



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/24/3344781
12 Crawford Close, Isleworth, TW7 4DP

- 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 Ali Rezvani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is 00320/12/P1.
 - The development proposed is 3.5 single-storey side extension, 2.5 m first floor rear extension & single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. The proposed extensions comprise a single storey rear extension, a first floor rear extension and single storey side extension. The Council has confirmed that it is satisfied with the scale and proportions of the proposed extensions in terms of the effect on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area. The reason for refusal is specifically related to the design of the first floor rear extension which is considered to be an unsympathetic addition to the host property and not in keeping with the character of the area.
3. From my site visit and all the information before me I have no reason to take a different view. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the design of the first floor rear extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached property at the eastern end of Crawford Close, which comprises semi-detached and short terraces of similar properties along the northern side and eastern side of the road. There is a pedestrian footpath leading along the southern edge of the property through to a commercial estate to the rear, with vehicular access off Rennells Way. As a result of this pedestrian access the rear elevation of the appeal property is seen in public views.
5. The proposed first floor rear extension in terms of its scale, depth and width would respect the proportions and scale of the existing property. In terms of its design, it would have a solid wall facing towards the neighbouring property but almost full length continuous glazing to the side and rear elevations under a

hipped roof. The predominant pattern of development for the traditional houses in the street are of solid walls punctuated by windows. I consider that the extent of glazing along the rear and side facing elevations would be excessive and would not respect the more traditional design form of the existing property and the surrounding houses. It would therefore harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

6. Given the pedestrian footpath which goes around the edge of the property, the first floor extension would be very visible to pedestrians using the footpath. The proposed design with such extensive glazing would be visually discordant in these street scene views.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed first floor extension, with particular reference to its proposed design and extent of glazing would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area. This would conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the adopted Local Plan and the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
8. I have taken into account the appellant's objectives to maximise the light to the rear room. However, I am not satisfied that the proposal before me would be the only design solution to achieve this objective. Given the harm I have concluded I am not persuaded to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR