

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Beverley Doward BSc BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/16/3158350

84 & 86 Milner Drive, Twickenham, TW2 7PJ

- 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 & Mrs Jean Marsh & Ryan Weber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1714/HOT, dated 30 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'joint application for proposed porch'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwellings and on the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises two mid-terraced houses in a residential area. The porch would be sited at the mirrored entrance on the front elevation of the two houses and would be constructed in matching materials to the existing houses.
 4. The roof of the porch would have hipped wings and a central gable section which would sit between the triangular first floor windows. However, the design of the porch would fail to maintain symmetry between the houses, one side being enclosed with a door and the other remaining open. Accordingly, whilst the appeal proposal seeks to reflect the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations May 2015 (SPD) in relation to porches which indicates that where front doors are paired, a joint scheme with the neighbouring owner should be considered, it would nevertheless result in the front elevation of the dwellings appearing unbalanced.
 5. The porch would have an overall width of around 5.75m (2.875m to each dwelling either side) and be about 1.45m deep. Notwithstanding that the eaves would be the minimum height to accommodate a front door, the main ridge of the gable would be about 3.5m high and the hipped roof sections on either side of the gable front would be set at about 2.8m. The height of the porch coupled with its overall width and depth would result in it appearing as a substantial addition to the front of the host dwellings which would detract from their appearance. Furthermore, whilst there are other porches in the area
-

there are no front porches on the other houses in the terrace within which the appeal properties are situated. Accordingly, in the context of the consistent built form of the houses within the terrace the porch would appear as an uncharacteristic and incongruous addition to the host dwellings which would be out of keeping with the prevailing wider street scene.

6. Having regard to all of the above therefore, the appeal proposal would conflict with policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Core Strategy April 2009 and policy DM DC 1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan November 2011. Taken together these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high design quality and respects local character. It would also conflict with the Council's SPD which has similar aims.

Other matters

7. The appellants have submitted photographs of other porches in the area and I saw some of these on my site visit. The Council acknowledges that there are a number of front porches in the area but indicates that these additions were approved under previous policy and guidance. I have considered the appeal proposal on the basis of its individual merits taking into account the specific context of the site and its surrounding and having regard to the relevant development plan policies and all material considerations. The existence of other porches in the area is not a reason to allow a development which I have found to be harmful.
8. I appreciate that a front porch could be erected without the need for planning permission. However, any such development would not be as substantial as the proposal now before me.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Doward

INSPECTOR