
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: 05 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3374794

Rear of 26 Carlton Avenue, Land to the east of Denham Road, Feltham, Hounslow TW14 0DB

- 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 IBC Property Development Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1488.
 - The development proposed is erection of a new single storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The site is located within a densely built-up urban and residential area of North Feltham. It is a semi-detached dwelling and located on the corner with Carlton Avenue and Denham Road. The dwelling of 26 Carlton Avenue backs onto the rear garden of Number 3 Denham Road behind. It is within part of the rear garden of Number 26 Carlton Avenue that would be subdivided to which a single bungalow is proposed to be positioned.
4. The dwellings here consist of a mix of ages and styles and of semi-detached or short terraces of houses, many extended from their original build. They are laid out in planned housing layouts in a relatively ordered and consistent pattern, and I could see that the long rear gardens behind houses are a characteristic of the local area.
5. I could also see from my inspection that Number 24 Carlton Avenue has a double garage at the bottom of their garden with access directly onto Denham Road. This is a typical feature within residential gardens and does not look out of place. Therefore, low level domestic buildings in gardens laid out perpendicular to the main dwelling in this context are not an alien feature within the street scene.
6. Turning to the proposal before me to erect a dwelling on this garden land, the site is one of a constrained nature given it is a domestic garden located in a suburban context. The scale presented as a wide double fronted bungalow of the proportions before me, set close to the back of the estate road and encompassing nearly the

full width of the plot, with limited undeveloped space either side, would only seek to appear cramped in its surroundings when viewed from the street scene.

7. The site would be broadly speaking the shape of the number '7' as the angled nature of the site boundary would create an awkward and uncharacteristic plot configuration. In this location the grain of development is such that houses front onto the street scene with reasonably sized gardens to the rear of houses. The proposed development would occupy most of its width with an unusually shaped rear garden. The layout would be at odds with the established characteristic layout of the locality. Above all, it would poorly integrate into the street scene despite the use of matching materials and the use of similar design cues taken from the existing vernacular, leading to visual intrusiveness and a detriment to the character and appearance of the local area.
8. There is nothing before me to indicate the proposal would be built to a 'high quality' standard according to the appellant and even if the site is not part of a statutorily designated heritage asset within a conservation area, these things considered, does not lead me to a more favourable decision. I understand the appellant has engaged with the local authority through pre-application advice and made amendments to the proposal to satisfy Council concerns, which demonstrates some compromise on their part.
9. The dwelling's proposed room sizes, daylight issues and effects on neighbour living conditions have not been disputed by the Council and I have no reason to form an alternative view on these matters. Nor do I find a reason to argue against the direct access onto Denham Road for cycles and waste management or on-street parking availability. The appellant raises the point that the Council do not object to the principle of development. That may be so but there are many material planning considerations that are required to be met before development here can be deemed acceptable.
10. There are no examples of this type of scheme seen locally and despite the appellant's comparison to No 7 Lafone Avenue, this is a distance from the appeal site and set within a materially different urban context. It cannot be directly compared to the proposal before me. Nor do the semi-detached dwellings of Numbers 2 and 4 Denham Road compare as despite the fact they sit perpendicular to the garden of Number 24 Carlton Avenue, they are more akin to the character of the existing architectural rhythm than the appeal before me. They integrate into the street scene.
11. There would be associated benefits arising from the proposal by way of a new dwelling adding to the Borough's stock with green credentials. These are given some moderate weight in the balance. The appellant maintains that the site is underutilised although there is nothing to substantiate this. The appellant asserts that a new dwelling here would increase natural visual surveillance of the local area and discourage anti-social behaviours and fly tipping that arises along the grass verge running parallel to the garden boundary, and indiscriminate parking, and provide guardianship to this grass verge. Be that as it may, there is nothing before me to substantiate their concerns and, in any case, there are other means to improve upon these things other than by erecting this dwelling. The site may be built out in a well-managed way by the appellant, however how this would be substantiated is not before me and I apportion no weight to this.

12. All things considered, in the balance, the benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the local area.
13. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would not respect the character and context of the local area to which runs contrary to Local Plan Policy CC1, or the good design aims of Policy CC2.

Conclusion

14. 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