
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: 22 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/16/3161224

28c Sheen Lane, East Sheen, London, SW14 8LW

- 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 Susanne Pedersen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1780/FUL, dated 5 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is to erect extension to the first floor to one storey height and protruding out to 4 metre into the existing flat roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In the appeal documentation the Council indicates that the reference to policy DM HD 3 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan November 2011 (DMP) in its reason for refusal is a typographical error and that it should instead refer to policy DM HD 1 of the DMP as referred to in the Council's delegated report which relates to conservation areas. I have had regard to this policy in my consideration of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the Sheen Lane (Mortlake) Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a three storey end of terrace property comprising of a ground floor shop with a flat above. The other properties within the terrace comprise ground floor shop/commercial uses and residential above. The ground floor shop forms part of the secondary shopping frontage area of East Sheen town centre.
 5. The appeal site is within the Sheen Lane (Mortlake) Conservation Area which is linear in form and runs between Mortlake station to the north and Upper Richmond Road to the south. The conservation area has a mixed character comprising of commercial and residential properties. The Council describes it as having an eclectic mix of mid to late 19th century shops and cottages, with
-

the building line to Sheen Lane and the 2 to 3 storey scale of buildings on narrow plots providing cohesiveness to the area. I agree with this characterisation.

6. The proposed first floor rear extension would partially replace the existing first floor roof terrace which has been created on the flat roof of the ground floor extension and which is enclosed by a yellow stock brick wall and glazed balustrade. It would be about 4m deep and would extend across the full width of the appeal property contrary to the advice contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations May 2015 (SPD) which indicates that two storey rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building in order to ensure that the extension does not over dominate the buildings original scale and character.
7. I appreciate that the extension would be fully glazed to the rear and house a lantern-light to the roof. However, it would also have a solid brick elevation adjoining No 30 (to the south) and a part brick/part glazed elevation to the north facing elevation. Accordingly, it seems to me that any benefits from the use of glazing to allow for the original form of the building to be read would be limited and that the proposed first floor extension would not appear subordinate to the host building but rather a dominant addition which, having regard to the mixture of solid elevations and glazing, would also lack architectural cohesion and appear unsympathetic to the host building and the terrace. Notwithstanding, that there are various ground floor extensions to other properties in the terrace, with the exception of the existing roof terrace at the appeal property and the two storey extension at No 38, the original upper floors of the rest of the terrace are intact. Therefore, the appeal proposal would be out of character with the prevailing architectural form of the terrace and appear incongruous within the wider conservation area.
8. Views of the proposed extension from public vantage points within the conservation area would be limited. However, the north facing elevation would be visible from Sheen Lane. Furthermore, the extension would be visible from the service alley at the rear of the property and from the rear of the properties on Sheen Lane. I have taken into account the particular circumstances of the site in that the extension would be seen in the context of the mixed use live/work units to the rear and the rear addition at No 28a. However, even so this would not serve to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the conservation area.
9. The harm to the Sheen Lane (Mortlake) Conservation Area would be "less than substantial" as set out in paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to persuade me that there are any public benefits which would outweigh the harm caused by the proposed development.
10. To conclude therefore, the proposed development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host building and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Accordingly, it would conflict with policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Core Strategy April 2009 and policy DM DC 1 of the DMP which together seek to ensure that new development respects local character and is of a high design quality, as well as the Council's SPD which has similar aims. The proposed development would also be contrary to policy DM HD 1 of the DMP which

indicates that new development should conserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas and which, although not indicated in the Council's reason for refusal, is referred to in its delegated report. The proposal would also be contrary to the principle of the Framework of conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other matters

11. The appellant contends that the Council has been inconsistent in its consideration of the appeal proposal and refers to a number of developments in the area. However, each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its own merits taking into account the specific context of the site and its surroundings and having regard to the relevant development plan policies and all material considerations. I have considered the appeal on this basis and the existence of the developments referred to by the appellant is not a reason for allowing a development that would cause harm.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Doward

INSPECTOR