
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by Caroline Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3154711
85 Nelson Road, Twickenham TW2 7AZ

- 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 Mrs Sheila McHale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1428/HOT, dated 12 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey dwelling on a prominent corner plot on the junction of Nelson Road and Redway Drive. Whilst minor changes have been made to the appearance of the terraced row of houses, overall, the strong sense of rhythm and symmetry in the front elevation of the terrace has been retained.
 4. The proposal encompasses both a two storey side and two storey rear extension. The two storey side extension would be approximately double the width of the existing dwelling and would incorporate a two storey bay to match the existing on the dwelling. The two storey rear extension would be sited towards the boundary with Redway Drive away from the common boundary with the adjoining property.
 5. The Councils 'House Extensions and External Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) states that two storey side extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original house and set back behind the front elevation. The proposal would not meet these requirements. The side extension, by virtue of its bulk, mass and scale would appear over dominant and disproportionate to the main property failing to achieve subordination. The form of the extension would also unbalance the pleasing symmetry and rhythm
-

of the terrace which has a positive effect on the street scene. This visual harm would be exacerbated by the prominent corner position of the appeal site.

6. In coming to my decision I have had regard to the previous permission for a two storey side extension at the appeal site which has since expired. I have been provided with limited details of this application and the Council has stated that the extension was granted prior to the adoption of current policies and the adoption of the SPD. In any event, each case must be considered on its own merits.
7. I appreciate that a smaller extension would lead to a small side garden that would be undesirable for the appellant. However, there is little evidence to suggest that this would lead to potential nuisances such as litter. I have also had regard to the extended property on the opposite corner occupied by a private nursery. I am not aware of the circumstances which led to this extension and given that the extension differs in design to the appeal scheme, it is not directly comparable.
8. Whilst the Council refer in their officer report to the rear extension having an overbearing visual impact on the adjoining properties, in my view its siting would be sufficiently separated from adjoining properties so as not to cause material harm in this respect. However, this does not alter my findings above with respect to the side extension.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area contrary to Policies DM DC1 and DM DC5 of the Council's Development Management Plan (2011), Policy CP7 of the Council's Core Strategy (2009) and guidance within the SPD. These seek, amongst other things, high quality of design that protects and respects local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Jones

INSPECTOR