



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3370876

39 Hatton Road, Feltham, Hounslow TW14 8JN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Thomas Tkacz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4169.
 - The development proposed is new two storey two bedroom detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The application seeks outline planning permission, and the application form indicates that approval is sought for all matters of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development. I have determined the appeal accordingly having regard to the plans and information before me.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residents;
 - whether the proposed development would provide adequate living conditions for the future occupiers, with particular reference to the size and quality of the internal accommodation and external space; and
 - whether the proposed development would make adequate provision for car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises an L-shaped area of land to the side and rear of the existing dwelling at 39 Hatton Road. Despite some reference in the appellant's later evidence to the current use of the site as a builder's yard, both parties consistently refer to the site as part of the garden of No 39. The appeal site has been subdivided from No 39 by fencing with a pedestrian gate, and features

hardstanding from the gated access with Hatton Road and a grassed area to the rear section. A garage building, other smaller sheds and a covered storage area lie to the rear of the site. A separate, open strip of land between the site and 37 Hatton Road lies beyond the southern boundary.

5. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with mainly two-storey semi-detached and terraced houses and some detached properties. While the layout and appearance of development varies, the dwellings fronting the western side of Hatton Road from No 39 up to the junction with Bedfont Close, and those on Bedfont Close to the rear of the site, share distinctive features, including steep roofs, gables and consistent materials, forming a cohesive group. The proposal would be seen in the context of the spacious, landscaped setting of the generous gardens to the rear of the properties on Hatton Road and Bedfont Close, as well as the space between Nos 37 and 39. These are clearly visible from public views, thereby contributing to the overall pleasant, open character and appearance of the area. Development in rear gardens in this area is typically smaller-scale domestic outbuildings.
6. Despite its lower height in comparison to existing dwellings, the development would occupy a large proportion of the site's rear section, eroding the spacious rear garden area and diminishing its more open character and that of its immediate surroundings. The design attempts to reflect features of the dwellings in the vicinity, including lower eaves with accommodation in the roof space and a front gable. However, due to its position, the shallower roof gable, the overall roof form, its proportions, and the combination of materials, the proposal would not respond meaningfully and sensitively to the established characteristics of the site and the surrounding area. Overall, the proposal would result in an incongruous form of development in this location that would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.
7. Whilst there are variations in housing development within the wider area, this would not justify the harm I have identified from the development of the appeal site. Despite a nearby example of a detached dwelling to the rear of properties on Hatton Road, I do not have full details of that development to determine if it is directly comparable to weigh in favour of the appeal scheme. Although there are some public views of it, from my observations on site, this is seen within a less prominent context to the appeal site, with differences in design and the spacious characteristics of the sites and their immediate surroundings. The presence of this does not alter my finding that the proposal would have an adverse visual impact.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an unduly harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area, therefore it would conflict with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (the LP). Amongst other things, these policies aim to secure development that sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character, and retain, promote and support high quality urban design.
9. Given the above policy conflict, the development would also be contrary to Policy SC1 of the LP. Amongst other things, this requires the design of small infill sites to respond to and reflect local context and character, with a presumption against the development of self-contained residential units within the curtilage of existing dwellings where the proposal would be in conflict with other policies in the plan.

10. The appellant references Policy SC4 of the LP in support of the proposal. Its supporting text states that proposals should not compromise the important characters of the area, including that of back garden spaces, and proposals for inappropriate garden land development will be rejected. However, I have found harm in terms of the development not achieving high quality design or adequately responding to and protecting local context and character. Although the proposal would make efficient use of land, for the reasons set out above, it would not accord with Policy SC4.

Living conditions – neighbouring residents

11. The appeal site is bound by existing panelled fencing that provides a solid form of enclosure around the area to be developed and the retained garden area of No 39. The rear boundary with 9 Bedfont Close also features existing landscaping, including evergreen planting, which extends above the height of the boundary fence, although the plans do not provide full details of proposed landscaping for the development.
12. Although the proposed front elevation gable would have a lower ridge compared to the main roof, this part of the proposal in particular would have an unacceptable overbearing effect on occupants of No 39, especially in views from their garden. This is due to the overall width and height of that front facing gable and its proximity to No 39, which would have an unacceptable effect on the outlook of those neighbouring residents. The harmful impact would be exacerbated by the subdivision of the site and the reduced garden area, which would increase the more oppressive sense of enclosure for occupants of No 39.
13. The development would be close to the boundary with 9 Bedfont Close, but given the layout in relation to the side elevation of that property and the lower eaves height and sloping roof of the proposed dwelling, the development would not have adverse overbearing effects on occupiers of No 9. For the same reasons, there would be no loss of light or outlook to those occupiers. Boundary fencing would also adequately restrict the potential for any loss of privacy at ground floor level between adjoining properties, and would also effectively mitigate the relatively limited harm from additional activity associated with comings and goings for an additional dwelling.
14. First floor openings are limited to the use of rooflights in the main roof, one of which is over the staircase, and an obscure glazed bathroom window to the front gable facing No 39. This would adequately mitigate any potential harm from overlooking of neighbours. Due to the position of the dwelling and their siting within the roof slope shown in the section drawing, the rooflights serving the bedrooms to the rear would reduce the potential for direct overlooking down and over the rear garden of 9 Bedfont Close and towards openings in that dwelling. Therefore, the dwelling would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for occupiers of neighbouring properties.
15. Consequently, whilst I have not found harm to occupants of all neighbouring properties, I conclude that the development would result in an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents at No 39 as their outlook would be unacceptably reduced. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CC2 of the LP. Amongst other things, this aims for development to have a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents and minimise overbearingness.

16. In addition, notwithstanding the appellant's comments on Policy SC4 of the LP, the proposal would not protect existing residents' amenity, and therefore I am not persuaded that this policy would weigh in favour of the development.

Living conditions – future occupiers

17. There is no dispute between the parties that the overall internal layout of the development would meet the 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (2015)' (NDSS) and that the size of the external space would meet that required by Policy SC5 of the LP. Amongst other things, this policy aims to ensure developments will be of the highest quality internally and externally and meet the demands of everyday life for the intended occupants. However, there is dispute over the size of the bedrooms and the usability of the external space.
18. The proposed first floor plan provides some indication of the overall floor area and headroom for the accommodation and the appellant asserts that the proposal would meet or exceed all relevant standards. I also note the dual aspect and use of rooflights, which would allow for light, ventilation and some outlook for rooms. However, I have not been provided with sufficient or detailed evidence to adequately demonstrate that the proposal would meet the minimum internal space standards for the bedrooms, as required by Policy SC5 of the LP or the NDSS, including taking into account areas with lower headroom and floor to ceiling heights. Consequently, notwithstanding the overall floor area, I am not satisfied that the development would provide the highest quality of internal space and meet acceptable standards for its occupants.
19. The plans indicate that external amenity space would wrap around the rear and side of the new dwelling. The remainder of the site would largely be occupied by the access and parking areas to the southern side of the property. Due to its location and aspect, as well as the relatively limited size given the proximity to its boundaries, this space would not be of the same quality as larger gardens in the area. Whilst this may be a less desirable space for residents in comparison to other spacious gardens, it would afford privacy and security for occupants. I also have no compelling evidence before me to demonstrate that it would not be a sufficiently usable space in relation to the size of the dwelling.
20. Consequently, whilst I find the size and quality of the proposed external space to be acceptable, I conclude that it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for the future occupiers, with particular reference to the size and quality of the internal accommodation. Therefore, the development would conflict with Policy SC5 of the LP, the aims of which are set out above.

Car parking

21. There is dispute between the parties on the existing vehicle parking available to No 39. The application form indicates one existing and one proposed space, while the appellant's appeal statement refers to two off-street spaces, one for the new dwelling and one retained for No 39. However, the proposed plans do not show provision for No 39, and in any event, it is unclear how this could be achieved given the proposed subdivision. The appellant also claims No 39 currently lacks access to parking, but I have limited evidence to support this or to indicate there is a lawful use of the site as a builder's yard that may prevent this, as suggested in their final comments.

22. Based on the existing site plan and my observations on site, there is space to park more than one vehicle on the appeal site. Notwithstanding the inconsistencies in describing the use of the site, from the evidence before me, the development would appear to result in the loss of at least one off-street parking space that would have been available to No 39, even if it is not currently used.
23. Whilst many properties in the area have off-street parking, not all do, including some close to the appeal site. There are parking restrictions along Hatton Road, including to the frontage of the site, as well as bus stops that limit on-street parking. There are areas on Hatton Road where on-street parking can take place, which become limited where there are dropped kerbs serving off-street parking to properties. With regard to existing parking pressures, whilst no surveys have been provided, during my site visit at late morning on a weekday, I observed cars parked off the highway within neighbouring properties, as well as moderate levels of parking taking place on Hatton Road, particularly to its eastern side close to the site. There were spaces available along Hatton Road and in surrounding streets, although it may be reasonable to expect greater potential for parking pressure outside of normal working hours when residents are more likely to be at home.
24. I have limited information before me to clearly show the minimum or maximum vehicle parking provision required to serve housing development in this location. The Council indicates that 0.75 spaces would be required for a two-bedroom dwelling and one space for a three-bedroom dwelling, although there is nothing before me to confirm the size of No 39. Despite the proximity to bus stops and reference to other public transport links, the parties agree that the site is in an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2. This suggests poorer accessibility, which may also increase the likelihood of occupants using a private vehicle. The supporting text to Policy EC2 of the LP notes that 'car-free' and 'low-car' development will be encouraged in locations of high public transport accessibility and where there are Controlled Parking Zones, which do not apply in this instance.
25. The potential for additional on-street parking may be relatively modest given the scale of development, and I have also had regard to the proposed provision of secure cycle storage and electric vehicle charging. However, having regard to the low PTAL of the site and given the relatively limited amount of on-street parking available in its immediate area, allowing development that does not make appropriate provision for vehicle parking would increase the potential for additional parking pressure and congestion in this area. This would be to the detriment of the transport network.
26. In the absence of sufficient and detailed evidence to indicate otherwise, I am not satisfied that the proposal would make appropriate provision for car parking, contrary to Policy EC2 of the LP. Amongst other things, this policy aims to reduce congestion, and demonstrate development is located appropriately with regard to public transport accessibility and capacity, road capacity and avoids adverse impacts on the transport network.

Other Matters

27. I have had regard to the appellant's comments that the proposal would deliver an additional home in a sustainable location. However, whilst there would be a modest

contribution to housing supply in the area, neither this, nor any other benefits of the development, would justify the harm that I have identified.

28. Where the development has been found to be acceptable in other respects, these are neutral matters and do not weigh in favour of the development.

Conclusion

29. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR