



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3372665
6 Court Road, Southall, UB2 5RY.

- 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 Sunet Kaur against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1849.
 - The development proposed is the retention of a single storey rear extension and front boundary wall with vehicle and pedestrian gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of a single-storey rear extension and front boundary wall with vehicle and pedestrian gates at 6 Court Road, Southall, UB2 5RY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2025/1849, and Plans Nos 2025/02 to 07 inclusive dated 10 June 2025.

Preliminary Matters

2. The retrospective nature the proposal has no effect on the manner in which the appeal is assessed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues relate to the design and scale of the disputed single-storey rear extension and its effect on residential amenity, as well the implications of the 1.5m front boundary wall and gates for pedestrian and road safety.

Reasons

Rear Extension

4. The extension exceeds the 6m rear projection limit of permitted development by 3.7m. However, it is of lightweight, fully glazed construction and is set in from the side boundaries of the generous rear garden.
 5. In the circumstances I do not consider that the extension conflicts significantly with design and form of the host dwelling or its neighbours.
 6. Nor do I consider that this lightweight and transparent structure would dominate or overshadow either of the adjacent dwellings, both of which enjoy equally generous back gardens affording a degree of spaciousness that would not be compromised by the appeal development.
-

7. Despite its departure from adopted design guidance regarding the design and dimensions of house extensions, I do not consider that the rear extension undermines the aims of Policies CC1-2 or SC7 of the adopted Hounslow Local Plan (HLP) with respect to its design in context, its inherent function or its the effect on the surrounding area.

Front Wall and Gates

8. There are other examples of relatively high front walls and gates in the vicinity of the appeal site, such that I do not consider that the wall and gates disputed in this appeal look out of place in terms of the street scene.
9. I consider that, within this essentially residential street, the width of the footway is sufficient to provide reasonable visibility, to both drivers of cars leaving the appeal property and any passing pedestrians, to avoid unacceptably dangerous conflict.
10. As with the rear extension, I do not consider that any degree of departure of the front wall and gates from adopted dimensional guidelines in this case undermines the aims of HLP Policy EC2 or London Plan Policy T4 regarding road safety or the sustainability of the transport system.

Conclusion

11. For these reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed on the basis of the submitted plans, but no further conditions are necessary as both elements of the appeal development are already complete.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR