



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/25/3366445

16 Westmacott Drive, Feltham, TW14 9RN

- 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 Mrs Girly Weerasingha Arachchilage against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4256
 - The development proposed is for a single storey front extension with tiled roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension with tiled roof at 16 Westmacott Drive, Feltham, TW14 9RN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/4256 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan, block plan and drawing Numbers 2024/112/01, 2024/112/02, 2024/112/03, 2024/112/04, 2024/112/05 & 2024/112/06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

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 local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a modern housing estate that is characterised by two storey detached, semi-detached and short terraces of two storey brick and rendered dwellings. The buildings have varied building and ridge lines and are informally arranged around curved roads.
4. Within Westmacott Drive many of the properties either back onto or sit at right angles to the highway and include tall rear/side fences, outbuildings and garages. This contributes to the mixed character and sense of enclosure within the street scene. The siting and appearance of the appeal property is consistent with this. The appeal dwelling is located within a small terrace of four irregularly designed

- dwellings with varied front building lines and roof designs. At the front the appeal dwelling is both recessed between and lower than the adjoining dwellings.
5. On one side of the terrace is a double garage whose pitched roof is hipped away from the pavement and beyond this garage are the rear gardens of an irregular shaped terrace that fronts onto a different road. On the other side of the appeal terrace the flank wall and fencing along the rear garden of another terrace fronts onto Westmacott Drive. Directly opposite the host terrace is an irregular shaped terrace whose flank walls project close to the pavement. Throughout the estate elements of the designs of these terraces are repeated and adapted to the curved alignment of the highway.
 6. Collectively and amongst other things policies CC1, CC2 & SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP), require proposals to respond sensitively the local architectural vernacular and to conserve and enhance the character of the area. Residential extensions should complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining dwellings and maintain the character of the street scene.
 7. Part 5 of the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Code (SPD) sets out residential extension guidelines. Paragraph AS1 acknowledges that every property is slightly different and the SPD is part of the consideration of a proposal. Paragraph 9.1 advises that front extensions that are larger than a porch will normally be refused due to their ability to appear bulky and significantly change the appearance of the house and street.
 8. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 sets out a presumption in favour of development and a positive approach to dealing with proposals. Together Paragraphs 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.
 9. The proposed extension would fill most of the recess between the adjoining dwellings which both have front porch projections. It would respect the strong horizontal lines of the host dwelling and would remain recessed between the adjoining dwellings above ground floor level. The front elevation would continue to have brick walls at ground floor level and render at first floor level above the proposed tiled roof. Also, notwithstanding the introduction of small top opening panes, the proposed windows would be proportionate in size and form. The appeal dwelling would have a front garden that would be consistent in size to the adjacent gardens and would not result in the loss of any off-street parking spaces.
 10. As a result of these factors the proposed extension would respect and complement the host dwelling. It would also respect the host terrace, with the appeal dwelling remaining visually modest and subservient and would be readily assimilated into the varied street scene and the local area. The proposal would also enhance the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling, without compromising the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining and nearby dwellings. In reaching this conclusion, I have assessed the proposal against the advice and guidance set out in the SPD and find that the proposal complies with the LP Policies CC1, CC2 & SC7.
 11. Finally, the council has suggested the imposition of conditions related to the use of matching external materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. These conditions are necessary to ensure the proposed extension blends in the host dwelling and terrace and in the interests of certainty.

12. I conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene and the local area. Accordingly, it would comply with LP Policies CC1, CC2 & SC7 and the objectives of the SPD.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR