



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/25/3365473

50 Winchester Avenue, Hounslow TW5 0HA

- 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 and Mrs Sidhu against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application ref. is P/2025/0402.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension at 50 Winchester Avenue, Hounslow TW5 0HA in accordance with the terms of planning application ref P/2025/0402 dated 7 February 2025, 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 approved plans: Location Plans nos. TQRQM25037232517027 & TQRQM25037233651966, P01, P02, P03, P04 and the Fire Safety Statement.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 48 Winchester Avenue in relation to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the south side of Winchester Avenue. It is a semi-detached two storey dwelling and its semi-pair to the east is 48 Winchester Avenue. Both dwellings have a rear garden. The gardens are separated by a close-boarded fence. The appeal site has a single storey rear extension with a rear canopy on posts over a patio before reaching a small lawn. No.48 has a small rear extension on the common boundary with the appeal site.
4. The appeal site shares an accessway for vehicles with no.52 to its west and has an outbuilding/garage in its rear garden.
5. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey rear extension joining on to the existing rear extension. It would have a patio door and two windows, a flat roof and three roof lights. The proposed depth taken with the

existing rear extension would be about 6m, the width about 5.7m and the height of the flat roof about 3m. The height of the rooflights above the flat roof would be about 0.6m.

6. Given the small rear extension at no.48 on the common boundary with the appeal site and the proposed height of the flat roof of the appeal proposal being limited to 3m, I consider that the occupants of no.48 would not experience an unreasonable loss of light to their rear garden nor experience an undue sense of enclosure when using their garden. The rooflights of the appeal proposal would be set back from the common boundary and would not be unduly overbearing for the occupants of no.48 or block light reaching their garden.
7. A further factor in favour of granting permission is that the area of the rear garden which is most likely to be most intensively used by the occupants of no.48 is screened by their small extension and would consequently be less affected by the appeal proposal. I have had regard to the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document, A5 Residential Extension Guidelines, however, in this instance, the cumulative depth of the extension being over 3.65m is overridden by other material considerations.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupants of no.48 Winchester Avenue through loss of outlook or light. It would not be contrary to policies CC1, CC2 or SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 Vol 1.
9. 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

10. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I allow the appeal subject to conditions.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector