
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **S Sharp BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3369274

46 Parkfield Crescent, Feltham TW13 7LA

- 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 Bhaven Bhatt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application reference is P/2025/0253.
 - The development proposed is a single storey annex out the rear of garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development on:-
 - The living conditions of future occupiers of No 71 Harvest Road in terms of outlook.
 - The living conditions of future occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings in terms of their enjoyment of their rear gardens.
 - The character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

The living conditions of future occupiers of No 71 Harvest Road

3. The host dwelling is currently the subject of building work, and the rear garden is characterised by unused spaces, or storage and materials associated with those works. There is an existing detached outbuilding adjacent to the boundary with No 44 Parkfield Crescent but otherwise the garden is devoid of outbuildings. The side and rear boundaries are marked by close boarded fences and vegetation.
4. No 71 Harvest Road is a dormer bungalow, its rear elevation orientated approximately parallel to the shared boundary with the appeal site. The dormer faces onto Harvest Road but there are windows serving primary living accommodation at ground floor level facing rearwards directly towards the appeal site. No 71's rear garden is small, and I was able to view over the boundary treatment into the rear ground floor rooms of this dwelling from within the appeal site. The proposed annex would be single storey in height with a flat roof, but all its width of approximately 5.9m would be positioned directly adjacent to the boundary with No 71. This would be a solid, blank elevation extending to approximately 2.6m

above ground level which would extend noticeably and materially above the boundary fence and vegetation.

5. By reason of this proposed massing, the proximity to the boundary with No 71 and the latter's small garden, there would be a significant harmful impact to the outlook of future occupiers of this neighbouring dwelling, both from the dwelling itself and from their garden. This harm to their living conditions would conflict with the objectives of policies CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LBHLP) which is part of the development plan covering the appeal site. These policies seek to ensure that, amongst other considerations, proposals have a positive impact on the living conditions of current and future residents and maintain the amenity of private spaces, including rear gardens.

Living conditions of future occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings in terms of their enjoyment of their rear gardens

6. The area of the garden within which the annex is proposed is currently used for storage of materials or unused whilst building works take place at the host dwelling. It is an enclosed space not visible from the road and, from my observations of neighbouring dwellings with similar sized gardens, such as No 44 Parkfield Crescent, it would typically be used for private, incidental recreation and relaxation when there is not building works taking place and when the weather is not inclement.
7. It is reasonable to assume that the proposed inclusion of additional ordinary living space within the annex would result in footfall between it and the host dwelling, as well as activity in and around the building when occupied. The level of dependence on the host dwelling for day-to-day living would mean that there would be a different level of activity to that associated with the currently outdoor, undeveloped space in the same location. However, the scale of the proposed accommodation is designed for a maximum of 2 occupants and, with facilities such as a bathroom included within the proposal, the level of footfall to and from the annex, and the level of activity in and around it, is likely to be low. Indeed, I have no evidence before me to indicate that its resultant impact on neighbouring future occupiers' enjoyment of their gardens would be materially different to that which would exist if the location was retained and used as outdoor garden space. The level of harm is determined to be negligible.
8. I therefore find that there would be accordance with policies CC2 and SC7 of the LBHLP insofar as they relate to this specific matter. To recall, these policies seek to ensure that, amongst other considerations, proposals have a positive impact on the living conditions of current and future residents and maintain the amenity of private spaces, including rear gardens.

Character and appearance

9. The area around the appeal site is residential and suburban in character and appearance, each dwelling sitting within a plot that includes a modest sized rear garden. Many of these gardens have outbuildings of varying scale and designs. These include single storey flat roofed designs, and such outbuildings are part of the prevailing appearance of the area. During my visit I could see low but noticeable levels of activity within the rear gardens of dwellings on Parkfield Crescent that were visible from the appeal site. I have already found that the level of footfall and general activity associated with the proposal would result in

negligible levels of harm to the living conditions of future occupiers of neighbouring dwellings when using their gardens. Such considerations lead me to find that the use of the annex as proposed would reflect the prevailing character of the area with no resultant harm.

10. I therefore find that there would be accordance with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LBHLP insofar as they relate to this specific matter. These policies seek to ensure that, amongst other considerations, proposals sensitively and creatively respond to an area's character and the layout, grain, massing and height of surrounding buildings.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge there are family reasons underpinning the appeal proposal, and there may be a fallback position of the planning permission granted for outbuildings under Class E, Part 1, Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO). However, in the evidence before me, there are very few details about the personal circumstances and care needs cited by the appellant. Moreover, there is no substantiated justification to show that a building of this size and internal layout, that includes primary living accommodation, would necessarily be incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwellinghouse. In these circumstances I give the family reasons and the Permitted Development fallback position little weight. It would be open to the appellant to apply to have the matter of lawfulness of the proposal determined under Sections 191 or 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Any such determination would be unaffected by the outcome of this appeal. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of what is proposed and its consequent effects.
12. Finally, I acknowledge the appellant's comments that the appeal site is at low risk from flooding and I have no evidence before me to conclude any differently. This matter is not determinative in my assessment and does not outweigh my findings in relation to the harm to living conditions.

Conclusions

13. I have found that the proposed development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area or the living conditions of certain neighbours. However, I have found harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 71 Harvest Road in terms of outlook. That is the prevailing issue and so, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Sharp

INSPECTOR