



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/25/3372859

53 Argyle Avenue, Hounslow TW3 2LE

- 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 and Mrs Rixon Adjwani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1764.
 - The development is change of use - front room to Skin Clinic.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Whilst the development was not in use at the time of my visit, I observed that the appeal site was available for use as a skin clinic. It appears from the plans and evidence that the development that has taken place is that referenced in the planning application. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought retrospectively for the development as set out in the application and the submitted plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular reference to noise and disturbance;
 - the effect of the development on the hierarchy of town and neighbourhood centres; and
 - whether the development makes adequate provision for car and cycle parking and refuse storage.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The appeal site is a detached dwelling situated within a quiet residential neighbourhood of predominantly semi-detached and terraced properties, some distance from commercial uses. The surrounding area's character and appearance is therefore overwhelmingly residential.
5. Very little information was submitted with the application to demonstrate the nature and level of the use, although the appeal submission provides some further detail

on the hours of use and confirms it would operate as a home business with no other employees. The appellants have also submitted a log of use stating the times and frequency that visitors entered or exited the property for an appointment over a two-week period. However, noting that the use has been operating since June 2020, this indicates the level of use over a very limited period, and it is not clear if this represents a typical level, which reduces the weight I give this.

6. The use will likely generate additional comings and goings for longer periods during hours of operation, as well as activity during appointments, in comparison to use of the property solely as a dwelling. Even if the overall level of activity would be relatively modest, it has introduced a commercial use into a residential setting where this would not normally be expected, which will likely result in some additional noise and disturbance for neighbours.
7. Whilst the evidence indicates that no heavy plant and equipment would be involved, I observed various equipment associated with the use within the front room. From the information before me, I have no compelling evidence to indicate whether or not any activity during appointments or the use of the equipment would have adverse impacts in terms of increased noise and disturbance that would be over and above residential use of the property. External wall-mounted equipment was attached below the window level to the front elevation and close to the neighbouring property. However, I have no details of its planning status, and as it is not part of the application, it is outside of my remit for this appeal.
8. The use is contained within one part of the ground floor frontage of the dwelling, detached from its adjacent neighbours, and given the limited size and capacity of the space, these factors would likely mitigate the impact of the use to some degree. Noting that no objections from neighbours have been received, the appellants go some way to demonstrating that the use would be compatible in this area, and there are indications it would be a potentially low impact use. Operating hours and restrictions on numbers of customers could be secured by condition were I minded to allow the appeal. However, in the absence of sufficient and detailed evidence to demonstrate the overall level of use and type of activity, I am unable to adequately determine the impact of the use in this location.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the appellants have failed to demonstrate that the development does not have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular reference to noise and disturbance. The development therefore conflicts with Policies CC2 and EQ5 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (the LP). Amongst other things, these policies aim for development to function well in their effect on surrounding areas, have a positive impact on the amenity of residents, and consider the impact of noise and mitigation of these impacts on surrounding uses.

Location

10. Whilst commercial uses and services may well be more suited to a town centre or neighbourhood centre location in terms of accessibility and serving the needs of surrounding residential communities, the LP does not specifically define a 'town centre use'. However, paragraph 91 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the circumstances when a sequential test should be applied to planning applications for main town centre uses. Further advice is also provided within Planning Practice Guidance: Town centres and retail.

11. The requirements of the Framework are reflected in Policy TC3 of the LP, as well as the aims of Policy TC1 for the borough's town centres to be the focus of new retail and other main town centre uses. The Framework defines 'main town centre uses', and the appeal proposal would not comprise a use within this definition. Consequently, neither the LP nor the Framework require that a sequential test is necessary for such development. Notwithstanding my findings on the first main issue, having regard to the nature of the development, I have no compelling evidence to indicate that the proposal is in an inappropriate location that would undermine the objectives of the LP to maintain a network of successful town and neighbourhood centres.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development does not result in adverse effects on the hierarchy of town and neighbourhood centres. It therefore accords with Policies TC1 and TC3 of the LP, which amongst other things, aim for town and neighbourhood centres to provide the services and facilities to meet the needs of the borough's population, and meet the Council's regeneration objectives.

Car and cycle parking, and refuse storage

13. The plans indicate space for the parking of two cars to the front of the property, which were marked with white lines at the time of my visit, as well as space to access the front door. Dropped kerbs across the majority of the site frontage allow for access from the highway, although these do not extend fully across one of the parking spaces. There is a gated pedestrian access to the side of the property leading to the rear, and I observed refuse storage in this area.
14. The site is in an area classified as Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) 2, which suggests a lower accessibility that may increase the likelihood of customers using a private vehicle. During my visit on a weekday afternoon, I did not observe significant volumes of traffic along Argyle Avenue or adverse effects from parking. Many properties in the immediate vicinity of the site have some off-street parking and there are limited restrictions in this area allowing for on-street parking close to the site. There were some indications of greater parking pressure to the front of terraced properties without off-street parking provision in the area between the appeal site and Whitton Road, although this did not disrupt traffic flow or impact on pedestrian and highway safety. There were on-street spaces available along Argyle Avenue and in surrounding streets.
15. It may be reasonable to expect greater potential for parking pressure outside of working hours, including outside the proposed hours of operation of the business during weekdays, when residents are more likely to be at home, although demand may fluctuate. Consequently, whilst there may be some greater potential for parking pressure during the proposed business hours on a Saturday, from the evidence before me, and noting the suggested conditions to control the level of use, the potential increase in visitors arising from the site could be relatively modest. There is scope for parking within the site, although even if this was not available due to the residential use, I find the potential level of overspill parking arising from the development would likely be low. I therefore have no compelling evidence to find that the proposal would result in unacceptable levels of parking stress, or harm from associated servicing and deliveries, which would have an adverse impact on the transport network over and above the residential use.

16. Notwithstanding the Council's concerns over space for cycle parking and refuse storage, there is sufficient space within the curtilage of the site, including to the side and rear of the property with gated access to the frontage, for the likely level of use. Due to the more modest scale of the development alongside the existing residential use, as well as the layout of the property, any cycle parking or refuse storage provision to the side or rear would not result in significant or adverse effects on the living conditions of existing residents at the site. This provision could be secured by a suitable condition were I minded to allow the appeal.
17. Accordingly, I conclude that the development would make adequate provision for car and cycle parking and refuse storage. It would therefore accord with Policy T6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies EC2 and EQ7 of the LP. Amongst other things, these policies aim for development to secure appropriate levels of car and cycle parking, demonstrate they are located appropriately with regard to road capacity and that adverse impacts on the transport network are avoided, and incorporate suitable arrangements for waste management.

Other Matters

18. The potential benefits of a business use in relation to the economic, social and environmental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework are acknowledged. However, this does not alter my conclusion on the first main issue.

Conclusion

19. Notwithstanding my findings on the second and third main issues, 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