



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3361713

182A Wood Lane, Isleworth, Hounslow TW7 5EH

- 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 Gurmeet Singh Lamba against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/3708.
 - The development proposed is erection of two first floor rear extensions following demolition of a chimney.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of two first floor rear extensions following demolition of a chimney, at 182A Wood Lane, Isleworth, Hounslow TW7 5EH, in accordance with the terms of the application P/2024/3708, subject to the conditions set out below.
 - 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 drawing numbers: Site Location Plan, PL-050-001, PL-100-001, PL-100-002, PL-100-003, PL-100-011, PL-100-012, PL-100-013, PL-200-001 and PL-200-011.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. In the interests of accuracy, in the banner heading above I have used the description of development as provided for on the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

4. Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Osterley Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site lies within the CA and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to

the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

6. The appeal building is a two-storey detached home in a generous plot on a narrow lane with playing fields opposite. The wider area is of established residential character with varied designs and ages. Most are set back from the road, are detached or semi-detached, mostly have off road parking and pleasing front landscaping and generous rear gardens. The high quality, low density and larger gardens are features which allow the opportunity for trees and gaps between roofs, all of which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The appeal proposal would use the existing dwelling footprint and mirror the design detail of the existing dwelling to construct a first floor rear extension and a first floor rear infill extension. It would use hipped roofs, a feature characteristic of the wider area, and would use matching materials.
8. The Council raise concerns about the width and height of the first floor rear extension and its compliance with the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Part A5 Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2024). Despite the height and width of the proposed rear first floor extension, the scale and size of the proposal would be consistent with the built form of the surrounding area and the proportions of the original building.
9. Furthermore, with regard to the first floor rear infill extension, the Council raise concerns about the loss of original design features. In this instance, given that the proposal would use matching materials and hipped roofs, taking design cues from the original house, the proposal would have a positive effect on the original architecture. Despite its depth and the infill, subordination would be demonstrated by the step down in the rear hipped roof and the retention of the ground floor rear roof element which would be visible from the north and rear elevations. Overall, the scale and form of the proposed development would replicate the existing and would be proportionate and subordinate to the main house.
10. Consequently, the proposal would complement the existing building, harmonise with the wider area and thus preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Local Plan, and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), insofar as they require development to be of high-quality design that responds to local distinctiveness, preserves the character and appearance of the host property and preserves the character or appearance of the CA.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard three-year period implementation condition, which is a statutory requirement, it is necessary, in the interest of certainty and precision, to define the plans with which the appeal scheme should accord.
12. The Council have suggested a condition requiring that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces match those of the existing building. This would be unnecessary given the detail provided on the approved plans.

13. The Council have suggested a condition requiring that no additional windows or openings shall be formed in the side and rear elevations of the development, in order to protect the privacy of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. This is unnecessary as such development would require separate permission or approval.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR