



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025 by F Bradford BA (Hons) MRTPI

### Decision by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 January 2026

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3370095

#### 11 Borough Road, Isleworth, TW7 5DY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mrs A Bulatovic against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref is P/2025/1187.
  - The development proposed is described as “Demolish existing front porch Erection of a front porch and conversion of the front garage into a habitable room, including the replacement of the garage door with a window Erection of single storey rear and part side extension to dwelling house”.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The Council raises no concern with the proposed rear extension or the conversion of the garage to use as a habitable room. On the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree.
4. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed porch and front/side extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Spring Grove Conservation Area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The Spring Grove Conservation Area (CA) derives part of its significance from its history as a planned suburb. Borough Road exhibits characteristics which contribute to this significance, including the legibility of the suburb's original development pattern. The street's architecture also contributes to the CA's significance as a heritage asset, including dwellings of visual quality that have not undergone substantial alteration; and the prevalence of original features such as two storey bay windows and oriel windows.
6. Whilst there is not an entirely uniform design of development along the road, there are some groups of dwellings which appear to have been constructed together and are, in design terms, largely uniform. The appeal dwelling is semi-detached and is located among a row of four semi-detached dwellings which are of very similar

architectural design. Notwithstanding some alteration, particularly at the appeal dwelling's pair (No 9), there remains an overall appearance of uniformity derived from the consistent bulk of the dwellings and surviving features such as the two storey bay windows and oriel window supports at first floor level. This uniformity contributes positively to the character and appearance of the street scene and wider CA.

7. The edge of the proposed front extension would finish close to the existing bay window. This, combined with the extension's depth, would overwhelm the existing configuration by lessening the visual prominence of the distinctive two-storey bay window. Furthermore, the roof of the front extension would project to the bottom edge of the oriel window which would result in the loss of the characteristic domed support on one side of the semi-detached pair. The legibility of the original porch would also be diminished. These elements would weaken architectural features which are integral to design uniformity across the row of semi-detached dwellings, notwithstanding the proposed use of matching materials. Consequently, balance between Nos 9 and 11 would not be achieved and the proposal would erode the contribution of the appeal dwelling to the visual quality of the CA.
8. These alterations would also be inconsistent with guidance set out within Part A5 of the Hounslow Character, Sustainability and Design Codes Supplementary Planning Document (Residential Extension Guidelines or REGs), which notes that porches should not extend beyond the edge of a bay window and that developments should respect the existing architectural style around the site.
9. The proposed side extension would be chamfered following the shared boundary with No 13. Whilst this would not be fully consistent with REGs guidance, it would be sited behind the existing garage which already abuts the same boundary. As such, this design element would be largely obscured from the public realm and, despite the access path running alongside No 13, would have little adverse effect on the appearance of the front of the appeal dwelling.
10. Nevertheless, overall, the proposed front extension and porch would undermine the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and surrounding area, and thereby fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. The resulting harm to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset would be towards the lower end of less than substantial.
11. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of the level of harm to its significance. Where there is less than substantial harm, this should be balanced against public benefits. I note access to the dwelling would improve and I acknowledge an economic benefit, including employment during construction. However, given the modest scale of the proposed development, these public benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the great weight I am required to give the harm I have found.
12. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed front extension and porch would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area, including that of the CA. This is contrary to Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 Volume 1 which, among other things, aim to ensure that development conserves the character of an

area by responding sensitively to local architectural vernacular, complements the original building and takes opportunities to enhance any heritage asset.

### **Other Matters**

13. Though not a reason for refusal, the Council notes that due to the lack of an accurate site plan it was unable to determine the acceptability of the off-street parking space which could displace the privately parked vehicle onto the street and increase parking stress. Given the appeal is recommended for dismissal and this issue is not determinative there is no need for me to consider this matter further.
14. Whilst I acknowledge the desire of the appellant to create an enlarged home, such personal circumstances are of little consequence.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

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

*Finlay Bradford*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*C Carpenter*

INSPECTOR