



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3371424

487A Staines Road, Feltham, Hounslow TW14 8BN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Sandhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/2882.
 - The development proposed is redevelopment of first floor rear extension and roof extension to accommodate four new dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the above banner heading has been taken from the original application form. The decision notice includes cycle and refuse storage and reprovision of ground floor commercial units. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issues of the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Whether the proposed development would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers with particular regard to amenity space, noise and outlook;
 - Whether the proposed development would compromise the functioning and viability of existing businesses with particular regard to noise;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of adjoining and existing neighbours above 487 Staines Road with particular regard to outlook; and
 - Whether the proposed development demonstrates that the environmental performance of the building has been maximised.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site relates to an existing two storey building consisting of a parade of commercial occupied shop spaces with three flats above. To the rear of the ground floor is a commercial unit storage area. The commercial units to the ground floor include a hot food takeaway and an off-license retail store.
5. The existing dwellings above the commercial units include one 1 bedroom flat and two 2 bedroom flats. The appeal site is located on the corner of Staines Road and Gould Road. It forms the end of the terrace of units along this stretch of road. Staines Road is an area of commercial and residential character and Gould Road is an area which is predominantly two storey houses, with a mixture between terraced and semi-detached properties.
6. The proposed development seeks to erect a two-storey rear extension to accommodate four self-contained flats with associated cycle and refuse storage. The two-storey rear extension would contain on the ground floor, a revised commercial storage area, commercial & residential bin stores, residential bike store and residential entry to the flats above. The proposed first floor would contain three studio flats. The second floor/roof level would contain a two-bedroom flat. The materials would comprise a render finish, grey framed windows with slate coloured concrete roof tiles.
7. The proposed development would significantly increase the scale and mass of the existing property to the rear. It would introduce several dormer windows which are not characteristic features of the area particularly along Gould Road. They would therefore stand out as an incongruous feature in this specific setting which would be highly visible when viewed from both Staines Road and Gould Road. At my site visit, I observed the rear projection on the opposite side of the road to the east and noted that there was a step down in overall height along Gould Road. This allows for a more subordinate and subservient form of development which assists in assimilating the scheme with the lower and less dense development along Gould Road. In contrast, the proposed development would result in a large rear extension with no reduction in height which does not assist the transition. It would unacceptably draw the eye and would be an incongruous addition. This is further exacerbated by the material choice which does not respond well to the surrounding context being more contemporary in its style and appearance and thus would be particularly prominent/stark in this setting. Such designs may work elsewhere but that does not mean it is suitable for this specific location.
8. The appellant claims that the building is not aesthetically pleasing at present, which gives the parade a run-down look. However, I did not find the appearance of the building to be so detrimental at the time of my site visit as to benefit from the proposed development.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan 2015-2030, 2015 (LP) which together, amongst other matters, seek to retain, promote and support high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive, and liveable places.

Living Conditions – Future Occupiers

10. Policy SC5 of the LP states that a minimum of five square metres of private outdoor space should be provided for each 1-2 person dwelling and an extra square metre for each additional occupant. This can be provided in the form of

usable balconies, roof terraces or private garden space. Policy D6 of the London Plan, 2021 also specifies that all private outdoor amenity space must achieve a minimum width of 1.5 metres. No private amenity space has been provided. Policy SC5 also requires the provision of outdoor communal amenity space and sets out the requirement based on habitable rooms. No communal amenity space has been provided as part of the proposal.

11. The appellant explains that outdoor green space is provided within walking distance of the site and wider area. However, this would not be sufficient to address the lack of amenity space and policy conflict. No amenity space provision would not accommodate the future needs and activities of residents/families who are likely to require convenient access to outside amenity space within the confines of their property. The constraints associated with the site are noted but this would not alter my findings as a lack of provision is still unacceptable.
12. The proposal is above a hot food takeaway and off-license retail store. The Proposed Ground Floor Plan identifies Unit A as a retail unit and Unit B as a restaurant in a similar way to the existing situation. The existing plans and elevations show equipment related to the commercial use such as flumes/ventilation equipment for odour and noise. No details of this have been provided in the proposed plans/elevations and no information has been submitted with regards to how this would be managed or physically provided. No Noise Impact Assessment has been provided as part of the appeal. No information has been provided with regards to the opening hours of the restaurant/commercial unit, the associated comings and goings, delivery and servicing and noise impacts.
13. On this basis, no consideration has been given to any required sound insulation to ensure that the commercial use does not negatively impact the residential uses above. Consequently, I cannot conclude with certainty that noise associated with the commercial uses would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the accommodation. The appellant has suggested a condition to require the submission of a noise survey. However, in the particular circumstances of this case, I find it more appropriate for such details to be submitted and assessed prior to any consent given. This is to ensure that the residential amenity of future occupiers is not compromised.
14. I acknowledge that the different uses already operate together and is a common arrangement elsewhere. This does not however mean that such an arrangement is not harmful even if there is a lack of complaints. This would also not justify further noise sensitive uses in close proximity to the commercial businesses where harm could arise from the commercial operations. Certain elements of the build would be subject to building control measures/requirements but in order to allow the appeal, I must be satisfied that the proposed development would not be harmful to the living conditions of future residents which I am not certain of based on the evidence before me.
15. Turning to matters relating to outlook, the 3 studio flats on the first floor would be open plan with windows facing to the east and west. Whilst outlook particularly to the west would face onto a neighbour, it would not be so detrimental to be harmful to the living conditions of future occupiers. This is because the open plan element is also served by further windows allowing for good levels of outlook more generally. Levels of outlook would however be restricted for the upper floor flat in the roof space of the extension given the nature of windows comprising dormers

and rooflights only. I am not therefore satisfied that this would allow for good levels of outlook to be achieved. I will go on to consider the living conditions of adjoining and existing neighbours above 487 Staines Road as a separate matter further in my decision.

16. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers with regard to amenity space, noise and outlook. It would therefore be contrary to Policies SC3, SC4 and SC5 of the LP and Policies D4, D5 and D6 of the London Plan, 2021. These policies amongst other matters, require development to be of the highest quality internally and externally, and meet the demands of everyday life for the intended occupants.

Functioning and viability of existing businesses

17. Policy D13 of the London Plan, 2021 relates to the agent of change and states that developments should be designed to ensure that established noise and other nuisance-generating uses remain viable and can continue or grow without unreasonable restrictions being placed on them. In the absence of acoustic information to demonstrate that no harm would be caused in relation to noise then I cannot be certain that the business uses would not be compromised through the introduction of further noise sensitive uses in close proximity.
18. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would compromise the functioning and viability of existing businesses with particular regard to noise. It would therefore be contrary to Policy DL13 of the London Plan, 2021 and Policy EQ5 of the LP which together, amongst other matters, require the location and design of new development to have considered the impact of noise, and mitigation of these impacts, on new users and surrounding uses according to their sensitivity.

Living conditions - Existing Occupiers

19. The existing dwellings above the commercial units would have a reduced outlook as a result of the proposed development to the rear. Currently they have a relatively unobstructed outlook over the single storey element before it meets the side elevation of No 2 Gould Road further south. However, the outlook would face onto the extended area within close quarters leading to poor outlook and sense of enclosure. Other residential units in the vicinity may have similar levels of outlook, but this does not mean that it is not harmful, nor would it be sufficient to justify harmful development.
20. For the above reasons, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of adjoining and existing neighbours above 487 Staines Road with particular regard to outlook. It would therefore be contrary to Policies CC1 and CC2 of the LP which together, amongst other matters, expect development proposals to have a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents.

Environmental Performance

21. Policies S12, S13 and S14 of the London Plan, 2021 state amongst other matters, that major developments should be net zero-carbon. This means reducing greenhouse gas emissions in operation and minimising both annual and peak energy demand in accordance with the energy hierarchy. Policies EQ1 and EQ2 of the LP echo these principles but go further in requiring all new developments

(major and minor) to meet the carbon emission reduction requirements set out in the London Plan.

22. The appeal is accompanied by an Energy Statement which sets out a number of energy efficiency measures, low carbon energy supply and on-site renewable technologies. It confirms that a 56% reduction in on site emissions would be achieved. The residential Be Lean target of 10% is achieved, with 33% savings achieved. A number of design measures have also been considered including, fabric insulation improvements on Building Regulations Part L minimum standards; air permeability targets implemented as part of the project to minimise heat loss; improved glazing U & G values for the development as well as a low energy lighting scheme adopted for the site. A 100% electric solution is proposed with no gas boilers. The report concludes that solar PV has been identified as the most viable options to achieve the criteria set out by the local authority. The development has been deemed viable for additional measures and therefore it is recommended to explore the financial feasibility of these options to maximise the reduction in carbon emissions on site. The key focus on site is to minimise heat loss and reduce the regulated energy consumption on-site through utilisation of the energy hierarchy.
23. The Council raise concern regarding best practice, U-values, positioning of PV panels, and consideration of existing flats which include new built elements. Whilst such concerns are noted, I recognise the appellant's commitment to maximising environmental performance as demonstrated by the above findings which would be beneficial. I am sufficiently satisfied based on the evidence before me that such concerns could be overcome via an appropriately worded planning condition were I minded to allow the appeal.
24. It is therefore considered that subject to an appropriately worded planning condition, the development would maximise the environmental performance of the building, resulting in a low-quality energy strategy. This would accord with Policies S12, S13 and S14 of the London Plan, 2021 and Policies EQ1 and EQ2 of the LP. A lack of harm in this respect would not however overcome the other harm I have identified.

Other Matters

25. When covering matters relating to the quality of the accommodation and impact on adjoining occupiers, the Officer's report raises concern regarding access, ceiling heights, odours and daylight/sunlight although these matters are not specifically referenced as a reason for refusal. As these did not form part of the reasoning for refusal in the decision notice and that I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds, I do not find it necessary for me to consider these matters further. The Officer's report also raises concern regarding the lack of a waste management plan. This did not form part of the reasoning for refusal and as I am dismissing on other grounds, I similarly find that I do not need to consider this matter further.
26. I am aware of the location of the site in relation to services and facilities and acknowledge the appellant's claims regarding the efficient use of land. I do not dispute that there would be some social, environmental and economic benefits arising from the proposals. To this end, the proposals would help with the provision of housing in the borough which is a benefit, and I note the references to self-build and custom-built development. The appellant claims that the Council is not able to

demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing and thus it is claimed that the tilted balance is engaged as per paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). This states that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This position has not been confirmed by the Council but even if the tilted balance was engaged, the adverse impacts identified above would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

27. I am aware of the level of support shown for the scheme, but this does not mean that the development would not be harmful, nor would it be sufficient to allow harmful development.

Conclusion

28. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework that individually or cumulatively outweigh this harm. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR