



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **S Sharp BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3373768

176 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 Koti against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application reference is P/2025/1089.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side garage extension bringing in line with the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant submitted an amended set of plans with the appeal, included as Appendix B to their Statement. A balustrade and side parapet were shown on the plans the subject of the decision by the Council. The appellant has clarified that this balustrade and side parapet do not form part of the appeal proposal and they are omitted from the amended plans for clarity. They were also not included in the description of development on the application form. The amended plans also include annotation confirming that the existing garage is used for storage and not accommodating a motor vehicle and that ancillary storage is the proposed use of the appeal proposal.
3. Although the amended set of plans have not been the subject of public consultation, they do not constitute a substantial difference or a fundamental change to the application. They do not result in a different application. A decision based on this amended set of plans would not cause unlawful procedural unfairness to anyone involved in the appeal. I have therefore based my decision on these amended plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site with special attention paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Osterley Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The site lies within the Osterley Park Conservation Area (CA). In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The appeal site

was incorporated into the CA in 2019, and its character and appearance are of leafy suburbia. The relatively narrow width of Wood Lane, the hedge and trees on the east side of the road, and the lower background noise levels compared to those experienced further south around the Great West Road, are all values that contribute to the significance of the area. It is part of the wider setting of Osterley Park which was the focus of the original designation.

6. The design and detailing of many of the dwellings on the west side of Wood Lane also contribute to the significance of the CA. They are an eclectic mix of architectural styles and ages but the host dwelling at the appeal site is, with No 178 Wood Lane, a particular positive contributor to the CA's significance. This pair of semi-detached 2 storey dwellings is 1930s in origin and, although the subject of alterations and subtle differences, possesses a pleasing symmetry when viewed from Wood Lane. It includes features of aesthetic value such as the porches, bay windows and chimney breast. No 178 Wood Lane features a side extension that is not set back from the main part of the host dwelling's front elevation, but the structure is lightweight in construction with a front elevation that is largely open, except for a transparent panel. The openness and transparency of this design visually allow the proportions and the aesthetic values of the host dwelling to remain the focus of one's attention when viewed from Wood Lane, and it has not disrupted the overall symmetry of the pair of dwellings.
7. The proposed extension, the subject of this appeal, would be in line with the main part of the front elevation of the host dwelling, and it would be faced in brick and feature a solid shutter door facing Wood Lane. The extension is not proposed to project as far forward as the bay windows and porch, but its positioning, solidity and visibility from Wood Lane, would result in it being an overly prominent and distracting addition. It would visually disrupt the original proportions and symmetry of the building as a whole (Nos 176 and 178) and detract from details such as the porch and bay windows of aesthetic value that contribute to the dwelling's positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the area.
8. I acknowledge that the proposal would not result in a terracing effect because of the gap that would remain to Nos 172-174 Wood Lane. The proposed extension would also be less than half the width of the original building and parallel to it. However, the accordance with these principles does not overcome the harm identified. I also observed that other dwellings in Wood Lane, including No 170, feature an attached or integral garage not set back from the front elevation. Furthermore, I noted the different designs and scale of buildings present in the vicinity of the appeal site, notably the adjoining block of flats at Nos 172-174 Wood Lane. However, it is the aesthetic values of the host dwelling at the appeal site and the contribution it makes as a largely symmetrical pair, with No 178 Wood Lane, to the CA's significance, that are considerations that materially differentiate the impact of the appeal proposal in comparison to those other examples.
9. The harm to the significance of the CA is at the lower end of less than substantial harm and no public benefits have been identified in the evidence before me that would outweigh this level of harm. The proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As a result, it would conflict with policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LBHLP). These policies seek to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the asset's significance and to ensure that proposals retain, promote and

support high quality design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive, and liveable places to maintain the character of an area. The appellant has cited policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 (LP). The latter, with the LBHLP, is part of the development plan covering the appeal site and the cited policies seek to enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape. For the reasons already given, I also find conflict with these policies in the LP. In reaching these findings, I have had regard to the guidance contained within Part A5 of the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD 2024 which, amongst other criteria, seeks to ensure that proposed side extensions are set back from the main part of the front elevation to allow the original proportions of the host building to remain the prominent feature.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has highlighted that his family currently has security concerns, with several unsuccessful attempts and one successful instance of theft occurring at the appeal site. They state that the proposal would increase security to the main living space in the dwelling by inhibiting access to the side of it. There is no evidence before me as to whether and how this open side area was a factor in the attempts and successful instance of theft. I note that the side area is overlooked by the adjoining dwelling and from Wood Lane itself. I therefore afford this benefit very little weight as a consideration in the overall planning balance. It is also a private benefit and not a public one that could be weighed against the harm to the significance of the CA.
11. The appellant has also cited benefits to be derived from the proposed extension blocking the view into a study area in the host dwelling from an existing, openable first floor window on the side elevation of Nos 172-174 Wood Lane. The betterment to the living conditions of occupiers of the host dwelling is a benefit but one that I afford very little weight in the overall planning balance. Again, this benefit is private and not public and cannot be weighed against the harm to the significance of the CA. In other respects, the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupiers of the appeal dwelling and neighbouring dwellings would be neutral.
12. The amended plans the subject of this appeal and my observations on site confirm that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the supply of, and demand for, off street parking at the appeal site.
13. Finally, I acknowledge the appellant's concerns in relation to the Council's handling of the application and specifically the lack of opportunity to submit amended plans. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under this planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal. The appellant has suggested that such amendments, incorporating a set back of the extension behind the line of the main elevation of the host dwelling, could be secured by condition. However, I can only determine the appeal on the plans before me and such a condition would be unreasonable.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Osterley Conservation Area, it would conflict with the provisions of the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Sharp

INSPECTOR