



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2026

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 July 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3375610

9b Maswell Park Road, Hounslow TW32DL

- 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 Jagtar Chokker against the decision of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2025/1431.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a balustrade around the existing roof of the ground floor rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, with particular regard to privacy, and the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. No.9b is part of a subdivided end of terrace property occupying the first floor. To the rear is a single-storey flat-roofed extension on which the balustrade is proposed. It is accessed via a patio door from 9b (not shown on the plans) and from this elevated space, an outlook is afforded over the property's garden space and towards that of the neighbours.
4. The ground-floor flat has a defined section of the garden, with the rest of the garden, together with the single-storey building sited along the rear boundary comprising a separate unit of accommodation. In addition, due to the depth of the space, which is greater than the extension to the neighbouring property (No.7), users of the terrace would be able to look back towards the first-floor windows and dormer windows to the roof. The terrace would also be visible from No. 8 Hounslow Garden to the rear, and from the adjacent commercial garage. As a result, the proposal would cause both actual and perceived loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers.
5. A balustrade approximately 1.7 metres high is proposed to enclose the space, but no specific details of the screening have been provided. Although a condition could require the screen to be obscurely glazed, that would not overcome the visual harm arising from its scale and position. The screening would be a prominent and incongruous addition to the host property. Sitting above the deep rear extension, it

would add further visual massing to the property which has already been significantly extended, and I saw no comparable features in the surrounding area.

6. The proposal would provide a usable outdoor space for the occupiers and screen views of the neighbouring commercial premises. However, those direct views would only arise when the roofspace is utilised as a terrace, and these benefits do not outweigh the harm identified above.
7. Thus, the proposal would fail to integrate with the character and appearance of the area and would be harmful to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposed development would therefore conflict with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Local Plan 2015-2030, which together and amongst other things, promote development that sensitively and creatively responds to the area's character, harmonises with the existing building, and has a positive impact on the amenity of current and future residents, including minimising overlooking.
8. There would also be conflict with the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines, which advise that the use of a flat roof as a balcony or roof terrace is likely to harm neighbours' privacy, and the Council will normally refuse such schemes.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR