



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 10 September 2025

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by M Bale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3367637

1A Bristow Road, Hounslow TW3 1UP

- 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 Pamer Hothi, Hothi Capital Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/1288.
 - The development proposed is erection of a 4 bed detached house & 11 flats consisting of 6 two bed, 4 three bed, 1 four bed flats with associated amenity space & cycle parking following demolition of the existing building at 1A Bristow Road, Hounslow TW3 1UP.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 4 bed detached house & 11 flats consisting of 6 two bed, 4 three bed, 1 four bed flats with associated amenity space & cycle parking following demolition of the existing building at 1A Bristow Road, Hounslow TW3 1UP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/1288, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers of the site with particular regard to the adequacy of outdoor space, outlook, noise, and odour; and
 - the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring dwellings, with particular regard to outlook and light at Rapur Court, and light to the gardens of adjoining Bristow Road dwellings.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site is in an edge of town centre location surrounded by housing, commercial and industrial uses, and adjacent to a public car park. There are a mix of residential building typologies in the area, including terraced housing and flats.
4. From Hanworth Road, the site would be read alongside the neighbouring flats at Rapur Court, other flatted blocks and commercial development. In this context,

there is no obvious reason that the proposed roofscape, including stair overruns and roof access points would be particularly dominant or intrusive.

5. There are no flats adjoining the site on Bristow Road, but some are visible in the townscape alongside the terraces. The Council confirmed at the Hearing that the introduction of flats to the site would not in itself harm the character and appearance of the area. The design of the detached house would differ from the adjoining terraced dwellings but would reflect that of the proposed flats. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's position that its detailed design would be appropriate.
6. However, London Plan 2021 ("LP") Policy D3, supported by the National Design Code, seeks to ensure development responds fully to its context. The south elevation of Block B, while having some detailing, would be a largely plain elevation, with limited fenestration. Despite its slight setback from the detached dwelling at Block A, the upper floors of this inactive elevation would be seen in context with Bristow Road.
7. An alternative design, with a greater articulation in the 'T' shaped plan of the building could create a larger arrival space, with a building access to the flatted blocks facing towards Bristow Road. Nevertheless, I must assess the scheme before me.
8. The building would be set behind a parking area for the neighbouring industrial site, and so does not have a direct relationship to the street. This significantly reduces the need for an active street frontage to be provided. At close range, the well-articulated west elevation, with balconies and numerous windows, would be a visible and obvious front elevation, alongside a clear and legible pedestrian route through the site's open space to the building accesses.
9. It became clear during the Hearing that the Council is concerned to ensure that, if adjoining sites are also redeveloped, then coherent urban design should be provided across the various developments. In this regard, it was explained how the current parking area for the industrial site might provide an open area fronted by development, and flanked by the south elevation of Block B. That would make Block B a more prominent piece of townscape. The same might be said for the north side of Block C, which could become part of the townscape linked to any redevelopment of the public car park.
10. However, I understand that there are currently no development proposals for these sites. Nor did those present at the Hearing believe that they were, or were proposed to be, allocated for housing. There is, therefore, no obvious need to consider the proposal in the context of these sites, the redevelopment of which is purely hypothetical.
11. Thus, in design terms, I find that the development makes an appropriate response to the site context as it stands now. Its position relative to the site boundaries and existing uses, while leaving some small slivers of open space, would optimise site capacity while responding to the present context. The open space proposed around the development would provide an attractive, landscaped setting and a legible development.
12. I, therefore, find that it is of a sufficiently high quality to meet those aims of LP Policies D3, D4, and D6, and Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 ("HLP") Policies

CC1, CC2, and SC4 that require high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive a liveable places through a design-led approach to development that responds to and enhances local context.

Living conditions of future residents

13. Block A is a single, detached dwelling for which HLP Policy SC5 expects 75 square metres of garden space to be provided. Only 24 square metres are proposed, which is a significant shortfall. However, the dwelling is proposed as part of the development of flats, including facilities for waste storage for the wider development within the building. Within those flats is a further family sized dwelling with 4 bedrooms, that requires only 9 square metres of private garden space.
14. While policy treats the two units differently, this is primarily a development of flats. The two family-sized units would have similar access to the wider communal areas on the site and provide broadly similar accommodation for comparable end users. At the Hearing, the Council provided no compelling reason for the two units to be held to two different standards on this site.
15. The 4 bedroom flat would have a small private garden, as required by HLP Policy SC5. It would be sandwiched between the 3 storey flatted block and the site boundary wall. Although not entirely square, it was agreed at the Hearing that the garden would measure almost 3 metres in one direction, close to the maximum dimension possible if the required 9 square metres were provided as a square. The policy does not require such gardens to always be square.
16. The plans show that the private garden space would measure only 8 square metres, but this can be enlarged by moving its southern boundary fence further into the communal space it adjoins. That could be dealt with through the approval of a detailed landscaping scheme and boundary treatment. However, as the occupants would also have access to their own 6 square metre balcony, a specific condition to secure it is not necessary to make the development acceptable. On this basis, appropriate private garden space would be provided for the development.
17. The development should also provide 350 square metres of communal external space for use by the future residents, less any space provided in private spaces. In considering the Block A dwelling as part of the scheme, it and its private space should be included in the calculation. The Council explained at the Hearing that this led to a requirement for 246 square metres.
18. An area of 35 square metres to the front of Block B would be in close proximity to windows of the ground floor units of that block. Its use could result in some loss of privacy to that unit, but the space could equally be used by its own occupants as part of the wider external space available to them. It would not make the balcony significantly less private than others within the development, so it should be counted as part of the communal space.
19. An area to the rear of Blocks B and C is particularly narrow. It might afford some incidental space, for example to allow children to play informally, as they might do elsewhere in constrained locations where alternatives are not readily available. Nevertheless, the appellant agreed at the Hearing that the planning system should not aim to confine public spaces to awkward corners, even if some groups might make use of them, and I find that they should not be counted as usable public

spaces. As it is not required as functional open space, a detailed landscaping scheme could ensure that defensible space was provided to the closest windows.

20. The removal of this space from the calculation, along with a small 21 square metre section adjacent to Bristow Road, that is more likely to form the landscape setting of the development than usable open space, would result in a total provision of 239 square metres. However, that figure also seems to account for removal of a further space to the front of Block B that is not measured separately on the plans. For the reasons given in respect of the 35 square metre area to the other side of the Block B entrance, that area should be included as usable open space. Given its size, this is likely to provide sufficient additional space to meet the policy target for the development. Even if that is not correct, the shortfall would be very small.
21. Notwithstanding this, the drawings indicate that open space at the site would be left open to, and accessible from, adjoining external space at Rapur Court. Presently, Rapur Court does not have sufficient external space to meet current policy requirements. The proposed arrangement would, therefore, likely result in residents of Rapur Court using the proposed communal spaces at the site, resulting in a more intensive use than set out in the policy standards. The result could be that residents do not have sufficient space to comfortably meet their needs.
22. Given that the proposal includes sufficient space, this potential harm could be avoided by requiring an impenetrable site boundary to be installed between the two sites. In that scenario, there would be no change to the facilities available to the Rapur Court residents, but the space for future residents of the site, while policy compliant, would be more enclosed and less spacious. Leaving the site open, while increasing likely use, would result in a more coherent and better designed space of a more usable shape. I find that this would outweigh the potential for the site to be used over intensively. Moreover, residents of both developments would have easy access to Inwood Park, which provides further multifunctional green space.
23. As there would be adequate on-site provision for open space and, in particular, children's play equipment, then the planning obligation requiring payment of the Play Space Contribution is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Accordingly, that obligation does not meet the statutory tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and I have had no regard to it in reaching my decision.
24. With regard to the above, I find that the development provides sufficient external space to meet the needs of future residents of the site.
25. The bedroom windows of some units in Blocks B and C face the site boundary wall at close range. These rooms would not be afforded a good outlook. Nevertheless, while future residents would not necessarily use the rooms as bedrooms, the dual-aspect layout of the flats means that there would be good outlook from the accommodation generally.
26. The site adjoins commercial and industrial uses. In particular, a metal plating business creates noise that could result in unacceptable living conditions for future residents if windows were open. This can be addressed through the use of a mechanical ventilation system, providing occupants choice over whether to open windows or not.

27. The use of mechanical ventilation could lower the energy performance of the buildings, which might hinder their ability to meet the forecast levels of carbon reduction. However, the Energy & Sustainability Statement does not set firm measures and discusses the potential for use of mechanical ventilation while still meeting the anticipated target. In addition, as the building is unlikely to meet 'net-zero' carbon emissions, there is also provision within the planning obligations to address any shortfall (to be fully assessed upon completion) through a contribution to off-site measures. I, therefore, find that potential effects from noise can be addressed, embracing the 'agent of change' principle, without preventing the building meeting policy compliant energy performance standards.
28. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has indicated that there is also potential for odour nuisance or a reduction in air quality from the adjoining industrial processes. There has been no assessment by the appellant of the potential for adverse effects as set out in HLP Policy EQ4. However, the industrial premises are already surrounded by similarly positioned dwellings. There is no particular evidence of a localised air quality problem, such as an explanation of the industrial processes, or complaints from other existing residents at similar proximity. In the absence of any tangible evidence of an existing problem, I find that the relationship to the adjoining works would not lead to harmful living conditions, or the need for new restrictions on those businesses, in this regard.
29. For the reasons given, the development would provide appropriate living conditions for future residents, in compliance with those aims of LP Policies D3, D6, D13, and D14; and HLP Policies SC4, SC5, CC2, EQ4, and EQ5 that seek to ensure that development is of a high quality, creating liveable places that give future residents appropriate amenity. That includes providing access to suitable internal and external space, while ensuring that development takes responsibility for mitigating effects from existing nuisance generating or polluting uses.

Living conditions of neighbouring residents

30. Block C would be positioned around 11 metres from the site-facing windows of Rapur Court that serve bedrooms and living rooms. The facing elevation would be three-storeys high and extend across much of the site's width.
31. The appeal site, at the Rapur Court boundary is heavily overgrown. Currently, outlook from the ground floor windows is, therefore, significantly obstructed and short range. The Council accepted at the Hearing that the effects of the proposed development on ground floor occupants would, consequently, be limited.
32. The upper floors are currently afforded some outlook across the relatively low buildings at the appeal site and a greater sense of enclosure would result. Nevertheless, from the upper floors the relative height of the new building would be, at most, two storeys higher than the existing neighbours' floor level, significantly reducing the enclosing effect. Some outlook would still be available to the sides of the new building, especially from the affected lounge windows that are towards the sides of the facing elevation.
33. There would likely be increased potential for shading of Rapur Court. No study has been undertaken of daylight levels within that building. However, while the extent of shading at mid-day is somewhat unclear, the shading diagrams provided indicate that morning and afternoon sunlight would still reach the affected elevation

at the equinox. On this basis, I find that the effect on the living conditions of Rapur Court residents would be acceptable.

34. The gardens of the closest neighbours on Bristow Road would be overshadowed around sunrise at the equinox and, to some extent at 0800, on 21 June. There is no evidence showing how this would compare to the existing situation. Nevertheless, any resultant shading has been shown to only affect the very early morning period and there would be no new effect beyond that. I find that the living conditions of the closest neighbours on Bristow Road would not be harmed.
35. The Council is satisfied that the relative positions and distances between the proposed buildings and the dwellings on Inwood Road and Bristow Road mean that there would be no harmful loss of privacy. At the Hearing, the Council confirmed that obscure glazing of the southern elevation was not required to safeguard this, and I have no reason to disagree. Irrespective of the future tenure, there is no obvious reason why the increase in residents would generate unacceptable noise and disturbance to existing properties, beyond the residential and commercial uses already in the neighbourhood.
36. With regard to the above, I find that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with those aims of LP Policy D6 and HLP Policies CC2, and SC4 that seek to ensure that the living conditions of neighbouring residents are safeguarded.

Other Matters

37. Other than in respect of children's play, discussed above, planning obligations would secure an appropriate affordable housing review mechanism, and contributions to address the effects associated with the other matters detailed in the Council's fifth reason for refusal. These are linked to development plan policy aims and necessary to make it acceptable, would be directly related to, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
38. The development would make no on-site parking provision and a planning obligation would prevent future residents accessing on-street parking permits. Therefore, other than provision for one marked disabled bay, there would be no increase in on-street resident's parking pressure. There may be some increase in delivery vehicles, but they would be able to stop at the front of the site rather than between the rows of parked cars in the marked bays. There is no objection from the local highway authority and no substantive evidence that this would interfere with the safe and convenient operation of the highway network. The London Fire Brigade also made no objection to the proposal and, as such, I have no reason to find that emergency access or egress at the development would be problematic.
39. The site is constrained and local residents may experience noise, disturbance and other inconvenience during construction activities. Such effects would only relate to the duration of development and so are of limited weight. Furthermore, they can be managed so as to avoid unacceptable harm through the imposition of conditions. Therefore, such effects are not a reason to withhold planning permission.

Conditions

40. In addition to the statutory time-limit for commencement, a plans condition is required in the interests of certainty.
41. To ensure that the development plan aims of reducing energy and water consumption, and building with sustainable materials are met, conditions are required to ensure that the proposed energy reduction target set out in the Energy Strategy is met, water consumption control measures are installed, and all construction materials are appropriately sourced. Drainage details must be agreed to prevent any increase in flood risk. An ecological management plan is required to safeguard ecological interests and conditions are needed to investigate and remediate any contamination, to ensure that the site is suitable and safe for the residential use.
42. To ensure that appropriate living conditions and facilities are provided for future residents of the site, details of a scheme to mitigate noise should be submitted for approval and the resultant building checked prior to occupation. Adequate waste storage and collection procedures must be secured and, to meet the policy requirement for accessible housing, a wheelchair accessible dwelling must be provided. Given the small size of its private garden, it is necessary to prevent future extensions and outbuildings through permitted development rights within the plot of the detached dwelling.
43. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, and achieving a well-designed development, conditions are required to secure details of the proposed external materials and landscaping. To protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents, a construction logistics plan should be approved and implemented, with controls imposed in respect of obscure glazing to the north elevation of Block C, the use of the flat roof of the detached dwelling, and noise from any new plant installed.
44. To encourage travel by non-car means and to ensure the site and the pedestrian environment is appropriately restored, the development should not be occupied until the existing vehicular access is closed and revised details of cycle parking facilities are implemented.
45. I have made some alterations to the Council's suggested conditions to ensure compliance with the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Other than where clarity is necessary, I have also removed a number of standardised lists of requirements and references to other guidance, leaving the parties open to agree what is needed, and to the appropriate standard, at the relevant time. In some instances, the Council suggested the submission and approval of verification reports, but this is not necessary where conditions require certain standards to be met in any case. Nor is it necessary to stipulate who carries out any survey or monitoring work, as inadequate assessments need not be approved. I have, therefore, not included such requirements within the conditions.

Conclusion

46. For the reasons given, the proposal complies with the development plan. There are no material considerations that otherwise indicate that planning permission should not be granted. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR

Schedule

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 975/RDP/FIG01, 975/RDP/PA2/P05, 975/RDP/PA2/P06 A1, 975/RDP/PA2/P07, 975/RDP/LS01.
- 3) No development shall take place until an Ecological Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The Ecological Management Plan shall incorporate:

- (a) details of measures to protect reptiles, breeding birds, nests and eggs from mortality/damage, injury and disturbance, including avoidance by timing and/or appropriate supervision;
- (b) details of the ecological clerk of works supervision to be put in place to monitor the clearance of vegetation to ensure no impact on undiscovered or other unexpected faunal encounters;
- (c) an ecological lighting plan;
- (d) details of ecological enhancement and urban greening factor, including how the urban greening factor is to be delivered and achieved on site;
- (e) details of when and how the enhancement measures will be monitored, managed and maintained, including the long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules;
- (f) additional detail on location and type of bird/bat boxes, maintenance and a commitment that any data collected is to be shared with the Council;
- (g) species surveys within and around the site to demonstrate ecological enhancements.

The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained as such.

- 4) (a) No development shall take place until a preliminary non-intrusive risk assessment (Phase I desk study report) to identify possible areas and sources of land contamination which may exist on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. It will establish what intrusive investigation or site remediation measures may be necessary before the development commences.

The Phase I desk study report will include the aims and objectives, data collection, site reconnaissance (walk over survey) and development of the initial Conceptual Site Model (CSM) with preliminary risk assessment whereby risk of all potential pollutant linkages are evaluated with a risk category. The report shall also make recommendations for the further gathering of information and/or intrusive investigation, to ensure that it will be possible to render the site safe for its proposed use.

(b) Following the completion of the Phase I desk study report, if intrusive investigations or gas monitoring is recommended, a Phase II site investigation must be undertaken. No development other than necessary works to enable intrusive investigations shall take place until a Phase II site investigation report, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The report shall identify the areas and sources of land contamination that exist on the site and identify the scope of site remediation measures necessary before the development commences.

The investigation shall be based on the initial CSM and on-site observations, to identify the extent and nature of contaminants. The initial CSM shall be updated accordingly following a tiered risk assessment based on the findings of the investigation and, where applicable, the report shall include proposals to deal with the identified contamination on site.

The report shall include details of building demolition, sampling of soil, soil vapour, ground gas, leachate, surface water and/or groundwater, at such locations and depths as are considered to characterise the site conditions based on the initial CSM and on-site observations during investigation work.

Suitable testing shall be undertaken in accordance with the potential contaminants identified in the CSM, and any unexpected/suspected contaminants encountered during the investigations.

(c) If a scheme for remediation is recommended in the Phase II site investigation for the site, no development shall take place until a remediation method statement to specify the works necessary to render the site suitable for its proposed end use, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The remediation method statement shall provide suitable details of how the risks of each pollutant linkages, as identified in the updated CSM, will be mitigated.

Remediation work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved remediation method statement for verification and validation before the development is first brought into use.

(d) During the development, the local planning authority shall be notified immediately if any land contamination not previously identified is encountered. Where necessary, further assessment shall be carried out, including soil and groundwater sampling and testing, before any further part of the development that may be affected by the additional contamination that has been discovered continues.

A revised remediation method statement shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority for approval within one month of the discovery of such contamination. Further remediation work to remove or manage additional contamination shall be carried out in accordance with the approved revised remediation method statement for verification and validation before the development is first brought into use.

(e) Before the development is first brought into use, the agreed scheme for remediation, including any amendments, shall be fully implemented. A verification report, produced upon completion of the remediation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development is first

brought into use or in accordance with a programme approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The verification (closure) report shall revisit the CSM and provide evidence that each aspect of the remediation plan has been implemented correctly and successfully in accordance with current UK guidance and best practice. Where applicable, the report shall describe how any additional/unexpected contamination encountered during development has been managed in line with the revised remediation method statement. The report shall demonstrate that the development is suitable for its proposed use in terms of land quality.

(f) If long term monitoring and maintenance is required following successful completion of approved remedial measures, reports which demonstrate the effectiveness of the monitoring and maintenance shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority according to an agreed timescale as shall first have been approved under other parts of this condition.

- 5) No development shall take place until a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP), written in accordance with current TfL guidance, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved CLP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.
- 6) No new building work above ground level shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority which demonstrate that:
 - (a) At least three of the key elements of the building envelope (external walls, windows, roof, upper floor slabs, internal walls, floor finishes/coverings) are to achieve a rating of A+ to D in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) The Green Guide of specification.
 - (b) At least 50% of timber and timber products are to be sourced from accredited Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) or Programme for the Endorsement of Forestry Certification (PEFC) scheme.
 - (c) No construction or insulation materials are to be used which would release toxins into the internal and external environment, including those that deplete stratospheric ozone.The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained as such.
- 7) No new building work above ground level shall take place until full details and samples of all materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces (including windows, doors and balconies) of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained as such.
- 8) Notwithstanding any details included in the submitted plans, no new building work above ground level shall take place until details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include:
 - (a) A statement setting out the design objectives and how these will be delivered;
 - (b) existing and proposed finished levels or contours;
 - (c) means of enclosure/boundary treatment(s) and retaining structures;

- (d) vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- (e) hard surfacing materials;
- (f) minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, CCTV etc.);
- (g) proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating alignments, levels, access points, supports as relevant);
- (h) renewable energy installations;
- (i) planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers and densities where appropriate;
- (j) an implementation programme;
- (k) an ongoing management and maintenance strategy.

The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details at the times specified in the agreed implementation programme and thereafter maintained in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance strategy.

- 9) (a) No new building work above ground level shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority of a scheme providing for the insulation of the proposed dwellings against the transmission of externally generated aircraft, road and industrial noise, taking account of any ventilation requirements necessary, in order to ensure that the maximum noise levels permitted within the dwellings will not exceed the following standards:
- Living Rooms = 35 dB LAeq, 16hours;
 - Dining room/area = 40 dB LAeq, 16 hours;
 - Bedroom = 35 dB LAeq, 16 hours during daytime (07:00 - 23:00); and
 - Bedroom = 30 dB LAeq, 8 hours during nighttime (23:00 - 07:00).
- (b) Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied or brought into use, post-completion noise tests shall be carried out and test reports shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Noise tests shall be carried out taking account of worst case environmental conditions, such as easterly operations at Heathrow, peak-time traffic, normal working hours of the adjoining industrial premises, wind speed and direction and presence of temperature inversion.
- 10) No new building work above ground level shall take place until a final detailed drainage design, including drawings and supporting calculations has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details, including a management plan confirming routine maintenance tasks for all drainage components, shall also be submitted and approved which demonstrates how the drainage system is to be maintained for the lifetime of the development. The development shall be carried out in strict compliance with the approved details and thereafter maintained as such.

- 11) (a) Prior to first occupation of any dwelling within the development hereby approved, evidence shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to show that the development has been constructed in accordance with the approved Energy Strategy, and any subsequent approved revisions, and achieved an 86% reduction in emissions.
- (b) Upon final commencement of operation of any low and zero carbon technologies, suitable devices for the monitoring of the low and zero carbon technologies shall have been installed, and the monitored data shall be submitted automatically to a monitoring web-platform at daily intervals for a period of three years from the point of full operation. The data shall be made available to the local planning authority on request for a period of five years.
- The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 12) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of secure covered cycle parking facilities for not less than 31 bicycles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use by the occupants of, and visitors to, the development before the development is first occupied or brought into use and shall be thereafter retained for use at all times without obstruction.
- 13) No part of the development shall be occupied until full details of the arrangements for the storing of waste and recycled materials (including details of how the placing of waste and recycled materials in a suitable location for collection would be undertaken and managed) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained as such.
- 14) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or brought into use until the existing vehicular access to the site has been permanently closed and kerbs and footway reinstated so that it cannot be used as an access across the pavement.
- 15) Prior to first occupation of the building hereby approved, the development shall have been constructed to achieve an internal water use of 105 litres/person/day or less and any measures so installed shall thereafter be maintained as such.
- 16) Prior to first occupation of Block C, the windows formed in the northern side elevation of Block C shall be obscure-glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres above internal floor level. The windows shall not be repaired or replaced otherwise than in accordance with the requirements of this condition.
- 17) The two bedroom, four person ground floor dwelling shall be a fully adapted wheelchair home that meets Building Regulation M4(3) part 2(b) 'wheelchair user dwellings'.
- 18) (a) The cumulative measured or calculated rating level of noise emitted from any mechanical services plant including heating, ventilation and air conditioning installed at the development hereby permitted, shall be 10dB(A) below the existing background noise level, at all times that the plant operates. No plant shall be operated that does not meet this standard. The measured or calculated noise levels shall be determined at the boundary of the nearest ground floor

noise sensitive premises or one metre from the facade of the nearest first floor (or higher) noise sensitive premises. Where an alternative position for assessment/measurement is preferred for ease of access, this may be used, provided that it is shown on a map and noise propagation calculations detailed to show how the design criteria are achieved.

(b) Any plant shall be isolated on adequate antivibration mounts to prevent the structural transmission of vibration and regenerated noise within adjacent or adjoining premises, and these shall be so maintained thereafter.

- 19) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order), no enlargement of the detached house (Block A) or any additional structures/buildings/enclosures within its curtilage shall be carried out, other than as shown in the approved drawings.
- 20) The flat roof area of the ground floor projection on the detached house (Block A) hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

End of conditions

Appearances

For the appellant:

Ben Norton LB Hons MRTPI

Pamer Hothi

For the Local Planning Authority:

Jillian Ridler

Walid Omeir

Documents submitted at the hearing

HD1 Draft Planning Obligations Deed¹

HD2 Email from Jillian Ridler to Benjamin Norton dated 9 September 2025

HD3 Hounslow Local Plan Policy ED4

HD4 Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD 2024, Part A2: Common Considerations

¹ A completed version was submitted after the Hearing had closed.