



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

**by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2026

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3374726**

### **37 Raleigh Road, Feltham TW13 4LE**

- 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 Ms Anna Zelazko against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application reference is P/2025/1126.
  - The development proposed is change of use class of part of a dwelling house (an existing study room, located within an existing side extension, on ground floor) (Use Class C3), into a dog grooming studio (Use Class Sui Generis).
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use class of part of a dwelling house (an existing study room, located within an existing side extension, on ground floor) (Use Class C3), into a dog grooming studio (Use Class Sui Generis), at 37 Raleigh Road, Feltham TW13 4LE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/1126, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

### **Main Issues**

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would represent a suitable location for the proposed use, having regard to i) relevant development plan policy, ii) the effect on the character and appearance of the area; iii) the effect on neighbours' living conditions; and iv) the effect on the surrounding transport network.

### **Reasons**

#### *Development Plan*

3. The Council cites conflict with Policies CC1, TC3 and TC5 of the Hounslow Local Plan (September 2015) (the HLP) in its first reason for refusal, but the officer report does not elaborate on the proposal's interactions with these policies beyond brief comments that provision of a commercial use within a residential area is not supported.
4. Policy CC1 relates to the character and context of the area, setting a positive vision for maintaining or improving character by responding to surrounding context. In this respect, the predominantly residential character of the area is an obvious consideration, but the policy does not set out any explicit restriction on business uses locating outside of town centres.
5. Policy TC3 seeks to direct town centre uses to one of the Borough's four town centres, or to demonstrate through a sequential test that suitable locations in town centres are not available, followed by edge-of-centre locations, then large

neighbourhood centres, small neighbourhood centres and finally out-of-centre sites. Policy TC5 addresses neighbourhood centres and isolated local shops, protecting existing centres and units and encouraging new units in centres.

6. Main town centre uses are defined in the glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Dog grooming is not specifically listed, and the fact that it is proposed as a sui generis use, and the Council has not challenged this, is one indicator that it is not a typical town centre use.
7. The use would be operated by the residents of the dwelling as a home-based business. No external commercial signage is proposed and customers would visit on an appointment basis. In this respect, the proposal would not rely on passing footfall, such that it would be best served by locating in a town or neighbourhood centre. It would instead be an operation of modest scale which would not require a bespoke commercial premises in a town centre. Moreover, given its small scale and the fact that users would visit for a specific purpose, the use would not compete with or draw customers from existing centres. Nor is there specific evidence before me that the vitality or viability the nearest defined centres is under threat, or that the failure to locate the proposed use in a defined centre would deprive these centres of a business needed to maintain said vitality or viability.
8. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the vitality or viability of the Borough's town, district or neighbourhood centres, and no conflict would arise with the aforementioned aims of Policies TC3 and TC5. In addition, the small scale of the use would not effect a demonstrable change to the prevailing residential character, and no conflict in this respect would arise with Policy CC1.

#### *Character and Appearance*

9. The proposal includes the external change of a window to a French door on the front elevation, which would access the proposed dog grooming area. I have noted the Council's Residential Design Guidance (May 2024) which sets out that separate front doors will not normally be acceptable on side extensions.
10. The plans indicate a door of similar design to the existing fenestration. The door would have the same width and framing material/colour as the existing window, with the sill lowered to ground level. The door would appear broader than the existing front door owing to the inclusion of a side light, but would be in a recessed position behind the parking area on the front drive, where the extended depth of the fenestration would be frequently screened by the appellant's parked vehicle.
11. Viewed from the street, the change would be modest. The property has a tall front wall with horizontal railings that filters views of the lower parts of the front elevation. Effectively, the upper part of the door would be visible with the same overall position, height and width as the existing window. The dwelling would retain a residential character and coherent overall appearance, with the projecting, centrally placed front porch still forming the visual focal point of the front elevation.
12. In the wider context, the change to the fenestration would not be obvious within what is a long, expansive streetscene characterised by consistency in scale, shape and roof form, but with variation in fenestration, facing materials, porches and boundary treatments. Thus, the proposal would not undermine the overall

pattern of development or the principal elements of consistency that contribute positively to the area's character.

13. Overall, whilst acknowledging that the Council's design guidance is generally resistant to additional front doors, in this case I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the HLP, which together require development to complement the original building and harmonise with the wider area.

#### *Neighbours' Living Conditions*

14. The Council's reason for refusal cites an absence of information as to the nature of the proposed use, including customer numbers and hours of operation, and thus a failure to demonstrate that the proposal would not harm neighbours' living conditions by reason of noise and disturbance.
15. The appellant's planning statement sets out that customers would visit on an appointment only basis. Having observed the size of the proposed dog grooming space, I am satisfied that it would not be practical to have more than one customer at a time. The proposed hours of operation are given as 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday, which represent reasonable daytime working hours where neighbouring residents are less likely to be at home and disturbed by activity on the appeal site.
16. Appointments are indicated to last between 2 and 2.5 hours, with 30 mins for cleaning before the next appointment. Thus, a maximum of three appointments per day would be expected, with only one dog on site at any one time. This, along with the appellant's intent to install acoustic panelling, would assist in reducing the frequency and volume of noise from any barking to a level which, on the evidence before me, would be no worse than that from any domestic environment where dogs are present.
17. Moreover, the position of the proposed studio would be to the opposite side of the dwelling from the shared party wall with No 39, and would be separate from the living spaces of No 35 on the other side by the neighbours' attached garage. I am satisfied that, subject to necessary planning conditions to ensure the use operates as described, that it would not generate a level of noise or disturbance that would materially undermine neighbours' living conditions.
18. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, and no conflict arises with Policies CC2 and EQ5 of the HLP, which require proposals to function well in themselves and in their effect on surrounding areas, have a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents and to consider the impact of noise, and mitigation of these impacts, on new users and surrounding uses.

#### *Effect on Transport Network*

19. The appellant initially indicated that up to two employees would work from the site, including the appellant herself. The Council has raised concern over potential parking demand by an external staff member. The appellant has clarified that only the appellant and her partner, who both reside at the property, would operate as employees, with no external parties employed.
20. The PTAL Rating for the site is 1a, meaning poor access to public transport, though there are bus stops within some 10 minutes' walk on High Street. Given the

nature of the use, some customers may choose to walk their dogs to and from the site, whilst others would drive to the business if not living close by. Overall, the site is not so remotely located that it could not be reached by sustainable modes of transport.

21. Moreover, trip generation and additional demand for parking would be limited to one customer at a time during daytime hours, and around three over the course of the day. Raleigh Road is not subject to parking restrictions and I saw spaces available on street at the time of my visit. On this basis, I am satisfied any on-street parking demand arising would be limited and would not pose a significant risk to highway safety or inconvenience other residents. In these respects, the development would not conflict with the Framework, which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
22. For these reasons, I find no conflict with Policy EC2 of the HLP in terms of its requirement that proposals demonstrate that adverse impacts on the transport network are avoided.

### **Other Matters**

23. The Council raises concern at the proposed closing off of the internal access to the dog grooming studio as facilitating a separate, self-contained commercial unit. However, the studio would remain part of the same property with a single access point from the street and domestic parking immediately in front. Conditions can be imposed to ensure that the studio is not used by persons other than the occupants of the dwelling or separately to the primary residential use of the property.
24. I have had regard to the alternative proposals advanced by the appellant but, given my findings above, it is not necessary to consider these as a potential fall-back, as it would not be determinative to my overall decision.

### **Conditions**

25. A condition setting out the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. To ensure the use operates as intended, conditions are required specifying opening hours, the location of the proposed use, the number of customers on site at any time and the timing and recording of appointments. It is also necessary to restrict the use to the occupants of the property, to prevent separate use of the studio by others which may give rise to unanticipated impacts, including for occupants' living conditions and parking.

### **Conclusion**

26. On the main issues, I have found the proposal would be acceptable and, overall, would preserve the prevailing residential character of the area. The proposal would accord with the development plan when considered as a whole. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

*K. Savage*

INSPECTOR

### Schedule of 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 the following drawing numbers:
    - 2509-CD-101 Rev 02 (Location Plan)
    - 2509-CD-102 Rev 02 (Block Plan)
    - 2509-CD-103 Rev 02 (Block Plan – Fire Service Site Plan)
    - 2509-CD-110 Rev 02 (Ground Floor – Existing)
    - 2509-CD-111 Rev 02 (First Floor – Existing & Proposed)
    - 2509-CD-112 Rev 02 (Roof Plan – Existing & Proposed)
    - 2509-CD-120 Rev 02 (Front Elevation – Existing)
    - 2509-CD-210 Rev 02 (Ground Floor – Proposed)
    - 2509-CD-220 Rev 02 (Front Elevation – Proposed)
  - 3) The use hereby permitted shall take place during the following hours:
    - Monday to Friday 9am – 5pmand no customer shall be permitted to attend the premises outside of these hours or on Saturdays, Sundays or Bank Holidays.
  - 4) The use hereby permitted shall be restricted to the dog grooming business operated by the owners/occupiers of the property, Ms Anna Zelazko and Mr Robert Ziolkowski. The use permitted shall occur only in the studio room as identified on drawing 2509-CD-210 Rev 02. The permitted use shall cease, and the room shall revert to residential use forming part of the dwelling at 37 Raleigh Road, Feltham TW13 4LE, if the dog grooming business ceases to operate from the premises. No other parties shall be employed on the site other than the two owner/occupiers of the dwelling.
  - 5) The number of customers on the premises shall not exceed one at any given time. All customer appointments in connection with the dog grooming use hereby permitted must be pre-arranged allowing a minimum of 10 minutes between the end of one appointment and the start of the next consecutive appointment. An appointment diary shall be maintained and be available for inspection on request by officers of the Local Planning Authority.
-