
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

by Rory Cridland LLB (Hons), Solicitor

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

Decision date: 10 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/16/3157049

484A Upper Richmond Road, Barnes, London SW15 5JG

- 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 Paul Roberts against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/2429/FUL, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential street characterised by large attractive dwellings. The building itself consists of a semi-detached property which has previously been converted into flats with the appeal site taking up the ground floor. It is situated in a prominent location on the corner of Upper Richmond Road and Leconfield Avenue.
4. Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy¹ (CS) seeks to protect buildings of high quality from inappropriate development. It requires new development to recognise distinctive local character and contribute to creating places of a high architectural and urban design quality. Furthermore, Policy DMDC1 of the Development Management Plan² (DMP) requires new development to respect local character and to contribute positively to its surroundings. It sets out a number of criteria against which proposals will be assessed including their compatibility with local character in terms their scale and proportions.
5. The proposed extension would result in a significant addition to the property. Its overall scale and bulk would considerably alter the side elevation of the existing building, increasing its size and appearing as a dominant addition. This

¹ London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009).

² London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Development Framework Development Management Plan (2011).

would fail to accord with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance³ (SPG) which advises that side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house and should harmonise with the original appearance. Furthermore, the inclusion of a triangle shaped window to the rear elevation would appear in stark contrast to those which are characteristic both in the existing building and its adjoining neighbour. Together, these impacts would materially erode the character of the host property.

6. Moreover, in view of its prominent location on the corner, its impact on the street scene would be noticeable. While at present the existing extension appears subservient and modest, the size, bulk and rear projection of the proposal would be considerably greater. It would appear dominant within its surroundings and would fail to make a positive contribution to the street scene.
7. While I note that the appellant has indicated that the existing extension at neighbouring No 482 is more dominant than the one proposed, that extension is partially screened and has a considerably greater degree of set back from the road. As such, its impact on the street scene is diminished. Likewise, while I note that the appellant considers the garages opposite already have a detrimental impact on the street scene, that does not provide sufficient justification to grant planning permission for the development proposed.
8. Furthermore, while I note the use of matching materials and the existing fencing would go some way to reducing the overall impact, they would not in my view be sufficient to mitigate the resultant harm. Moreover, although the appellant has suggested increasing the fence height in order to provide further mitigation, in the absence of any firm details, I cannot be certain that any such increase would not result in further detriment to the street scene.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not contribute positively to its surroundings and would be harmful to both the character of the existing building and that of the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to CS Policy CS7, DMP Policy DMDC1 and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rory Cridland

INSPECTOR

³ London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015).