
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3166172

67 Gainsborough Road, Richmond, London TW9 2DZ

- The appeal is made under S.78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Alison Wood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/3232/HOT, dated 11 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor 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 host property and the area generally.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is within a residential area comprising a variety of dwelling styles including semi-detached and three storey houses. It forms part of a terrace of four dwellings over which is a grey tiled roof. The end of terrace properties both have a front facing gable whilst the inner two each have a rear facing gable. The arrangement of these gables provides symmetry to the roof of the terrace as a whole that forms a distinctive local feature.
4. The proposed first floor rear extension would have a rear facing gable that would resemble the original rear gable at the site in terms of its profile and the use of a matching window and external materials. However, it would form a more conspicuous element in the roofscape projecting beyond the original gable. The proposed development would not be a subordinate feature but would dominate the existing gable when viewed from the rear. The original form of the dwelling would not readily be discerned and in this respect the development would detract from its appearance.
5. Whilst the development would not be seen from Gainsborough Road, the roof line of the whole terrace is clearly visible from Fitzwilliam Avenue to the south of the site and to varying degrees, due to tree cover, from the rear gardens of other properties in the terrace and from the dwellings to the rear. I have noted the presence of alterations to dwellings in the vicinity, including a large rear and side extension to 71 Gainsborough Road and rear dormer windows to the

houses to the rear of the site. Notwithstanding the presence of these features, I do not find the proposed development acceptable in relation to the character and appearance of the surrounding area having regard to the distinctiveness of the gables within the terrace containing the appeal site.

6. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Core Strategy 2009 and policy DM DC1 of the Development Management Plan 2011 which both seek to ensure that the design quality of new development respects local character. One of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework is that development should seek high quality design, so conflict would also arise with this document.
7. I acknowledge that the development would not exceed half the width of the house and would adhere to some of the guidance within the Supplementary Planning Document on House Extensions and External Alterations 2015. However these factors do not lead me to a different overall conclusion.

Other Matters

8. I have had regard to the representations submitted by the occupiers and owners of adjacent properties but given the siting of the development away from the side boundaries and its limited depth, I consider that it would not result in any significant adverse effect on living conditions.

Conclusion

9. I acknowledge that this is a second application to provide additional space at first floor level. However, for the reasons given, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed first floor rear extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area generally and therefore that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR