



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3366302

36 North Hyde Lane, Hounslow TW5 0EQ

- 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 Jagmeet Singh Malhotra against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/0909
 - The development proposed is for erection of ground floor rear/side extension to the house.
-

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 host dwelling, the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a housing estate that is characterised by detached, semi-detached and short terraces of uniformly designed two storey houses from a limited range of designs. Their similar design detailing including front projecting gables, materials, strong building lines and modest sized front gardens reinforce the sense of rhythm and uniformity within the street scene and the estate as a whole. This is despite the fact that many of the dwellings have been altered and/or extended, particularly to the rear.
4. The appeal property occupies a prominent position within the street scene adjacent to the junction of North Hyde Lane and The Vale. Whilst the highway narrows at this end of The Vale, its wide verges, absence of parked cars and the single storey nature of the side extension at 38 North Hyde Lane, help retain a sense of space within the street scene.
5. The appeal dwelling comprises one of a pair of symmetrically designed houses with prominent front facing gables and fully hipped roofs. The adjoining dwelling (No.34), has a recessed two storey side extension with a hipped roof which sits below the ridge line of the host dwelling. The appeal dwelling has a hip to gable extension and a two storey side extension with a prominent gable end facing towards The Vale is currently being constructed.
6. To the rear of the appeal dwelling a large flat roofed dormer extension; a projecting two storey extension with a pitched roof; and a flat roofed single storey extension are currently being constructed. These extensions are all recessed behind the existing two storey side

- extension. Notwithstanding this, together with the two storey side extension with its gable end, they are prominent and have an enclosing effect within the street scene.
7. In particular, when approaching from the west along The Vale the rear extensions are prominent, both because they are partially sited forward of the adjacent dwellings in The Vale and because the front gardens of the dwellings in The Vale and the rear garden to the appeal site form an open vista above the existing tall boundary fence. Whilst I acknowledge that much of the rear single storey extension being constructed is screened by a tall fence, its upper part is clearly visible and adds to the overall bulk and rather stark appearance of the extensions.
 8. Collectively and amongst other things policies CC1 & SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP), require proposals to respond sensitively to the local architectural vernacular and to conserve and maintain the character of the area. Extensions should not harm the existing character of the building and should complement the existing building. The councils Residential Extensions Guidelines is consistent with this. It advises that extra care is required with corner plots due to their exposed location and that wrap around extensions will normally be refused.
 9. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework), sets out a presumption in favour of development and a positive approach to dealing with proposals. Together Paragraphs 129, 131 and 135 of the Framework state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Proposals should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, be sympathetic to local character and history and add to the overall quality of the area. Proposals should also look to make effective use of land and optimise the development potential of the site.
 10. In itself, the proposed infill extension would be modest in size. However, due to its siting close to The Vale and wrap around design it would materially add to the bulk of the extensions currently being constructed. The resultant extensions would appear bulky and out of keeping with the form and character of the host dwelling, the street scene and the prevailing character of the area. As stated in paragraph 139 of the Framework development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.
 11. The harm that would be caused by the proposal would outweigh the benefits for the appellant and their family that would result from the proposal and is not something that could be adequately addressed through the imposition of conditions.
 12. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with LP Policies CC1 & SC7 and the SPD.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR