



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 18 March 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3352231**

**33 Duke Road, Chiswick, Hounslow, London W4 2BA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Daniel Tade against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow Council.
  - The application Ref is P/2024/1204.
  - The development proposed is a ground floor rear extension with lantern skylight and first floor partial rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to Council's decision, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) (the Framework). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
  - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area; and
  - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey terraced house with an existing single storey rear outrigger. The proposal includes a ground floor infill extension to the side of the existing outrigger to its full depth. Above this would be a part first floor flat roofed extension that would be approximately 2.330 metres deep and 2.728 metres wide. this would sit on the boundary of the appeal dwelling which adjoining house at 35 Duke Road (No.35).
5. The design guidance for first floor extensions in the Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017) advises that such

extensions should be no greater than half the width of the original house, project no more than 2.5 metres beyond the rear wall of the house and be set a minimum of 2 metres from the original side wall of a neighbouring property.

6. Although the proposed part first floor extension would project rearwards less than the recommended maximum, it would be wider than half the width of the appeal dwelling and with no set in from the side wall of No.35. Whilst No.35 does itself have a part first floor rear extension on its shared boundary with 37 Duke Road (No.37), this adjoins with and makes an identical pair with a part first floor extension at No.37.
7. The excessive width of the proposal would result in it not appearing proportionate and subordinate to the main dwelling. Rather it would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition, which would not reflect the form and positioning of first floor outriggers to other properties in the terrace. This would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area.

### *Living Conditions*

8. By being positioned on the boundary with the adjoining house at No.35, the proposed extension would be in close proximity to a first floor window to this neighbouring dwelling. There is also a second window at first floor level at No.35 that is close to its own first floor outrigger.
9. Given the existing first floor outrigger at No.35 the proposed part first floor extension would create a significant increase in a sense of enclosure to the rear of No.35 at first floor level. This would be experienced by the occupiers of this neighbouring property as oppressive, especially from the window closest to the proposed extension. Given the proximity of this window to the proposed extension, it would result in a significant loss of light to this window that, although it appears to be to a staircase, would further exacerbate this detrimental loss of outlook for neighbouring occupiers.
10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal, when considered as a whole, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area. This would be contrary to policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (2015). Collectively these seek developments, including extensions, that are of high quality urban design and architecture and that creatively respond to the areas character, do not harm the existing character and appearance of the building and its context and do not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents.
11. Whilst the proposed extension would provide additional living space, which would benefit existing and potential future occupiers, this does not constitute a substantial public benefit. In general, planning decisions should be made in the wider public interest. In this context, the harm I have identified outweighs these benefits.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

*Victor Callister*

INSPECTOR