
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3364344

64 Barrowgate Road, Chiswick, London W4 4QU

- 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 & Mrs Obiakor against the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application ref. is P/2025/0184.
 - The development proposed is for construction of a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a front porch at 64 Barrowgate Road, Chiswick, London W4 4QU in accordance with the terms of the application ref. P/2025/0184, 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: PB24/64Barrowgate/1c , PB24/64Barrowgate/3a, PB24/64Barrowgate/3b, PB24/64Barrowgate/7a, PB-24/64barrow/10.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the determination of this appeal is the the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounds, including the Turnham Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a detached dwelling on Barrowgate Road with off-street parking on a driveway to the front. The street scene is predominantly residential in nature with mature trees on the pavements to both sides of the highway.
4. The CA Appraisal notes that the area's special architectural and historic interest derives from the green's origins as part of a much larger common on which the English Civil War Battle of Turnham Green took place in 1642; its formative role in the development of Chiswick as a whole; the high quality of many of the surrounding buildings; and the high quality of the residential areas to the south and west.
5. Being situated in the CA, I have applied the statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA by attaching considerable importance and weight to that desirability.

6. With regard to Barrowgate Road, the CA Appraisal states that it was one of the earliest streets to be developed in the character area, being laid out from 1882 along what had been the southernmost strip of the gardens. In particular, I note the analysis that it is “the most varied of the streets in the area. It features housing in a wide range of sizes and styles dating from the 1880s to the post-war period.”
7. The front extension would replace an existing porch and small bay window. Whilst I acknowledge that the appeal scheme would be larger than the current elements, it would not project further forward. Consequently, the impressive and larger arched bay window on the ground floor of the facade would remain the foremost feature of the property, and the development would not unduly compete with its appearance. The proposal would be set back, broadly flush with the front gable at first floor level, which to my mind would provide for a satisfactory design solution that would integrate with the style and form of the dwelling.
8. Taking into account the multi-faceted character of buildings in the neighbourhood, I consider that the scheme would not appear out of keeping; it would be of relatively small scale and visually connect with the overall appearance of the property, without being imposing or dominant in the context of the street scene. Whilst I therefore acknowledge the relevant sections of the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2024 (REG), I find that no demonstrable harm would arise in this instance.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounds, including the CA. It would conform with Policies CC1, CC2, and CC4 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030, the CA Appraisal and the REG, which together seek to ensure proposals relate to surrounding development, meet high standards of design, and protect the character of conservation areas.

Other matter

10. Although the reason for refusal in the Council's decision notice refers to “a serious and adverse effect on the amenities enjoyed by occupants of neighbouring properties”, the delegated report is clear that the proposal poses no harm to neighbouring living conditions. I am satisfied that there would be no detrimental effects in this respect.

Conditions

11. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match those used on the existing building would provide for a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above and all other issues advanced, the appeal is allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR