
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3246767

15 Bulstrode Gardens, Hounslow TW3 3AJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Harpreet Bhatia against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00171/15/P3 dated 3 October 2019 was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The development is a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to retain the porch at 15 Bulstrode Gardens, Hounslow TW3 3AJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 00171/15/P3, dated 3 October 2019, and the plans numbered 1939-pl-01 and 1939-os-01.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural matter

3. From my site visit, it could be seen the porch had already been constructed. As such, I have therefore considered the appeal on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms the left-hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses. The appeal property, No. 9, 11 and 13 share a similar configuration distinct from the vast majority of houses along Bulstrode Gardens which are generally larger and traditional in design. The appeal property and its immediate neighbours to the north include ground floor garages/rooms that protrude forward from the main front elevation. The appeal property and No.13 have different roof forms comprising of gable and hipped respectively. Additionally, most of the properties on this road have varied roof forms, porches of various styles and some include two storey side extensions. These

additions cumulatively do not provide a strong sense of consistency and the character and appearance of the area is diverse.

6. The development extends the ground floor protrusion to the south and although the resultant protrusion is wider than the others in the immediate vicinity, and is more than half the width of front elevation, it does not appear bulky or visually intrusive by virtue of the set in from the south elevation. The mono-pitched roof and matching materials complement the features of the appeal property and creates a pleasing view when seen from the street. Further, given the various styles and scales of development witnessed on Bulstrode Gardens, the development does not appear incongruous or prominent in the immediate or wider vicinity. The Council state the development unbalances the pair of semi-detached properties, however, given the different roof forms, it is not considered that there is much symmetry to the pair.
7. Based on the reasoning above, the development does not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. I therefore do not find conflict with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan, Volume One, 2015 to 2030, (Local Plan) which seek to ensure developments respect the context of the area and have good quality design respectively. It further does not conflict with Policy SC7 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure extensions maintain the character of the area. The proposal would be contrary to the Residential Extension Guidelines, Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted 20th December 2017 which advises against porches that are attached to other extensions. However, due to the aforementioned lack of symmetry in the pair of semi-detached houses, combined with the variety in designs locally, the lack of adherence to the SPD in this case does not harm the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions

8. As the development has already commenced there is no need to regulate the commencement of the development through a planning condition as suggested by the Council. Furthermore, as the materials used are acceptable there is no need to control these by condition either. I have however phrased the terms of the decision so that it includes specific reference to the plans in the interests of certainty.

Recommendation and Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend the appeal is allowed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR