
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: 29 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3250394

Jubilee Priesthood Centre, 75 New Road, Bedfont TW14 8HR

- 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 Jubilee Priesthood Centre against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00791/B/P2, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of porch extension and canopy to the flank of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of porch extension and canopy to the flank of the property at Jubilee Priesthood Centre, 75 New Road, Bedfont TW14 8HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00791/B/P2, dated 22 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: 1:1250 scale site location plan, Drawing numbers 173-EXT-01, 173-EXT-02, 173-EXT-03, 173-EXT-04, 173-PROP-05, 173-PROP-06, 173-PROP-07-A and 173-PROP-08
 - 3) Notwithstanding the submitted drawings, the porch hereby approved shall be constructed of timber, which shall be maintained in its natural colour and not painted or stained any other colour.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council raise no concern in respect of the canopy to the side of the building. Based on what I have seen, I find no reason to disagree with this and, on this basis, I have confined my consideration of the main issue to the proposed porch.
3. The appellant has provided a revised drawing showing the proposed elevations, referenced as a revision to the original drawings. The Council has been given the opportunity to comment on this and has no objection to this revised drawing being referenced within my decision. As such, I am satisfied there would be no prejudice in basing my decision on this revision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the porch on the character and appearance of the host building, a non-designated heritage asset, and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a single storey detached building located along New Road. There are predominantly residential properties along the street, with the exception of the appeal site and the community facility, a Royal British Legion club, opposite. The gable end of the building addresses the road, with a centrally located access doorway positioned on this elevation. The doorway is topped by a semi-circular panel that is framed by an ornate brick archway, with further brick detailing above. Either side of the doorway, the elevations appear to be rough rendered to just above the height of the door, with the brick wall visible to the elevation above. The Council indicate that the building is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset due to its historical interest and architectural merit.
6. The appeal scheme seeks the erection of a porch over the doorway, on the front elevation of the building. The porch is proposed to be constructed from glass and timber, supported to the sides on a plinth, which the application form indicates would be, constructed in brick. The porch would extend to a height just below the brick detailing above the archway but would cover the brick arch above the door. However, given that the structure is proposed to be constructed in glass, the brick archway would remain a visible feature of the building and would not be obscured. As a consequence, the architectural detailing of the building would continue to be appreciable.
7. The porch would be set in from the edge of the raised pillars either side of the doorway. When this is taken together with the height being below the highest point of the brick detailing, the porch would have the appearance of a subservient addition to the elevation. The glass construction would also ensure that it does not appear as a bulky or intrusive addition and it would not dominate the existing building. I accept that the location to the front of the building, near to the road will result in the porch being clearly visible, however given my findings above, this of itself does not result in harm.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the historical or architectural interests of the building. As such, there would be no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building, a non-designated heritage asset, or the surrounding area. Thus, the scheme accords with policies CC1, CC2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030), insofar as they seek to ensure that development is sensitive to an areas character, that development is of a high quality urban design and that the significance of heritage assets is conserved.

Other Matters

9. Concern has been raised in respect of neon signage, as well as other signs, at the site. However, these are not part of the appeal scheme that is before me. It has also been commented that the proposals would cast shadows onto neighbouring properties, however given the glass construction of the elements of the scheme, any effect in this respect would be negligible. I also note that there is reference to the reduction of the forecourt area as a result of the

porch, impacting on the ability of people to drop-off/collect children from the nursery that operates from the building. The porch would only occupy a small part of the forecourt and I see no reason why this would reduce the ability of people to stand within the forecourt area. As such, these matters have little bearing on my decision.

10. It has also been contended that the porch would not help to reduce the sound levels from activities taking place within the building. However, there is also nothing before me to show that sound levels would be worsened and therefore this is not a matter that adds to my reasoning.

Conditions

11. I have imposed a condition in respect of a timescale for the commencement of development and, in the interests of clarity, a condition is required to define the plans with which the development must accord.
12. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the porch to be constructed from timber and retained in its natural colour. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the property, I agree a condition is required in this respect, albeit I have slightly amended the condition to remove reference to the requirement for the permission of the local planning authority.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR