



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3365172

103 Ringway, Southall, UB2 5SS

- 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 S Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application ref. is P/2024/4298.
 - The development proposed is a part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part first floor rear extension at 103 Ringway, Southall UB2 5SS in accordance with the terms of the planning application ref P/2024/4298, dated 18 December 2024, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents/plans: P10302, P10303, P10301, P10304 (Fire and Safety), Fire Safety Statement and Location Plan.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling located on the north side of Ringway in a residential part of Southall. It has a flat-roofed single storey side extension to the west and a single storey rear extension with a mono pitch roof sloping from the main rear elevation of the house which then turns into a flat roof. There is a roof light in the rear main roof slope. The property has a small rear garden with some decking, outbuildings and a pergola.
4. No.101 Ringway is the terraced dwelling to the immediate east. No.105 Ringway is a semi-detached dwelling to the south-west and is orientated away from the appeal site.

5. The proposal involves constructing a first-floor rear extension over part of the rear extension. Its depth would be approximately 3m which is about as deep as the sloping part of the rear extension roof. It would not encroach onto the flat roof. It would step in from both the east and west ends of the rear extension and would have a hipped roof including a receding front hip, the apex of which would be slightly lower than the height of the ridgeline of the main house. It would have one window which would face the rear garden. Its width would be about 4.90m.
6. The Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document, A5 Residential Extensions Guidelines (May 2024) (A5/45 onwards states) that the “height and width of [two storey and first floor] rear extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house. A suitable balance will need to be achieved to allow a practical room size without harming neighbouring properties or damaging to the character of the host property and surrounding area. Whether the scale of a two storey rear extension will be acceptable will be dictated by the need to protect neighbouring properties from loss of light, safeguard outlook and prevent enclosure. This will vary based on the size of the host property and the proximity of adjoining homes. On this basis the width of a first floor rear extension should be no greater than half the width of the original house. The depth of the first floor extension should not project more than 2.5 metres beyond the rear wall of the house, unless you can clearly demonstrate that there will be no harm to neighbouring properties (for example through a daylight and sunlight analysis). The eaves height of the addition should match the height of the eaves height of the host property.”
7. The proposed development would be wider than half the width of the original house and the depth would be 3m rather than 2.5m. However, these exceedances would not be large and the appellant has demonstrated via, inter alia, a sunpath analysis, that there would be no harm to neighbouring property from undue loss of daylight or sunlight. In terms of loss of outlook, the location of the first-floor extension would not cause an undue sense of enclosure to either occupants of no.101 or 105 Ringway when in their rear gardens owing to the separation distances.
8. In the particular circumstances, I consider that the proposal would be proportionate and subservient to the main house and would not harm the surrounding area. I have considered this in the light of the existing extensions that have been undertaken at the host dwelling and I come to the same view on a cumulative basis.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would not be contrary to policies CC1 or SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted 2015) or the intentions of the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document, A5 Residential Extensions Guidelines (May 2024).
10. The Council suggested some conditions in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered these in the light of Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to avoid uncertainty. A condition requiring materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development to match those used in the existing building is necessary to secure a good quality finish and a high quality development compatible with its surroundings.

Conclusion

11. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I allow the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector