



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2025 by F Bradford BA (Hons) MRTPI

Decision by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3369442

126 Uxbridge Road, Feltham TW13 5EA

- 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 Isa Maliqi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1010.
 - The development proposed is described as "New Outbuilding to the rear garden to allow for studio space".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outbuilding to the rear garden at 126 Uxbridge Road, Feltham TW13 5EA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/1010, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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 Refs: Site Location Plan, 25-7520-00-00-PR-REV - Proposed Plan and Elevations, Site Block Plan, and Proposed Site Block Plan (Fire Safety).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan Ref 25-7520-00-00-PR-REV-Proposed Plan and Elevations.
 - 4) The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be used other than for purposes incidental to the dwelling known as 126 Uxbridge Road, Feltham TW13 5EA.

Appeal Procedure

2. 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

3. In the decision above, words not describing acts of development have been removed from the description of development in the interests of accuracy and clarity.
4. Based on my observations, the development had commenced but had not been completed at the time of my visit. I have considered the appeal accordingly.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area;
- whether the proposed outbuilding would be for purposes incidental to the host dwelling; and
- the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular reference to noise and disturbance.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with front and rear garden. It is located within a suburban area characterised by dwellings with rear gardens of similar size, with the appeal dwelling's garden bordered by those of surrounding properties. There are outbuildings of varying size and design within some nearby rear gardens.
7. The proposed outbuilding would be sited to the rear end of No 126's garden and would be single storey. Although it would occupy almost the full width of the garden, it would be located as far away as possible from the host dwelling and, given its height at approximately 2.5 metres and notably smaller footprint, its overall scale and mass would be clearly subordinate to that of the existing house.
8. In addition, the proposed use of timber cladding to the exterior of the outbuilding would contribute to its clear visual differentiation as a secondary structure within the boundary of the appeal dwelling. Furthermore, timber cladding would be appropriate to the garden context. External materials could be secured via condition.
9. I therefore find that the design of the outbuilding would be consistent with guidance in the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD (the SPD), which advises that an outbuilding should be set as far away from the host dwelling as possible; not be taller than 3 metres (and reduced even more so within 1 metre of the boundary); appear subservient to the footprint of the host dwelling; and be in materials to match the host dwelling or be otherwise sympathetic to its garden setting.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 or SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (HLP) which, amongst other things, aim to ensure development maintains the character of the general street scene, respects the quality, character, materials, and scale of the principal building, and avoids overdevelopment in terms of mass and density, having regard to SPD design guidance.

Functional relationship to the host dwelling

11. HLP Policy SC7 resists the use of outbuildings as independent dwellings. Guidance in the SPD adds that they should not be designed in a way that may

facilitate future independent occupation, through inclusion of primary living accommodation, such as a bedroom, bathroom or kitchen.

12. The appellant states the proposed outbuilding would be used as a studio/home office with space to store garden equipment and tools to work on home projects. This is consistent with the drawings before me. Whilst a WC with a toilet and wash basin is proposed, this would not constitute a full bathroom facility required to enable primary residential use. In addition, no kitchen is proposed. As such, notwithstanding the size of the outbuilding and even in the event of it being used as additional living accommodation, functional reliance on the host dwelling would remain.
13. In any event, a separate residential unit has not been applied for and is therefore not before me to consider. If the structure is not built or used as proposed, or if there is a material change of use in the future to create a separate dwelling, then a separate grant of planning permission would be required, and the building would be at risk of enforcement action if such permission is not granted.
14. That said, the description of development as applied for is not in itself precise enough to secure the use of the outbuilding as incidental to the host dwelling, so I recommend a condition to secure this. This would be consistent with the approach set out within HLP Policy SC7 and the SPD.
15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed outbuilding would be incidental to the enjoyment of the host dwelling, and I find no conflict with HLP Policy SC7.

Living Conditions

16. The proposed outbuilding may somewhat increase activity at the rear of the host dwelling's garden. However, as its use would be functionally linked to the host dwelling, additional comings and goings would be largely those of the house's occupants. There is no pertinent evidence to demonstrate that noise and disturbance would be materially greater than that usually associated with a domestic garden. Furthermore, the outbuilding's siting to the rear boundary of the appeal site and away from the rear elevations of neighbouring homes would reduce the risk of disturbance to their occupants.
17. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, with particular reference to noise and disturbance. I therefore find no conflict with HLP Policies CC1, CC2 or SC7 which, amongst other things, aim to ensure development minimises harm to neighbouring residents. I also find no conflict with the SPD in this respect.

Conditions

18. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and simplicity. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I recommend a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty.
19. Conditions securing external materials and restricting the use of the outbuilding are necessary for the reasons given above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR