
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3157974
35 Sheendale Road, Richmond, TW9 2JJ

- 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 Ms Nicola Robledo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/2262/HOT dated 7 June 2016 was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
 - The development proposed are ground and first floor extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground and first floor extensions at 35 Sheendale Road, Richmond, TW9 2JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/2262/HOT dated 7 June 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 the following approved plans: Drawing No's 1, 2, 3 and 4 (dated 25/05/2016).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Sheendale Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling which is locally listed as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) and is situated within the Sheendale Road Conservation Area. The properties along the road generally consist of similar, modestly sized two storey dwellings which are mainly linked by single storey porches to the side. The detailing and symmetry provided by the consistent use of brickwork with corner quoins and moulded window
-

surrounds, as well as the shallow pitched roofs, gives the area a pleasant and attractive character. The regular spacing between dwellings provided by single storey porches alongside planting within front gardens and the presence of street trees, further make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

4. The proposal includes a first floor extension above the existing flat roof porch entrance which would be joined to a two storey extension to its rear that would align with the main rear elevation of the property. I acknowledge that this would alter the appearance of the appeal property and the adjoining semi-detached property, which are a pair of matching villas. However, given the narrow width of this extension and its setback from the front elevation of the property, I do not consider that it would greatly unbalance this pair of villas to the unacceptable detriment of their character and appearance. Although the Council state that the height of the roof exceeds the eaves of the main property, the extension would be set down from the ridge of the property and the eaves height would also broadly align with the existing eaves, ensuring it would have a subservient appearance to the original building.
5. I appreciate the contribution the regular gaps between pairs of semi-detached properties make to the Conservation Area. However, the appeal property is the final semi-detached villa on the eastern side of Sheendale Road. Unlike other properties which have adjoining porches, the appeal property has a much greater separation with the block of flats to its south. Although this gap would be reduced, the separation would still be in excess of the gaps between other pairs of semi's in the area. I do not therefore consider that the proposal would unacceptably disrupt the rhythm of development along Sheendale Road.
6. The Council have raised no objections to the rear extension and given its scale and design, I have no reason to disagree.
7. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, which is a BTM and would preserve the character and appearance of the Sheendale Road Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with Policy CP7 of the Council's Core Strategy, Policies DM DC 1 and DM HD 1 Council's Development Management Plan. There would also be no conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document's '*House Extensions and External Alterations*' and '*Buildings of Townscape Merit*' or Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, for development to conserve or enhance the historic environment.
8. I note the reference to the setting of precedence. I am however determining this appeal on its own merits and any future application or appeal would also be considered on its own circumstances.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and having taken into account all other matters raised, including reference to the Conservation Area Study, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

10. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I consider the standard implementation condition and a condition for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to be necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I will impose a condition in relation to materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the building and area.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR