefore accord with the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030) (the 'Local Plan') Policies CC1, CC2 and CC5 which seek, amongst other things to ensure development including adverts, protects character and is of a high-quality design.

18. In respect of Appeal B, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the amenity of the building or wider area. In so far as it is relevant it would accord with Local Plan Policy CC5 which seeks to ensure that adverts respect their context with suitable regard to amenity.
19. The proposals would also accord with the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD; Part A2 Common Considerations (May 2024) which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that on shopfronts and public buildings signage should be proportionate and make a positive contribution to the townscape.

### **Other Matters**

20. An interested party has raised concerns that the underground car park is for the use of the residents of the building only and not for commercial purposes. The granting of planning permission and advertisement consent does not override land ownership matters, legal covenants or restrictions. The appellant would need to obtain any relevant consents to use the car park and install the proposed signage. Advertisement consents are subject to a standard condition preventing the display of any advertisement without the permission of the owner of the site on which they are displayed. Any enforcement matters relating to the construction or occupation of the host building are a matter for the Council and relevant landowner.

### **Conditions**

21. I have varied the wording of the Council's suggested conditions where necessary to ensure precision and compliance with the Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.
22. In Appeal A, along with the standard time limit, conditions are imposed to list the plans and specify the proposed paint colour in the interests of certainty.
23. In Appeal B, all advertisements granted express consent are subject to 5 standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations. As the western and fascia signs would be illuminated and sited amongst residential properties, conditions to limit the luminance levels and hours of operation are reasonable and necessary. The appellant has not disputed the need for these conditions. There is no suggestion that the proposed advertisements would contain moving displays and therefore a condition to require them to be static is unnecessary.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

24. For the reasons given above, I recommend that Appeals A and B should be allowed.

*Elizabeth Davies*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

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

*M Clowes* - INSPECTOR

\*\*\*\*\* SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS \*\*\*\*\*

**Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/Z/25/3363684**

- 1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Shop front signage location (Rev A).  
Exterior signage drawing number JM/LPH/001

- 3) The existing building's southern front window/door frames and main entrance shopfront frames shall be painted with pearl gold (RAL 1036) only.

**Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/Z/25/3363719**

In addition to the 5 standard conditions in the Regulations;

- 6) The illuminated fascia advertisements hereby approved shall comply with the following terms:
  - (a) Between the hours of sunset and 23:00, the intensity of the illumination of the advertisement shall not exceed 150 cd/m<sup>2</sup>;
  - (b) Between the hours of 23:00 and sunrise, the intensity of the illumination of the advertisement shall not exceed 150 cd/m<sup>2</sup>;
  - (c) The advertisement shall be fitted with a light intensity monitoring sensor to ensure the illuminance intensity is dimmable to take account of ambient light conditions and comply with the maximum recommended lighting intensity;
- 7) The advertisements hereby permitted by this consent shall only be illuminated during the opening hours of the premises to which it relates.