



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2026 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Zoë Franks, Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/C/25/3373374

23 Oaklands Avenue, Isleworth TW7 5PX

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Qani Bici against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The notice was issued on 11 August 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the unauthorised construction of roof extensions.
 - The requirements of the notice are to: i. Demolish the rear roof dormer; ii. Demolish the side roof dormer; iii. Restore the roof of the house back to its condition prior to the breach taking place and iv. Remove all resulting debris and materials from the land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 9 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

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. The Council did not attend the arranged accompanied site visit. I therefore proceeded with an access required site visit and observed everything I needed to see on the appeal site and in the surrounding area. The Council has further confirmed that a second site visit is not required.
4. On 17 August 2026 the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The main parties were invited to comment on the revised Framework in relation to the development so that their views would be considered in the determination of the appeal.

Ground (a) and the deemed planning application

5. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Osterley Park Conservation Area (CA).

6. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located in the CA, which covers a large area including the historic Osterley Park and part of the residential area southeast of the park to the A4 Great West Road. Its significance is mostly derived from the Grade I listed Osterley House, its landscaped grounds and rural setting, which together is one of the last remaining country estates in London. The CA is also notable for its houses whose integrity of roof form, architectural features, quality of materials and design reflects the suburban character of the time and thus adds to the significance of the CA.
7. The property is located in an area of the CA which is partly characterised by late interwar and early postwar two-storey semi-detached houses. Although I observed various roof extensions on Oaklands Avenue on my site visit, I also found that hipped roof forms and plain roof slopes are still common in the street scene and thus contribute positively to the integrity of the roofscape in the CA. Moreover, the appeal property's existing elevations demonstrate that its simple hipped roof form generally reflected this surrounding roofscape and therefore contributed positively to the suburban character and appearance of the CA.
8. Despite still being pitched, the steeper angle of the roof's side extension has altered the host dwelling's characteristic hipped roof form and is notably steeper than the angle of the other hipped roofs on Oaklands Avenue. Combined with the gable roof design of the side dormer window, the side extension has a mansard style which further undermines the hipped style of the original dwelling. Even considering the appeal site's limited visibility by virtue of its location at the end of the cul-de-sac, the altered hipped roof angle and side dormer are incongruous additions to the host dwelling and in the street scene.
9. Furthermore, even though it is slightly set down from the roof ridge and setback from the eaves, due to its excessive scale and mass, the rear dormer window appears as a bulky addition which dominates the rear roof slope of the host dwelling. Its shallow dual-pitched roof form and window proportions also fail to reflect the prevailing design of the dwelling's original roof and windows. The rear dormer window is therefore a further discordant addition to the appeal property which is harmful to its appearance. The use of matching materials both in terms of the side and rear elements of the development does not overcome the harm.
10. I acknowledge that there are roof extensions including side and rear dormers on Oaklands Avenue and in the surrounding area, such as those referred to by the appellant. Even so, I have not been provided with the plans, decision notices and officer reports for these. Therefore, as I do not have the full planning background, I cannot make a direct comparison with the appeal scheme, and this limits the weight I can give to the examples. Some of the other extensions referred to are also from some time ago and I do not know the policies which applied. Moreover, on my site visit I found that such alterations generally serve to confirm that incongruous roof extensions are harmful to the integrity of the roofscape. Nor did I see any examples which are the same in terms of the combination of the roof angle and side and rear dormers. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
11. I therefore conclude that the development amounts to an excessively large roof extension which fails to respect the scale and design of the host building and the surrounding roofscape. Consequently, the development has introduced an incongruous feature which undermines the integrity of the roofscape which is

indicative of the suburban character of the area, thus resulting in harm to the significance of the CA.

12. I have had regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. For the reasons set out above, the development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This has resulted in harm to the significance of the CA. Given that the harm is primarily focussed on the appeal site and its surroundings, the harm is relatively localised and minor in scale. Nevertheless, and despite the scale of the development, I must give considerable importance and weight to this harm in accordance with policy HE6(3) of the Framework.
13. In accordance with the requirements of policy HE6(4) of the Framework, where a development harms the significance of a designated heritage asset, the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the development.
14. In that regard, I recognise that the development was sought to provide additional living space for the appellant and their family. Although I sympathise with the appellant in terms of their desire to improve the living conditions of their family, personal circumstances such as this are mostly a private benefit and seldom outweigh general planning considerations especially in the context of the effect on conservation areas. Therefore, this benefit only attracts limited weight.
15. Although I also acknowledge the letters of support from interested parties, this only attracts limited weight against the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Interested parties also refer to the benefits of increased house prices, but it is a well-founded principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests such as the value of land or property. Moreover, the absence of harm to the living conditions of neighbours is a neutral factor which does not weigh in favour of the appeal.
16. An interested party refers to the substantial weight afforded to development proposals which would create additional homes or floorspace within settlements by using the airspace above existing residential or commercial premises under policy L2(1)(d) of the Framework. However, in my view, the development is not an upward extension which uses airspace, as there was already a roof in place. Furthermore, point i. of the same policy clarifies amongst other things that this is if the proposal is consistent with the overall street scene. As I have found that the development is not consistent with the street scene, I give this benefit limited weight. The appeal decision referred to by the same interested party has not been provided and so does not alter my conclusions on this matter.
17. Consequently, given the limited weight I attribute to the public benefits of the development as outlined above, this does not outweigh the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, which is a matter that I must give considerable importance and weight in accordance with the requirements of the Framework.
18. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It conflicts with policies SC7, CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 Volume One (2015). Amongst other matters, these policies require that developments

complement and are subordinate to the original building and are harmonious with the surroundings and the wider character of conservation areas.

19. For the same reasons, the development conflicts with the guidance in the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD). This advises that extensions in conservation areas should never dominate in terms of their bulk, scale or design and that large roof extensions in conservation areas will not be granted planning permission. The extensions are also contrary to the Framework, which at policy DP3, seeks developments that respond to their context including history and character and integrate well with their surroundings.

Other Considerations

20. The appellant refers to the baseline situation of the approved roof extensions at the appeal site. However, the approved plans for the roof extensions clearly show that these extensions respected the hipped roof character of the property, that the side dormer was also hipped and reflected the design of the side dormer at the adjoining dwelling, and that the rear dormer was much smaller in scale. Accordingly, the approved development appears far more sympathetic to the scale and style of the property. For the reasons I have already set out under the main issue, the as-built roof extensions are harmful in comparison to what was approved including to the significance of the CA. Therefore, the baseline situation does not justify the appeal.
21. Furthermore, the appellant suggests that the development was sought in response to a requirement for more headroom for a staircase during the construction phase. However, the approved loft floor plan shows a staircase, a bedroom and a WC. Conversely, the as-built loft floor plan shows a much larger bedroom and a study, which is an altogether different layout compared to what was originally proposed. Therefore, the changes to the development seem to amount to a much greater change than simply to provide more headroom for a staircase, since it has resulted in an entirely different layout at the loft floor. In any case, this matter does not justify the harm I have identified under the main issue.
22. The appellant refers to Part 5 of the Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD (May 2024). I have not been provided with a copy of this. In any case, the wording provided by the appellant states that the roof extension should remain subservient to the roof face. I have already established that the development would not be subservient to the original roof. There is no substantive evidence before me to indicate that this document provides good reasons to allow the appeal.
23. Concerns were also raised regarding the impact of scaffolding in the street, and that the removal of the extension could cause structural damage and disturbance to neighbours. Nevertheless, such concerns regarding the impact of enforcement action following this decision are a matter for the Council and the appellant and does not alter the outcome of the appeal.
24. The appeal site is located near to the Grade II listed modern-style pavilion and clubhouse to the rear of the property. Although neither main party has made a finding on the effect of the development on the setting of the listed building, I have a statutory duty under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Given that the appeal property is a significant distance from the listed building and there is a large open space which separates

them, I am satisfied that the development has not harmed the setting of the listed building.

25. Policy S4 of the Framework states that development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework. However, I have already found that the public benefits in this instance do not outweigh the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. In my judgement, the benefits in this case are substantially outweighed by the adverse effects when considered against the decision-making policies of the Framework which include those relating to the conservation of heritage assets and which apply to the CA in this case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

26. The development is contrary to the development plan overall. There are no material considerations which justify granting planning permission for the development which is contrary to the development plan. Consequently, I recommend that the appeal on ground (a) should fail and the deemed planning application should be refused.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

27. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed as set out in my Decision above.

Zoë Frank's

INSPECTOR