

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2016

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3159414
36 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UW

- 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 Naheem Mohammed and Asma Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/2633/HOT, dated 1 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear third floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear third floor extension at 36 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/2633/HOT, dated 1 July 2016, and the plans submitted with it, 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 the following approved plans: 0001 (Proposed Floor Plans), 0002 (Proposed Elevation), and 0003 (Building Cross Section).
 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 in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the Richmond Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No 36 is a mid-terraced 3/4 storey house on the eastern side of Petersham Road, a short distance south of Richmond Town Centre. Nos 34 – 38 form a group of three houses with a degree of unity of design, and No 36 occupies the central position in this group. It has a front gable at roof level which is a significant feature in the street scene. No 38 marks the southern end of the terrace and there is currently no development immediately to the south, such that No 38 is highly visible when approaching along Petersham Road from the South. The houses are local Buildings of Townscape Merit and they all are located within the Richmond Hill Conservation Area (CA).
-

4. The proposed development would involve the vertical extension of an existing rear outrigger at the property by a little over 2 metres, to create a small room at fourth floor level. In this respect, the proposed extension would largely mirror a similar extension at the neighbouring No 38. The other property in this terrace of three (No 34) appears to have an unextended outrigger, similar in design to that currently existing at the appeal property.
5. The Council contends that the proposal would result in a significant alteration to the roof profile of the property and would be harmful to the visual quality and character of the host property and the properties in the rest of the terrace. However, No 36 is a large property with a steeply pitched roof, and the proposed extension would be a relatively small feature that would be set well below the ridge of the roof. The rear outriggers would appear to be features only of this small terrace of three similar properties at the southern end of the longer terrace along this part of Petersham Road. Furthermore, the proposal would largely match that already existing at the adjacent No 38, which is the only property affording any significant views of the side/rear elevation of the terrace in the street scene. The rest of the terrace comprises somewhat smaller houses of varying design, and the very small proposed extension at No 36 would have no impact on the essential character or appearance of these houses.
6. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension, by virtue of its very limited scale, restricted visibility, and sympathetic design and materials, would not in this case be harmful to the character or appearance of the host property, the small terrace of three dwellings of which it forms a part, or the longer terrace along this part of Petersham Road. It would not, on this basis, be harmful to the Buildings of Townscape Merit along this part of the road, it would respect and complement the character and setting of the surrounding buildings, and it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
7. In the light of the above, the proposal would not conflict with Policies DM DC1, DM HD1 and DM HD3 of the Council's Development Management Plan, all of which require developments to be compatible with and respect local character, including the conserving the character and appearance of conservation areas and protecting the character and setting of Buildings of Townscape Merit. Similarly, it would not conflict with more detailed guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Buildings of Townscape Merit.

Conditions

8. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR