



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2022

by **S Lo LLB M.SRA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/22/3301625

9 Bristow Road, Hounslow, TW3 1UP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Carmelo Mermina against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00158/9/P1, dated 27 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey detached house at rear of property and part demolition of existing house to provide access (landscaping to be determined)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has indicated in part E of the appeal form that the description of development has not changed from that detailed on the application form. However, a different description of development has been entered which matches that used by the Council and which matches the development shown on the submitted plans. I have therefore used this description of development.
3. Outline planning permission is sought, but with access, layout, scale and appearance to be considered at this stage. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to the frontage of No. 9 Bristow Road.

Reasons

5. The application site includes a two-storey, mid-terrace property and a rectangle of land to the rear of the property, which is immediately adjacent to Hounslow Road Car Park. The area is predominantly residential, with period features.
6. The proposed development to No. 9 Bristow Road involves the partial demolition of the property and removal of the existing ground floor bay window to create a 1.2 metre alleyway, thereby enabling access to the proposed new dwelling at the rear of the application site.

7. This section of Bristow Road exhibits a distinct pattern of uniform ground floor front bay windows, which are an integral part of the street scene. Although the proposed access path would use an archway design which is similar to the existing house, the absence of the front bay window would be an incongruous omission from the street scene. Therefore, the replacement of the bay window with an access path would disrupt the pattern of the street scene and would result in an incongruous appearance. As such, the proposed development would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development, and harmful to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.
8. While mid-terrace access paths are not unusual for Victorian and Edwardian terraced properties of this type, they are ordinarily created contemporaneously with the original development and not as later additions to facilitate modern renovation. As such, in the absence of any detailed examples by the Appellant, it is considered that there are no other properties in close proximity which could be referenced to support the proposed alteration. Therefore, the proposed development would appear isolated and incongruous as a modern addition.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not comply with the criteria for high quality design which is sensitive to the local context, contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan (2015). It would also result in development which would not harmonise with adjoining properties, contrary to the Hounslow Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017). As such, having considered this appeal proposal on its own merits, I consider that the proposed development would not be sympathetic to local character, in conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework's provisions, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Lo

INSPECTOR