



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025

by **J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/24/3355771

12A Fauconberg Road, Chiswick, Hounslow, London, W4 3JY

- 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 Matheou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/1183.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension to the rear of the property with external terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal relates to the first and second floor flat within a three-storey terraced building on the northern eastern side of Fauconberg Road. The heavily extended ground floor and the basement level are in commercial use. Other properties within the same terrace are of a similar character and appearance and most also benefit from deep ground floor extensions.
4. Most of the properties within the terrace display an original shallow outrigger at first floor level which is a relatively uniform feature of the rear elevation of the terrace. The proposed first floor rear extension would continue the width of the original outrigger. It would have a sloping roof which would extend beyond the original rear wall of the outrigger by around 3 metres. The proposed external terrace would project a further 3.5 metres and would be enclosed by a brick wall with privacy glazing above, to a height of 1.7 metres.
5. Whilst the extension would be constructed in materials to match the existing building, due to a combination of its width and particularly its depth, it would represent an overly large, bulky extension at first floor level which would dominate the appearance of the existing property and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the rear of the terrace which can be seen from

various angles along Hazledene Road as well as from surrounding dwellings and the alleyway to the rear.

6. Furthermore, whilst there are numerous ground floor extensions, few properties within the terrace have been extended at first floor level or above. There is an exception to this further along the terrace, where a large, flat roofed extension to the outrigger can be seen. I do not have any information of the planning history of this addition, but it is a prominent, bulky extension which detracts from the appearance of the terrace and does not justify further unsympathetic alterations. Properties within the terrace, including at the appeal site, have already been significantly extended and overdeveloped at ground floor level and the introduction of a large, imposing first floor extension would result in further harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The incongruous appearance of the development would be exacerbated by the proposed enclosure around the rear terrace which, being located towards the rear of the site, would stand out as being poorly related to the original host building and in terms of its height and appearance would appear out of place with its immediate surroundings. I observed the roof terrace and associated enclosure close to the appeal site referred to by the appellant my site visit, but this terrace is closer to the main original rear elevation of the associated property and is not comparable to the appearance and siting of the proposed terrace.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015) (LP) which expect proposals to respond to the context and character of the area in terms of design. There would be further conflict with Policy SC7 of the LP which requires residential alterations to complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties and requires extensions to have regard to the quality, character, materials and scale of the principal building, be subordinate to the existing building and not overdevelop the site in terms of mass and density. The proposal would also fail to accord with the high-quality design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the non-statutory guidance contained within the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD).

Living Conditions

9. The proposed extension would be sited about 1.7m from the boundary with 14 Fauconberg Road. At first floor level I observed that No 14 has a glazed opening on its main rear elevation and a window on its outrigger. Whilst I have no information before me regarding the internal layout of No 14, due to the height and depth of the proposed extension, it would be likely to adversely affect the amount of light received by the opening on the main rear wall of No 14. Furthermore, the extension would lead to a sense of enclosure and would adversely affect the outlook from that property. The proposal would therefore be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 14.
10. The closest window on the rear of 10 Fauconberg Road is on the first-floor outrigger. The proposed extension would extend a further 3m beyond the rear elevation of the outrigger but would, as a matter of judgement, be unlikely to have any significant adverse effect in terms of light or outlook.

11. The external terrace would incorporate privacy screening which, at a height of 1.7m, would reduce the potential for direct overlooking of adjacent properties, including the dwellings to the rear of the site in Hazledene Road. Nevertheless, the terrace would be close to adjoining properties on either side and would be elevated above the rear gardens of the dwellings in Hazledene Road. Its use would be evident and unacceptably imposing and given its proximity could also result in unacceptable noise and disturbance which would be detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, particularly in summertime when windows may be open.
12. I acknowledge that the appellant currently does not benefit from a garden and that the appeal proposal would provide access to outdoor space. However, this should not be to the detriment of the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. I note the appellant's comments that the flat roof area can already be used as a terrace as it can be accessed via the existing sash window. However, in my view this is not a strong fallback position as the proposed access to and enclosure of the terrace would formalise the space and improve safety and accordingly, would be likely to encourage more intensive use of the terrace.
13. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with particular reference to light, outlook and noise and disturbance. Thus, I find that the proposal conflicts with Policies CC2 and SC7 of the LP, the Framework and the SPD insofar as these policies and guidance seek a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR