



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3364550**

**46 Firs Drive, Cranford, Hounslow TW5 9TD**

- 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 R Johal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application ref. is P/2024/4228.
  - The development proposed is the “erection of first floor part rear infill to side of bay, with approved P/2022/3850 (first floor side extension), P/2021/4813 (single storey ground rear and side extension) & P/2023/0789 (first floor rear extension) along with internal alterations”.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The appeal site is located within the Cranford Village Conservation Area. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling with an attached single storey garage located on the north west side of Firs Drive in Cranford. No.48 Firs Drive is a detached dwelling to the north and no.44 Firs Drive is a detached dwelling to the south. The dwelling is in the Cranford Village Conservation Area and is positioned opposite a large green public open space.
4. The proposed development includes the erection of a ground floor rear and side extension wrap around, a first floor rear extension and a first floor side extension following the demolition of the garage. The focus of the appeal is the impact of the first floor rear extension.
5. The Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extension Guidelines (2024) indicates that the height and width of first floor / two-storey rear extensions should remain proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions of the main house. The width of a first floor rear extension should be no greater than half the width of the original house, while the depth of the first floor extension should not project more than 2.5 metres beyond the rear wall of the house.
6. Whilst the proposed first floor rear extension would largely be limited to a depth of 2.5 m, the proposed first floor rear extension would span the full width of the original rear elevation of the dwelling. It would have a width measuring far in excess of the

half the width of the original rear elevation of the original dwelling and would not be in accordance with the guidelines in that respect. In this case, the resulting appearance of the rear first floor extension, coupled with its roof, would be disproportionate and of a bulk and massing that would appear over dominant and insufficiently subservient to the main dwelling.

7. I have had regard to the fact that there is a realistic prospect of an extant planning permission being implemented on the appeal site if this appeal is dismissed. I have been invited to take this permission into account as a fallback development. This is application reference P/2023/0789 dated 30 May 2023 and is for the erection of a two-storey side/rear extension and a single storey rear extension to the house. The main differences between that permission and the appeal scheme are a narrower first floor rear extension and a different roof arrangement.
8. I consider the extant planning permission to be a better quality design than the appeal scheme in respect of the first floor rear extension and roof arrangement. The canted bay window is narrower and centralised within the rear elevation and appears less dominant, more nuanced and more proportionate to the original dwelling. The same can be said for the more sympathetic, less strident roof arrangement of the extant planning permission.
9. Turning to the Conservation Area impacts, I am mindful of the statutory duty under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to give special attention to the extent to which development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The significance of the Cranford Village Conservation Area is described in the Conservation Area Appraisal. Firs Drive and its greens are identified as one of four character areas.
10. The significance of Firs Drive derives from it being an estate of well-maintained, detached and semi-detached houses, a number of which are located around small, attractive greens. All are coherent in design, and some are of exceptional quality. Whilst there are mainly private views of the rear of the appeal dwelling, private views within a conservation area are of importance and consequently, in the case of the rear first floor extension proposed as part of the appeal scheme, its unsympathetic impact would detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition, the proposed first floor extension would be partially visible in public views from the Drive through the gaps between no.46 and its neighbours at nos.44 and 48, unlike the extant planning permission first floor addition which would be set in from both sides of the original house and not visible from the public realm. The harm to the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset would be “less than substantial harm” in NPPF terms, and I have weighed this against the public benefits of the scheme and conclude that the identified harm would not be outweighed by public benefits.
11. Overall, I conclude that the proposed first floor rear extension would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider Cranford Village Conservation Area. It would be contrary to policies CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the Hounslow Local Plan, the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document, A5 Residential Extension Guidelines (2024) and Cranford Village Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document.

## **Conclusion**

12. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

*Megan Thomas K.C.*  
Inspector