

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2017

by Oliver Blower MA (T&CP)

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3180034
23 Harewood Road, Isleworth TW7 5HB

- 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 Harkirit Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00556/23/P2, dated 27 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2017.
 - The development is described as “to legalise the front canopy together with two white pillars”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and immediate area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a retrospective application for a front porch and canopy supported on two classical white fluted columns with ornate capitals. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached house with a two-storey bay window shared with the adjoining house.
 4. The immediate area is predominantly characterised by rows of similar semi-detached houses with two-storey bays, most of which have half-timbering applied to the first-floors in the Tudor revival style. Although porches vary in design, they are mostly small scale and remain broadly in keeping with the architectural vernacular of the host building.
 5. The development plan includes the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (LP). Policies CC1 and CC2 of the LP seek to ensure, amongst other matters, that development has due regard to the urban context, local architectural vernacular and responds meaningfully and sensitively to the site, its characteristics and constraints.
 6. Policy SC7 of the LP seeks to ensure, in part, that development complements the original building, harmonises with adjoining properties and maintains the character of the general street scene.
-

7. Further guidance is given in the Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). This recommends that the depth of any porch or canopy must not extend out past the line of bay windows; overhanging canopies are not acceptable on front extensions except where they are used as an alternative to a porch; and pillars will be refused unless they are a feature of the original house.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that poorly designed development should be refused where it fails to improve the character and quality of an area.
9. The appellant has also referred to London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6. Together these seek, amongst other things, that buildings have regard to the existing street and make a positive contribution to the character of the place, and that development incorporate design appropriate to its context and details that complement, not necessarily replicate, the local architectural character.
10. Due to the excessive depth of the porch, in particular owing to the substantial projection of its canopy, it appears disproportionately large and out of scale with the host building. This excessive scale and depth is emphasised by its significant projection beyond the bay window, diminishing this distinguishing feature and unbalancing the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. Whilst I acknowledge that the building line is staggered and that the side extension of No 25 projects beyond the façade of No 23, this does not lessen the undue bulk of the porch or adequately mitigate the harm it causes to the character and appearance of the host building and immediate area for the reasons above.
11. Although the half-timbering at first-floor has been replaced with a contemporary rendered finish, the classical fluted columns of the porch neither complement the modern appearance of the host building or the Tudor detailing of houses nearby. As a result the columns appear incongruous in the street scene, further adding to the above harm.
12. I note that a previous scheme was granted at No 23 for a front extension, and that planning permission was also granted at No 5 for, amongst other things, a porch that extends slightly beyond the bay window of the house. In both of these cases, however, the approved porches are not as deep or as large as the porch the subject of this appeal, nor do they incorporate a canopy or classical columns. Thus they are not directly comparable to the development before me.
13. Consequently, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the development causes unacceptable harm to character and appearance of the host building and immediate area. As such, it conflicts with LP policies CC1, CC2 and SC7, advice in the SPG, the Framework, and London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

O Blower

Appointed Person