
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3250608
82 Bedfont Close, Feltham TW14 8LF

- 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 Tekbahadur Armaja Pun against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00093/82/P1, dated 2 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a "Retrospective application for proposed front porch to dwelling".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application form indicates that the porch has already been constructed and I was able to see this at my site visit. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building comprises an end-of-terrace, two storey property. The porch is located over the main entrance to the property and has a hipped roof which extends to just below the first-floor windows. Porches are not uncommon features of the terrace, or of other properties in the vicinity of the appeal site. However, the majority of porches that I observed in the vicinity were modest and unobtrusive visual elements.
5. By comparison, the porch at the appeal site was a substantial structure which appeared to stretch for in the region of half the length of the front elevation of the dwelling. Furthermore, whilst the hipped roof reflected that of the host property in shape, it rose to a height just below the first-floor windows, far in excess of the height of other porches on the neighbouring properties. As a consequence of the length combined with the height, the porch appears as a visually strident and unduly prominent addition to the dwelling, which dominates the front elevation and has a discordant visual presence. The use of

matching materials does little to ameliorate this. Moreover, it appears significantly larger than other examples of porches in the area, which reinforces its uncharacteristic appearance.

6. Accordingly, I find that the porch is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Thus, it conflicts with policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local plan (2015-2030) insofar as they seek to ensure that development sensitively responds to a site's characteristics and an area's character, as well as that extensions to residential properties are not harmful to the character or appearance of the building.
7. I acknowledge that there is an expansive front garden to the property and the porch does not significantly reduce this, as well as that there is no harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. I am also conscious of the contention that the porch is not substantially larger than that which could be constructed under permitted development. Nonetheless, none of these matters is sufficient to outweigh the specific harm resulting from the proposal that I have identified above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR