

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2017

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 9th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3161770

2 Nowell Road, London, SW13 9BS.

- 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 Jerry Dhillon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application ref: 16/3152/HOT, dated 4 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey front and rear extensions (part single storey to rear).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - a) The effect of the proposed extensions upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
 - b) The impact of the two storey rear extension upon the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of 99 Boileau Road.

Reasons

- a) *Effect upon character and appearance.*
3. The subject property comprises one half of a pair of inter-war, semi-detached houses located at the junction of Nowell Road and Boileau Road. It is within a mixed residential area which is not designated as a Conservation Area or Area of Special Residential Character.
 4. A Certificate of Lawful Development was issued by the Council on 10 October 2016 (ref: 16/3150/PS192) for a loft conversion and the erection of a garden studio. Those works were in progress at the time of my site visit.
 5. The small, two storey extension to the front of no. 2 would be constructed in matching materials. It would be flush with both the front and flank elevations
-

of the dwelling as originally erected and would not appear obtrusive in terms of the appearance of the host building. Furthermore, it would not unbalance this pair of semi-detached houses given their disparate appearance arising from the use of different materials. The subject property has brick elevations with grey tiles to the roof whilst no. 4 is roughcast rendered, having dark red tiles to the roof. As such, there is no uniformity of appearance that would be offended by the proposal.

6. I have therefore concluded that the small front extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance the host building or that of the surrounding area.
7. There are existing single storey extensions to the rear of the property, which would be replaced by a part single storey and part two storey extension.
8. I see no objection to the single storey element, with its lean-to roof. However, the proposed two storey structure would appear as an unacceptably dominant feature with its large area of unrelieved brickwork to the flank elevation and an untypical flat roofed design.
9. For these reasons, I have found upon the first main issue that the two storey rear extension would represent a poor design which would be out of character with and harmful to the appearance of the host building, contrary to national policy at Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework¹, Policy DM DC 1 of the DMP², Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy³ and the Council's adopted SPD⁴.

b) Impact upon living conditions.

10. I am satisfied that the proposals would not have any unacceptable impact upon the occupiers of 4 Nowell Road next door.
11. As to the effect of the development upon the occupiers of 99 Boileau Road, I acknowledge that the two storey rear extension is unlikely to bring about any loss of sunlight or a depreciable diminution in natural light to the windows of that property. Nevertheless, its bulk and proximity to the common boundary with no. 99 would result in some loss of outlook to the rear and flank-facing windows of that property.
12. Furthermore, the proximity of the flank and rear elevations of the new two storey structure to the boundary line between the two properties would have an overbearing effect as viewed from the garden and rear-facing windows of no. 99 and give rise to an unacceptable sense of enclosure to its occupants.
13. Accordingly, I find upon the second main issue that development as proposed would have an adverse impact upon the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of 99 Boileau Road, contrary to Policy DM DC 5 of the DMP and the Council's adopted SPD.

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

² London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework: Development Management Plan (adopted November 2011).

³ London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (adopted April 2009).

⁴ London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan: Supplementary Planning Document "House Extensions and External Alterations (adopted May 2015).

Other Matters

14. My attention has been directed to a number of properties nearby which have been the subject of alterations or extensions.
15. None of these is directly comparable to the proposals before me, whilst some were granted planning permission prior to publication of national policy in the Framework and adoption of the Development Plan policies and SPD to which I have referred above.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR