



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **B Astley-Serougi BA(Hons) LLM MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3369585

5 Southall Lane, Heston, Hounslow TW5 9WD

- 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, paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Ms Akanksha Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The application Ref is PA/2025/1745.
- The development proposed is single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear elements.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear elements at 5 Southall Lane, Heston, Hounslow, TW5 9WD in accordance with the application PA/2025/1745 made on 2 June 2025, and the details submitted with it including plan nos 2025-31-01 Rev A, 2025-31-02 Rev A, 2025-31-03 Rev A and 2025-31-05 Rev A, pursuant to Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4(2).

Preliminary Matter

2. I have removed words not in relation to acts of development from the description of development in the above banner heading.

Background and Main Issue

3. 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 GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
4. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, 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.

5. There is nothing to suggest that the proposed development would not meet the criterion at GPDO paragraphs A1. (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (h), (i) and (k). Given that the development would measure 5 metres in depth, the proposal would exceed the limits in GPDO paragraph A.1. (f), but not those outlined in paragraph A.1 (g). Accordingly, in these circumstances, where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, the prior approval of the local planning authority is required regarding the scheme's impact on the amenity of adjoining premises.
6. Paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the local planning authority to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. In this case, concerns have been raised in relation to the appeal scheme and its effect upon the outlook and sunlight of neighbouring occupants.
7. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises with regard to outlook and sunlight.

Reasons

8. Number 5 Southall Lane (No 5) is a semi-detached dwelling attached to 6 Southall Lane (No 6). No 6 has a rear canopy that measures approximately four metres in depth. Both No 5 and No 6 have a pebble dashed brick exterior and brown tile roof.
9. The appeal scheme would introduce a 5m in depth enclosed rear extension with a flat roof. The fence between No 5 and No 6 is relatively high and therefore the enclosed character of the proposed development would not result in a significant sense of enclosure for the residents of No 6. Furthermore, given the existing canopy and extensions on the rear elevation of No 6, there is limited substantive evidence before me to adequately demonstrate that the appeal scheme would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 6 regarding either outlook (including a sense of enclosure) or light.
10. I acknowledge that the canopy does not appear to benefit from planning permission and that given its lightweight character it could be removed. Nevertheless, it is extant and with limited substantive evidence to demonstrate that it is to be removed it is a material consideration in the determination of this appeal.
11. However, even if the canopy was to be removed, given the orientation of the dwellings as well as the proposed flat roof and height of the existing fence, the appeal scheme would not, to my mind, result in an unacceptable harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings, and particularly the occupants of No 6 regarding outlook or light.
12. There is no requirement to have regard to the development plan. However, its policies can be a material consideration. Policy SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (the HLP) outlines that residential extensions should, amongst other things minimise harm to neighbouring residents through high quality design. Thus, the appeal scheme accords with the aims of Policy SC7 of the HLP insofar as it is a material consideration.

13. I acknowledge that the London Borough of Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes SPD 2024 (the SPD) outlines a maximum depth of 3.65m for single storey rear extensions. Whilst this is a material consideration, for the reasons I have identified above, the proposed scale and massing of the appeal scheme would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants regarding outlook and sunlight.
14. Given all of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not adversely impact the amenity of adjoining premises.

Conditions

15. Planning permission granted for development under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO is subject to the conditions set out in paragraphs A.3 and A.4 of that Class. In summary, these require external materials be of a similar appearance to those used in construction of the exterior of the existing dwelling and provide details of written information required to be submitted before beginning the development. In addition, Article 4(2)(a) requires the development be completed within a period of 3 years starting from the prior approval date. I consider that no further conditions are necessary.

Other Matters

16. Interested parties have outlined concerns regarding noise and disturbance. Given the modest scale of development and the likely short construction period the potential for noise disturbance would be short term and limited.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

B Astley-Serougi

INSPECTOR