



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3368532

57 Park Drive, Acton, Hounslow, London W3 8ND

- 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. P. Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4210.
 - The development proposed is described as the “erection of two storey side extension; single storey rear extension and rear facing dormer roof extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as the “erection of two storey side extension; single storey rear extension and rear facing dormer roof extension” at 57 Park Drive, Acton, Hounslow, London W3 8ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/4210, subject to the following 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 drawing numbers: PARK1-SMART-00-ZZ-DR-A-0001 Revision R01; PARK1-SMART-00-ZZ-DR-A-3001 Revision R02; PARK1-SMART-00-ZZ-DR-A-3601 Revision R02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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 and Main Issue

3. Whilst amended plans have been submitted with the appeal, the process should not be used to evolve a scheme. What is considered at appeal should be the same as was by the Council and interested parties at application stage. Therefore, and for the avoidance of doubt, I have taken the originally submitted plans as referred to above into account.
4. The Council does not object to the proposed single storey rear extension, and I find no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focuses on the proposed two

storey side extension and rear dormer. The main issue in regard to which is whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey end terraced property, with single storey side and rear additions. It fronts onto Park Drive, with Triangle Way to its side and rear. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. It is defined by tightly arranged uniform blocks of terraced and semi-detached houses, organised around an established tennis club at the heart of the estate. The blocks are typically framed by a mirrored pair of projecting gables or catslide roofs to each end, lending to the street's rhythmic consistency. More recent interventions through side and rear dormers are prevalent. However, original features such as mock Tudor boarding, bay windows and detached rear garages are retained, which reinforces the area's traditional, suburban character. Collectively, all these elements positively contribute to the architectural significance of the CA.
6. Due to its prominent location, the proposed two storey side extension would be publicly visible on all sides. However, it would have a proportionate width, lower ridge height and a first floor setback to the front and side. This would ensure that the original building's prominence and design detail is maintained. Its traditional design would integrate well with the suburban setting of the CA. It would also sit within the footprint of the existing side extension, and the use of matching materials would reflect the original dwelling. Moreover, it would break up the bulk of the current side extension's roof, resulting in a more balanced and cohesive structure. The original roofline would be retained to the front, with the proposed hipped roof to reflect the surrounding roofscape. As such, it would comply with Section 5 of the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document 2024 (SPD).
7. The proposed rear dormer would fail to comply with the guidance outlined in Section 18 of the SPD and would increase the bulk of the property to the rear. Despite this, it would be well contained within the new rear roof slope, set below the ridge and eaves height and allow sufficient room either side. This would ensure its appearance retains a degree of subservience. Moreover, it would be viewed in the context of the area, where many similar, substantially sized flat roof extensions exist. Views of it would also be partially obscured by the retained chimney and the mature trees to the rear.
8. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (Framework) places emphasis on great weight being given to the asset's conservation. Given the assessment above, the proposal would ensure that both the character and appearance of the CA is preserved.
9. The appeal scheme would thus comply with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Local Plan 2015 – 2030; Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 (LP); and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek proposals to be of high quality design that responds to the character and appearance of the building and its context. They will also be expected to conserve and enhance any heritage asset and its setting.

Other Matters

10. Policy D1 of the LP has been referred to in the reason for refusal. However, this relates to Boroughs undertaking area assessments and how to use them to establish an area's capacity for growth. I do not find this policy to be applicable to the main issue. The policies mentioned above are sufficient to make a decision against the development plan thereon.
11. Allowing this scheme would not automatically set a precedent for similar proposals which would be required to go through their own site and development specific assessment. Representations have referred to a previous refused decision at the appeal site and elsewhere. However, I have not been supplied with details of these. In any case, I have assessed the appeal scheme on its own planning merits, which I find acceptable for the reasons set out.
12. The alleged unauthorised installation of a satellite dish and the breach of a material condition regarding the current side extension are matters for the Council's planning enforcement team and are not for me to resolve here. Exceeding permitted development allowances under an Article 4 Direction would not be applicable since this appeal seeks express planning permission. Any future use as a house in multiple occupation is also not part of the scheme before me and as no harm has been found on the main issue, the requirement to weigh it against any public benefits is not triggered.

Conditions

13. To provide certainty and for enforcement purposes, it is necessary to impose the standard time limit and to specify the approved plans. A condition is also necessary for materials to match those used on the existing building to maintain the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed in the circumstances set out and subject to the conditions explained, given it would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

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, subject to the aforementioned conditions.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR