



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3235190

30 Hartington Road, Chiswick, London W4 3UB

- 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 Ms S Myers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00567/30/P5, dated 10 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 05 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a front porch and installation of new fenestration and doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front porch and installation of new fenestration and doors at 30 Hartington Road, Chiswick, London W4 3UB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00567/30/P5, dated 10 May 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the appended schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Grove Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling located within the residential area of Chiswick, within the Grove Park Conservation area (CA). The proposal is for the construction of a front porch, and the installation of a new side door and window. The front porch would be of an open design at the front, with low stone walls on either side. The roof would be a tiled dual pitch design supported by timber posts. The proposal would also include a new window and door on the side of the property.
4. The proposed front porch would be of a modest scale, and the proposed materials would match the host dwelling. The open nature of the proposal with the low walls on either side means it would not appear as a dominant bulky addition. Although the porch would be in a prominent position on the front of the dwelling, due to its scale and mass it would appear subservient to the host dwelling. The proposed pitched roof design would complement the existing form of the property, and as such I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

5. The site benefits from an extant planning consent¹ which is for a similar designed front porch with a flat roof. The dimensions of the approved porch are the same as the appeal proposal, the only difference between the two is the proposed pitched roof design. Whilst the introduction of a pitched roof would increase the mass of the proposal, I find that this roof form integrates much better with the host property and is more in keeping with examples of porches in the surrounding area. I am satisfied that if the appeal proposal were not erected then there is every likelihood that such a fallback scheme would be constructed. This is something I give considerable weight to.
6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of CA's. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Annex 2: Glossary of the Framework confirms that CA's are included within the definition of a designated heritage asset.
7. The proposal would be a relatively minor extension to the front of the property and is sympathetic to the host dwelling's design. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of nearby properties which have similar front porches which include Nos. 44 and 46. During my site visit I observed that these existing front porches sit well within the street scene and CA. They do not appear as incongruous additions to their host dwellings. Therefore, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the CA.
8. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the Grove Park CA. As such there would be no conflict with policies CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 – 2030. Together these policies seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high-quality design that conserves heritages assets

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the proposals would be satisfactory. I have imposed a condition restricting the hours of working on the site during the period of construction to safeguard the living conditions of adjacent occupiers.

Conclusions

10. For the above reasons the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR

¹ Council reference 00567/30/P2

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS - APP/F5540/D/19/3235190

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: LC_18_30HARTINGTON_Plan_00 Site and Location Plan, LC_18_30HART_3rdApp_prp_01 Existing Floor Plans dated 09 May 2019, LC_18_30HART_3rdApp_prp_02 Existing Elevations Dated 09 May 2019, LC_18_30HART_3rdApp_prp_03 Proposed Floor Plans Dated 09 May 2019, LC_18_30HART_3rdApp_prp_04 Proposed Elevations Dated 09 May 2019 and LC_18_30HART_3rdApp_prp_05 Existing & Proposed Section A-A Dated 09 May 2019.
- 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building
- 4) Demolition or construction works shall take place only between the hours of 08:00am to 06:00pm on Mondays to Fridays and 09:00am to 1:00pm on Saturdays and none shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.