



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3362817

28 Winslow Way, Feltham, Hounslow TW13 6QD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Vernon Edward against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is PA/2025/0737.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension 6.0m deep with flat roof and Velux roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Class A of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations set out in paragraphs A.1 and A.2 and the conditions at paragraphs A.3 and A.4.
3. Where an application is made for prior approval for development, paragraph A.4(3) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply – or that the developer has provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.

Main Issue

4. The application was refused on the basis that the proposal has not met the condition at paragraph A.4(2) (c) of Class A with regards to the submission of the addresses of all adjoining neighbouring properties. Accordingly, the main issue is whether sufficient information with regards to the addresses of any adjoining premises has been submitted for prior approval to be granted.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a two storey, semi-detached dwelling with flat roof rear dormer, located in a residential area. The application which is the subject of this appeal was a notification under Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A of the GPDO of the intention to construct a single storey, flat roofed extension 6m deep to the rear of the dwelling. The Council's position is that prior approval is required because not

all owners or occupiers of the adjoining properties were listed in the application form.

6. In order to benefit from the provisions of Class A of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the GPDO the proposed development must comply with paragraph A.4(2) (c) which requires that the developer must provide the addresses of any adjoining premises to the local planning authority. The planning application form listed the adjoining premises as Nos 26 and 30 Wilmslow Way and 5 Ridge Way. However, the appeal site also adjoins 7 Ridge Way, which was omitted from the application form.
7. The Council therefore refused the application under paragraph A.4(3) on the basis that the developer provided insufficient information to enable the authority to establish whether the proposed development complies with the conditions, limitations or restrictions applicable to development permitted by Class A which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g).
8. As consideration in relation to prior approval under paragraphs A.4 (5), (7) and (9), do not apply where a local planning authority refuses an application under sub-paragraph (3), I have no need to consider whether consultation took place with each adjoining occupier or owner about the proposed development, nor to consider the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises. Therefore, as the condition of paragraph A.4(2) (c) has not been met, in relation to all of the adjoining premises being listed, the prior approval cannot be granted.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR