
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3247188

29 Hawthorn Close, Cranford, Middlesex TW5 9TG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sukhjinder Singh Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01612/29/P2, dated 4 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a conservatory front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice, however the application form adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the conservatory on the character and appearance of the Cranford Village Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. Hawthorn Close comprises residential dwellings, which while modern, incorporate matching design features and materials which, combined with the mature trees result in a pleasant street scene. The simple cohesive form of the properties, which generally only incorporate small porches and canopies to their front elevations, are defining features of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.
5. Although the conservatory would be set back from the estate road, at the western end of the terrace within which the appeal property sits, it would still be clearly visible from Hawthorn Close and the adjoining parking court given its positioning on the front elevation of the property and its pitched roof which would rise above the existing flat roofed side element.
6. Whilst I accept that back to back dwellings have more limited opportunity for extension, the conservatory if placed on the front elevation would form a feature which would be wholly out of character with the prevailing built form on Hawthorn Close and would therefore form an incongruous and obtrusive feature.

7. The conservatory would therefore detract from the appearance of the property. Subsequently, it would detract from the heritage significance of the Conservation Area which lies, in part, with the simple cohesive form of the properties.
8. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
9. The benefits of this scheme would be limited to the provision of increased living space at the appeal property. However, any benefit of increased space would primarily be a personal one for the appellant. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise from the appeal scheme, which would be visible to many people and the statutory protection afforded to conservation areas, such benefit would not be sufficient to outweigh this harm.
10. Consequently, the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to Policy CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030) (HLP). The proposal would also be out of context with the character of the area and would represent poor quality design contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the HLP which are concerned with these matters amongst other things. The proposal would not accord with SPD¹ guidance which advises against front extensions that are larger than a porch. While this is guidance only, I have not identified any material considerations that would warrant departing from it.

Other Matters

11. Whilst some materials to match could be incorporated, and no harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers has been identified, these are neutral matters which do not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017.