



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2019

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3228693

8 Seymour Gardens, Feltham TW13 7PQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Pawan Sondhi against the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01004/8/P3, dated 2 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front canopy to detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue to be considered is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property and the Hanworth Park Conservation Area (CA).

Procedural Matters

3. The plans upon which the Council have made their decision include plans reference SG2/PLN/004, however I have before me two versions of this plan, both dated July 2018. The main difference appears to be the removal of the porch on one of these drawings. Notwithstanding this, the description of development clearly describes the proposed installation of the canopy to the front.
4. My attention has been drawn to a recent appeal decision¹ at the site for a similar development, which included the porch. As described above, the appeal before me relates to the installation of a canopy only. The parties clearly agree on the description as this is consistent through the application form, the Council's decision notice and the appeal form. Therefore I do not consider that these plans have prejudiced the case for either party. I therefore make my decision on the development as described in the banner heading.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached two storey dwelling located on a cul-de-sac in a residential area. The dwellings are detached modern brick buildings set back from the road having front gardens or off-street parking. The Hanworth Park Conservation Appraisal explains that area of Seymour Gardens is a 1950s

¹ APP/F5540/D/18/3214059 dated 18 February 2019

estate which demonstrates typical examples of buildings of their time. The CA appraisal places importance on the design of the properties, specifically designed to blend in with the morphology and history of the site.

6. Dwellings are characterised by the gable frontages, with many also having bow windows to the front elevation. Some have this feature to both the ground and first floors, although the appeal site has only a bow window to the ground floor. There is a variation in designs however dwellings are similar in character and appearance, contributing to the overall appearance of the CA.
7. The appeal proposal would result in a canopy extending across the front of the property. Unlike the neighbouring property, number 10, the proposed development would span the entire frontage without a break. At number 10, the canopy follows the frontage of the smaller gable which protrudes from the main elevation. This is in contrast to the appeal proposal which would enclose the entire front elevation, and would not respect the change in gable elevations. Nevertheless, the canopy at number 10 still demonstrates a break in the vertical emphasis to the detriment of the original dwelling.
8. Policy SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (September 2015) (the Local Plan) expects no harm to the existing character and appearance of a building and its context as a result of alterations and additions and responds to and reflects the design recommendation in CA Appraisals. The Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (December 2017) (SPD) sets out guidance on extensions to the front of dwellings. This says that changes and extensions to the front of the house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street.
9. The proposed development would break the vertical emphasis of the gable end and would be deeper than the bay window to the front. Even with the loss of the porch element, the canopy conflicts with the SPD and is not sufficient to overcome the concerns raised in the previous appeal. The loss of the characteristic vertical form to the house would harm the original appearance of the building and is a dominant feature that would significantly alter the front elevation of the dwelling and thus its original appearance. The example at number 10, whilst is in evidence, is not sufficiently acceptable to overcome my concerns about the harm to the original character and appearance of the building.
10. I acknowledge the examples provided by the appellant close to the appeal site, however most of those properties with canopies or porches are differently orientated, with their gable ends perpendicular to the street, as opposed to facing the street as does the appeal site. Additionally, few dwellings at Seymour Gardens or Elizabeth Close have canopies installed across the full extent of the front elevation, particularly those properties with the gable end facing the street.
11. Whilst the development proposed would be a small addition to the house overall, the extent of the canopy breaching the entire front elevation significantly changes its character and appearance and as such harms the original features of the building and its contribution to the CA. Even with the removal of the porch element, I am not satisfied that the development as amended would overcome the harm identified.

12. As considered alongside Policy CC1 of the Local Plan I am not persuaded that the proposal would be able to demonstrate regard to the criteria of this policy, in particular it would not conserve and take opportunities to enhance special qualities and heritage in terms of the context and character of the location. I also find conflict with the other relevant policies, namely Policy CC2 which seeks to promote and support high quality urban design and architecture, CC4 which expects the enhancement and conservation of the borough's heritage assets to support an area's distinctive character and sense of place and finally.
13. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the CA. Therefore, there is conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Local Plan and the SPD which expects new development to provide high quality design and protects the special qualities, context and character of places and to complement the original building and maintain the character of the street, as well as conserve the character of the CA.
14. The statutory duty in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The proposal would have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in "less than substantial" harm in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). Notwithstanding the local support confirmed by the appellant, no public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.

Conclusion

15. Overall the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would also conflict with Policy SC7 of the Local Plan on residential extensions and alterations as well as CC4 on heritage and the more general provisions of Policies CC1 and CC2 on high quality of design. The proposed development would not conserve the heritage asset in a manner appropriate to its significance in line with one of the core planning principles of the Framework. Therefore, for the reasons given, the proposal is unacceptable and the appeal should not succeed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR