

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3155008

53 Dyers Lane, Barnes, London SW15 6JT

- 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 Jairun F Kausar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1124/HOT, dated 18 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension with part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension with part single storey rear extension at 53 Dyers Lane, Barnes, London SW15 6JT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/1124/HOT, dated 18 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans: Drawing No 0959 Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations Revision 1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end terrace dwelling. It is located in a residential area characterised by mainly two storey terraced dwellings with some two storey semi-detached properties. The area has a relatively uniform layout with the properties all set a similar distance back from the road and with relatively small spaces between the buildings.
 4. The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) (SPD) provides design guidance for two storey side extensions and states development, which would result in the significant reduction of an existing
-

important space or gap between neighbouring houses, is not normally acceptable. In conjunction with existing extensions to neighbouring buildings this can have a terracing effect on the street. Consequently, two storey side extensions should be sited 1m from the side boundary. Furthermore it states that the overall shape, size and position of rear and side extension should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours and should harmonise with the original appearance of the dwelling. Moreover, it states this can be achieved through designing the addition to appear subordinate to the main structure so that the original form of the dwelling can still be appreciated.

5. The property sharing the common boundary with the appeal site is No 52 Dyers Lane (No 52) which is set off the shared boundary with the appeal site a similar distance to the appeal dwelling. There is nothing before me to indicate that the occupants of No 52 wish to extend to the side and any proposed extension would need to be considered on its merits. Nevertheless, even though the appeal proposal would extend up to the shared side boundary at two storey level reducing the space, a substantial amount of space would remain between the extended appeal dwelling and No 52.
6. The proposed two storey side extension has a pitched roof reflecting the character of the appeal dwelling. Even though, at ground floor level the proposed extension would be in line with the existing front elevation, it would be set back at first floor level and has a lower ridge height making it appear subservient to the existing dwelling. Whilst the set back at first floor level is not a common feature of the street scene it would reflect the lean to roof of the porch of the appeal property and the porches of other dwellings on Dyers Lane.
7. The Council have raised no objections to the proposed rear extension; I find no reason to question this and overall, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. Thus, for the reasons given the proposed development would accord with the aims of the SPD, the development plan and the good design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It would specifically comply with Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and Policy DM DC 1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Development Framework Development Management Plan (2011) which, taken together, aim to ensure good design and that new development recognises distinctive local character and contributes to creating places of a high architectural and urban design quality.

Conditions

9. The conditions imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council but with some variation in the interests of clarity and precision having regard to the advice on imposing conditions in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition which requires materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR