The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3160376
28 Bryanston Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond upon Thames TW2 6HP

- 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 Scott Wilson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
- The application Ref 15/5422/HOT, dated 23 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2016.
- The development proposed is the erection of a double storey side extension with single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No. 28 is a semi-detached house located on the northern side of Bryanston Avenue in a predominantly residential area. This is characterised by semi-detached dwellings, similar in style to the appeal site property, some of which have been extended to the side.

4. Proposed are a 2 storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. I note the Council considered that the proposal would not harmfully change the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings in respect of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of outlook, and from my assessment I have no reason to disagree.

5. However, the Council raised concerns regarding the effect of the side extension on the street scene. While there are examples nearby of similar side extensions to that proposed, I observed that no. 28 and its attached neighbour at no. 26 retain much of their original appearance to their front elevations. In my judgement, the addition of a side extension at no. 28 would harm the symmetry that currently exists, creating an unbalancing feature that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host and its attached neighbour.

6. In addition, the existing 1 metre gap between no. 28 and its neighbour (no. 30) would be further closed (no. 30 has been extended to the side) creating a terracing effect that would detract from the street-scene. In which case, the presence of similar development nearby would not be a justification for a further development that I consider would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

7. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy CP7 of the adopted London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames, Core Strategy, April 2009 and Policy DC1 of the adopted Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames Development Management Plan which seek to ensure that new development connects positively with its surroundings and that regard is had to, inter alia, compatibility with local character including frontages, scale, height, massing, proportions, form and space between buildings.

8. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with guidance set out in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document; *House Extensions and External Alterations*, which advises that development which would result in the significant reduction of an existing important space or gap between neighbouring houses, is not normally acceptable.

9. Although neither party has invited me to consider a split decision, I note that the Council has not raised any objections in respect of the proposed rear extension. However, from the submitted details I am unable to be sure that the 2 parts of the proposal (the side and rear extensions) are clearly severable, both physically and functionally in terms of the rear part being capable of being built and then used for its intended purpose without the other part. For that reason I have not issued a split decision.

Conclusion

10. In conclusion, while I find that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, in my view this is outweighed by the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above, and noting the appellant's frustration with how the Council handled the application, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard McCoy

INSPECTOR