
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3371668

33 Worton Way, Isleworth TW7 4AX

- 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 Khandelwal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1251.
 - The development proposed is described as “roof extension to form habitable, a rear dormer and roof windows to the front & rear sloping roof”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as “roof extension to form habitable, a rear dormer and roof windows to the front & rear sloping roof” at 33 Worton Way, Isleworth TW7 4AX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/1251, 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: 03, 03-2, 04 and 05
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matter & Main Issue

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.
3. The description of development on the application form differs to the decision notice. I am however satisfied that it still accurately describes the proposal so the main parties would not be prejudiced by me using it for the appeal scheme. The main issue in regard to which is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a semi-detached dwelling which has been significantly extended to both the side and the rear. Many of the surrounding buildings have been extended in a similar way and the street is generally comprised of semi-detached examples set back from and facing the road. Symmetry plays a part in the street scene as far as roof profiles go so there is an element of consistency to

the street scene in this and the above regards. The immediate non-attached neighbour is gabled and attached to a hipped example.

5. The appeal proposal would change the roofline from a hip to gable to facilitate the rear dormer works. As the attached neighbouring building retains its hipped roof, this would result in an unbalancing effect between the two properties as a pair. However, and since the non-adjoined neighbour is already gabled, the works in this regard would actually reinstate a form of symmetry as a group of four. Taking into account that spacing between pairs has become significant eroded over time due to the multitude of two storey side additions, such a change in this regard would be more easily absorbed into the evolved street scene. The alterations would also retain a subservient appearance to the previous two storey side extension.
6. The dormer at the rear would not satisfy the guidance set out in the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document. It would no doubt be a substantial addition spanning most of the original roof. That said, it would be largely obscured from the front and read at the rear amongst a number of similar examples. It would not therefore, these concerns aside, leap out as an alien addition. The rear facing windows would also be in line with the corresponding fenestration of the lower floors, ensuring a degree of consistency and even rhythm with the rest of the building.
7. The proposals would therefore be acceptable for the character and appearance of the area and consequently comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Conditions

8. The time limit condition and reference to the approved plans are required for enforcement purposes. I have included a matching materials condition to ensure that development remains in keeping with the wider building. The Council have not recommended any other conditions, and I have not considered any others to be necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions listed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR