



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3374557

170 Hatton Road, Feltham, Hounslow TW14 9PY

- 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 Abbasi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1138.
 - The development proposed is The subdivision of the existing residential plot and erection of a new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene;
 - Whether or not there would be an effect on the living conditions of neighbours by way of noise and disturbance; and
 - Whether or not there would be a site accessibility issue.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is the rear garden of the detached dwelling of 170 Hatton Road, that would be subdivided. The local area is characterised by residential dwellings. The rear garden is linear and particularly long when compared to the neighbouring gardens along this side of Hatton Road. Along this part of Hatton Road is distinctive for its older traditional two storey dwellings.
4. Directly behind the appeal site lies the modern housing estate of Marriott Close. This estate contains rows of houses and pairs of two storey maisonettes. All these dwellings share the same design characteristics although more modern housing association blocks of purpose built flats are positioned off Marriott Close and close to Hatton Road, designed to a more contemporary finish.
5. The existing garden is surrounded by a combination of garage blocks laid out in planned courtyard arrangements and rows associated with dwellings within Marriott Close, and the residential gardens of a number of these dwellings.

6. There is an existing timber pedestrian gate within the corner of the garden between a group of garages and 5 and 7 Marriott Close, leading across a grassed parcel of highway land. This would be used to facilitate pedestrian access into the site and would be a car free development.
7. Although it would not relate to the typical two storey typologies of Marriott Close and the pattern of dwellings here have a street frontage, in this location in this context, a flat roofed dwelling of modest proportions including brickwork finish could be absorbed into the existing urban grain.
8. That being said, the external appearance of the building has limited aesthetic value. It would be seen above the existing garages and boundary treatments, seen in-between dwellings at Marriott Close as well as in views from the proposed site access. The dominance of brickwork with limited openings and as a consequence, the proportion of openings to brickwork would appear as a large domestic outbuilding, even with the grassed flat roof, rather than a detached dwelling of a residential characteristic, to which it is intended to function.
9. As the proposed access point would allow public views towards the dwelling and two of the three ramps that would surround part of the building would be visible, further reinforcing its poor articulation. Its appearance would have a limited but none the less adverse impact on local character.
10. The proposal would therefore not meet the expectations of the Local Plan in so far as the broad design aims of Policy SC1, character and context principles of policies CC1 and CC2. I have not been provided with the Council's Housing Design Standards LPG to consider. The Council refers to paragraph 71 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This relates to tenure mixes although I am not aware of how this directly affects the proposal before me. I find no direct correlation to Policy SC7 as this concerns residential extensions and alterations.

Living Conditions

11. The local area is residential in character. This is an existing rear garden where the occupants have free access to enjoy. Other domestic spaces back onto the appeal site and as a whole, there will be an expectation of existing noise and disturbance arising within this urban context.
12. A new dwelling would add to the housing supply locally and increase numbers of occupants. The net gain of one dwelling would however be of limited consequence and therefore I am not of the view that the effect of noise and disturbance would be such an intensification as to harm the living conditions of local occupants.
13. Therefore, with regards to this main issue, it would safeguard the living conditions of local occupants in accordance with policies CC2 and EQ5 in so far as amenity is protected. I find no direct relevance to Policy SC7 as this is associated with residential extensions and alterations or the Residential Extensions Guidelines.

Site Accessibility

14. A piece of existing highway land is required to be crossed to facilitate access onto the site. This is outside the ownership of the appellant and negotiations with the Council are required to secure access across the land, in perpetuity. There is no alternative to separately access the site without crossing part of this land. The appellant considers an appropriately worded condition would satisfy the lawful right

of access across the land. I have considered this in light of paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

15. The appellant has submitted a full planning application. Therefore, the access into the site should be considered as part of the proposal as a whole. Without a mechanism to ensure this can be secured, with no alternative means to access the site, I am not convinced it would be appropriate to condition the scheme as it would not meet the six tests of paragraph 57 of the Framework.
16. Therefore, the proposal would not meet the aims of Local Plan policies with regards to good overall design, layout and integration expectations of CC1, CC2 and SC7. The Housing Design Standards LPG is not before me to comment. With regards to Policy EC2, this is related to sustainable travel. It is not directly relevant to physical accessibility of the site.

Other Matters

17. Even if the proposal would be designed to be energy efficient, this would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
18. I am aware of the objections received to the proposal. One area of concern relates to a loss of privacy to one objector as well as a number of other concerns raised. However, as I am dismissing the appeal, there is not requirement for me to comment further on these matters.

Balance and Conclusion

19. In this circumstance, the design of the proposal by way of poor articulation it would harm the character and appearance of the local area. The mechanism to secure the means of access across third party land into the site has not been demonstrated. Although I conclude the scheme would cause no adverse effects to the living conditions of local occupants by way of noise and disturbance, this however does not overcome the harm I have identified.
20. The proposed development would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR