



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3370150

4 Campion Road, Isleworth TW7 5HS

- 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 Amit Prasad against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/0008.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side extension, following demolition of boundary wall and part of rear conservatory, and installation of side fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension, following demolition of boundary wall and part of rear conservatory, and installation of side fence at 4 Campion Road, Isleworth TW7 5HS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/0008 with no conditions.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of proposed works as set out within the planning application forms and on the Council's decision notice refer to the proposal seeking the 'retention of' the single storey side extension and therefore being retrospective in nature. However, the retention of a proposal does not amount to development in itself and therefore I have omitted reference to such within the banner heading above. Furthermore, at the time of my site visit, the boundary wall and part of conservatory shown to be demolished on the 'As-built Ground Floor Plan' and the 'As-built Side and Rear Elevations' had been demolished/removed and close boarded fencing erected along the shared boundary in its place. The scheme was substantially complete, in accordance with the proposed drawings and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the living conditions of 2 Campion Road, with specific reference to sunlight and outlook.

Reasons

4. The proposal relates to a modest, single storey side extension that has been constructed to the rear of a previously built shower room, up to and along the boundary of no2.

5. No2 is located at an angle to the appeal dwelling and therefore faces the flank wall of the extension and the host dwelling itself, along with the boundary fence at an oblique angle. The neighbouring dwelling also has a conservatory to its rear; but due to its orientation, and the presence of the main range of the appeal dwelling I consider that no material loss of sunlight would be caused to the neighbouring occupants.
6. I acknowledge that the Hounslow Character, Sustainability Codes SPD stipulates that the height and width of side extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the original house, with the roof height retained below the eaves level of the first floor of the property. It goes on to state that the width should be less than half that of the main house and that the side wall of the extension should be parallel to the original house and, where the boundary is at an angle to the house, the side wall should not follow the boundary line.
7. The proposed extension is built up to the boundary which is tapered in nature such that it narrows towards the rear, contrary to the diagram which shows chamfered extensions to be unacceptable in figure A5.5 of the SPD. However, bearing in mind that the extension is essentially a continuation of that previously constructed, and its relatively limited depth, extending no further than the main two storey rear elevation of the host dwelling, and its limited height, I consider that the proposed extension is not unduly overbearing upon the occupants of no2.
8. Consequently, I consider that the proposal does not cause demonstrable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of no2 and the proposal complies with Policies SC7 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030 which together expect development proposals to minimise harm to neighbouring residents, such as avoiding an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook or by creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
10. As the proposal was complete at the time of my site visit I consider it is not necessary to impose any conditions.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR