

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016.

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3156495

10 Chase Gardens, Twickenham, London, TW2 7PB

- 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 Stephen Booth against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref: 16/1498/HOT was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is: erection of a porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.10 Chase Gardens is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area and built around the 1930s. Chase Gardens is mainly lined with rows of semi-detached dwellings at either side. They are characterised by curved front bays with windows at ground and first floor levels. The dwellings have some variation in detailing. Some of the semi-detached dwellings have been extended to the side and have garages, but overall their character has been retained. The southern end of Chase Gardens has more recent residential development of a different design.
4. The existing front porches for the semi-detached dwellings in the street vary in design and appearance. There are porches with gabled roofs and hipped roofs. Some have an open structure with the roof supported by vertical timbers. Others have been infilled with brickwork or completely replaced by a new design. However, most of the porches are relatively small. They generally align with the front of the adjacent ground floor bay window and are limited in depth between their front elevation and the main front wall of the dwelling.
5. The existing porch at No.10 Chase Gardens is characterised by a symmetrical front elevation, with a pitched roof supported by timber pillars. The proposed replacement porch would project forward from the main front elevation of the dwelling by around 2 metres. It would be upside down 'L' shaped with a post supporting the pitched roof at one side. The external materials would match those used in the existing dwelling.

6. The appellant has submitted that the 'L' shaped design; with part of the porch open at the front would ensure that the view out of the adjacent ground floor bay window would not be completely blocked. However, the degree of projection of the porch would cause some blocking of angled views of the bay window from the street. The porch has been designed to be at least 2 metres from the public highway in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *House Extensions and External Alterations*.
7. Despite the above matters, I consider that the proposed porch would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and street scene because of the degree that it would protrude towards the street beyond the front of the ground floor bay window. Its overall size and design would be inconsistent with most porches in Chase Gardens and would fail to complement the appearance of the building. The proposal would conflict with policy CP7 of the Richmond Core Strategy: Maintaining and Improving the Local Environment and policy DM DC1 of the Development Management Plan which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development recognises distinctive local character and is of a high architectural and urban design quality. It would also conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *House Extensions and External Alterations* which indicates that a new porch should enhance, rather than detract, from the original house.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has explained that the inspiration for the design was taken from a replacement porch at nearby No.17 Alton Gardens which was approved by the Council. However, that front porch is not a frequent example in the street scene and its existence is not a reason to allow harmful development at the appeal site in Chase Gardens. Other examples are listed for streets in the vicinity where porches project forward of the ground floor bay window. However, they vary in form and design. I have determined this appeal based upon the individual merits of the proposal and its particular site circumstances, having regard to relevant development plan policies and all other material considerations. These considerations include the proposed front porches of a similar form and design at Nos.6 and 8 Chase Gardens, which are also the subject of appeals. The proposed porch, would be generally consistent with the design of these other two porches. However, porches of the design proposed would still appear out of character and intrusive in the wider streetscene.
9. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the intention to provide a toilet in the porch and the lack of neighbour objections. However, for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR