The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th May 2017

Appeal A Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3168298
Archway Cottage, 62 Archway Street, Barnes, London SW13 0AR

- 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 James Toseland against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
- The application Ref 16/4605/HOT, dated 3rd December 2016, was refused by notice dated 26th January 2017.
- The development proposed is a loft extension.

Appeal B Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3168473
Archway Cottage, 62 Archway Street, Barnes, London SW13 0AR

- 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 James Toseland against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
- The application Ref 16/4604/HOT, dated 3rd December 2016, was refused by notice dated 26th January 2017.
- The development proposed is a rear ground floor extension.

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. With regard to Appeal A, the main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. With regard to Appeal B, the main is issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 58 Archway Street.

Reasons

Character and Appearance (Appeal A)

3. Archway Cottage comprises three terraced properties that have been amalgamated into one. The property is two storeys high with a pitched roof, and is located in an area where the majority of properties are terraced. The roof pitch of the property is set marginally lower than the roof pitches on the adjoining properties at Nos 58 and 66. The rear roof planes of the adjacent and nearby properties contain a number of roof extensions, including dormers and balcony areas.

4. The proposed raising of the roof pitch would result in alterations to the angle of the front roof slope. This would sit uncomfortably within the terraced form of the street scene because the regularity of the angle of the roof slopes with the adjoining properties would be lost. As the roof slopes are elevated, this alteration would be prominent in the street scene. I recognise the increased ridge height would not exceed that of adjoining properties, although this does not outweigh my concerns caused by this alteration to the front roof slope and the resultant adverse effects on the building and the area.

5. The rear roof extension would extend across the near entirety of the width of the roof slope. The character and appearance of the rear roof slope would be lost to what would appear as an unsympathetic and dominant flat roofed third storey. The proposed French doors and Juliet balconies in the rear roof extension would further add to the unsatisfactory visual dominance of the rear roof extension.

6. The Appellant has drawn my attention to roof extensions on adjoining properties. However, based on my site visit, I consider the roof extensions to these properties, whilst similar in depth, are much smaller in width. They do not result in the loss of the character and appearance of the rear roof slopes. I have also noted that French doors and Juliet balconies previously received planning permission on the rear of the appeal property. However these were at first floor level and would not result in the same level of visual dominance.

7. The proposed materials would largely be in keeping with the existing materials on the property and similar to other roof extensions in the area. This does not however outweigh the harm to character and appearance which I have identified.

8. I consider the proposal would be contrary to Policy CP 7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (2009) and Policy DM DC 1 of LDF Development Management Plan (2011) which require that development recognises and is compatible with local character, and the need for high quality design. The proposal also fails to comply with the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) because it would not keep the roof extension in scale to the existing property and as it would dominate the existing roof.

9. Although the Council have 'adopted' the Local Plan: Publication Version for Consultation (2017) (Local Plan) for development management purposes, the Local Plan has yet to reach Examination and the policies it contains may change. I therefore attach limited weight to Local Plan Policy LP 1. Nevertheless Policy LP 1 applies a similar approach to character and appearance as the existing Development Plan and, as such, I consider the proposal would also be contrary to this emerging policy.

Living Conditions (Appeal B)

10. The boundary between the appeal property and No 58 is for most of its length defined by a wall and vegetation, which reaches a combined height of about 2 metres (m). The wall rises in height to 3m for a short length nearest the rear elevations of the dwellings. The proposed rear ground floor extension would be sited directly adjacent to the boundary with No 58 and would run its entire length.

11. The rear elevation of No 58 contains a number of windows that are directly orientated over its rear garden area and are in proximity to the boundary wall, due to the confined nature of the rear areas of each property.

12. The rear extension would be of noticeably greater height than the majority of the boundary wall and vegetation, and with its proximity and length along the boundary, would serve to enclose No 58 along this boundary. I consider this would represent an overbearing and visually intrusive form of development that would significantly reduce the outlook from the rear of the property.

13. Although the Appellant makes reference to larger extensions on neighbouring properties, no details of such extensions have been provided. In any case, effects on the living conditions of occupiers of relevant adjoining properties need to be assessed with regard to each proposal. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a pergola in the rear garden area of the appeal property, where the rear extension would be sited. At the time of my site visit, there was no sign of the pergola and, in any case, this does not alter my views as pergola structures are lightweight in form and would not have the same level of visual intrusion as the rear extension.

14. I consider the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM DC 5 of LDF Development Management Plan which requires that development protects adjoining properties, including from visual intrusion. The proposal also fails to comply with the SPD because it would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure and would appear overbearing from neighbouring properties and rooms. Whilst I attach limited weight to the emerging Local Plan, I consider the proposal would be contrary to Policy LP 8 which applies a similar approach to the protection of living conditions of occupiers of adjoining properties as existing Development Plan policy.

Conclusion

15. I have found that the loft extension in Appeal A will cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the building and the area. I have also found that the rear single storey extension in Appeal B would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 58. For these reasons, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR