
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2017

by William Fieldhouse BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3170913

28 West Temple Sheen, East Sheen, London SW14 7AP

- 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 Gordon Hunt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
- The application ref 16/4316/FUL, dated 9 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2017.
- The development is described on the planning application and appeal forms as:
"Amendment to extant planning permission reference 08/0025/HOT. Addition of a plant room at rear, a study at second floor level, and inclusion of a section of concealed flat roof at ridge. Updating of elevational treatments; on front elevation modifying window openings and replacing a single dormer with two small dormers. On rear elevation extending width of ground floor glazing and adding a subsidiary gable, set back from that already permitted, to facilitate addition of study area. Upgrading of insulation to increase thermal efficiency and inclusion of rainwater harvesting."

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mr Gordon Hunt against the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. That application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed roof extension, rear extension at first floor level, front dormer, front extension at ground floor level, and alterations to fenestration at 28 West Temple Sheen, East Sheen, London SW14 7AP in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 16/4316/FUL, dated 9 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TDA169-001; TDA169-002; TDA169-003; and TDA169-004 rev C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant's description of development included in the header above refers to an extant planning permission. That permission, granted in 2008, was for a

proposed roof extension, rear extension at first floor level, front dormer, and front extension at ground floor level. The Council advises that the approved building works were commenced and could be completed in accordance with the approved plans meaning that it is a legitimate fallback position.

4. In response to advice from the Council, an amended plan was submitted during the course of the planning application that led to this appeal¹. This shows one rear gable rather than two; an additional rear dormer; one front dormer rather than two; alterations to the roof height of the side extension; and a mono-pitched roof to the ground floor front extension. The Council determined the planning application on the basis of this revised plan, and I shall deal with the appeal accordingly.
5. The Council's decision notice describes the current proposal as a "proposed roof extension, rear extension at first floor level, front dormer, front extension at ground floor level, and alterations to fenestration". This is an accurate and succinct description of the development, and is therefore reflected in my formal decision above.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal relates to a two-storey detached house in a suburban residential area that comprises mainly detached and semi-detached dwellings that vary in terms of layout, design and scale. Nos. 26 and 30 to either side are both substantial detached houses that largely fill the width of their plots and are set slightly forward of no. 28.
8. At the rear, the proposed first floor extension would run across the full width of the house above an existing ground floor projection. There would also be additional rooms provided in the enlarged roof space, which would be extended to either side and at the rear with a gable projection and two dormers. Overall, the appearance of the back of the house would be quite different, it being noticeably larger and extending across virtually the full width of the plot at first floor and roof levels. However, this would not be out of character with the pattern of development nearby, the ridge height of the new side sections of the roof would be set slightly lower, and the building would not extend further into the large back garden than the houses to either side. The fenestration would be acceptable, and provided that appropriate materials were used I am satisfied that the rear of the property, which would not be visible from the public realm, would not detract from the character or appearance of the area.
9. The front of the house would also be noticeably altered, although to a lesser extent than at the rear. There would be a first floor extension to one side, and the roof would be extended above this and above an existing two-storey projection to the other side of the house. Thus, the front elevation would also extend across virtually the full width of the plot at first floor and roof levels. Whilst the side sections would be set back less than one metre from the main

¹ Plan ref TDA169-004 rev C (dated 10 January 2017).

front elevation, they would be considerably further behind the front of the neighbouring properties to either side. This relationship with the adjoining buildings, along with the central porch projection and slightly lower ridge height of the side sections, would mean that the enlarged building could be satisfactorily assimilated into the street scene provided that appropriate materials were used.

10. Overall, whilst the resulting building would be substantially larger and quite different in form to the original, it would not be unduly prominent or intrusive in its surroundings. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal would not materially harm the character or appearance of the area and that it would be consistent with national policy²; policy CP7 of the Richmond upon Thames Core Strategy 2009; policy DMDC1 of the Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan 2011; and associated guidance³. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that development recognises and respects local character, including the nature of the particular road, and contributes positively to its surroundings.
11. The Council's decision notice refers to policy LP1 in the emerging local plan. However, as this plan is subject to consultation and examination, the weight I can attach to that policy is limited. That said, it would not alter the policy context to such an extent that it would affect my determination of this appeal.
12. As I have found the current proposal to be acceptable on its own merits it is unnecessary for me to consider how it relates to the fallback scheme.
13. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the timing of development and compliance with the approved plans, it is necessary for the external materials to match those of the existing building in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. The Council has suggested that an additional condition is required to prevent any parts of the roof being used as a balcony or terrace. However, the officer planning report does not identify any potential for the use of the roof for this purpose, and the design and layout of the proposal does not indicate to me that it would be likely. I am not, therefore, persuaded that such a condition is necessary.

Conclusion

14. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

William Fieldhouse

INSPECTOR

² National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") section 7.

³ House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015.