
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2017

by D Boffin BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI Dip Bldg Cons (RICS) IHBC

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

Decision date: 19 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3164190

108 Ellerman Avenue, Twickenham TW2 6AQ

- 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 Naswar Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/3333/HOT, dated 18 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension and loft conversion.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling within a mainly residential area. The dwelling has been extended in the past and those extensions have not been totally sympathetic to its architectural composition which appears to have been inspired by the Arts and Craft style of the early 20th Century. One of the main architectural elements on the property that helps to illustrate this is the steep catslide roofline. 108 Ellerman Avenue (No 108) is located adjacent to the junction of Ellerman Avenue and Chester Avenue. As such the proposal would be plainly visible from both Ellerman and Chester Avenues.
 4. The proposal would entail a first floor extension that would replace the large flat roof 'dormer' that faces Chester Avenue and would extend above the existing ground floor extension. The part of the extension above the ground floor extension would be slightly set back from the front wall of the house but it would project beyond and wrap around part of the rear elevation of the dwelling. Furthermore, the remainder of the first floor extension would be in line with the front wall of the house. As such the characteristic catslide roofline would no longer exist. A dormer window is proposed on the rear roof slope of the extension.
 5. I acknowledge that the adjoining property has been extended at first floor level above the original ground floor footprint and the catslide roofline no longer exists on that property. As such the symmetry of the semi-detached pair has been eroded. However, even though the hipped roof design would be similar to that at 106 Ellerman Avenue the first floor extension's roof would not be set down from the existing ridge height and the extension would be substantially wider than that at No 106.
-

6. Only part of the extension's front elevation would be set back from the main front elevation of the host property and its side elevation would be slightly inset from the side elevation of the existing single storey extension. Nevertheless, taking into account the prominence of the proposal from Ellerman Avenue and Chester Avenue I am not persuaded that such a limited variation in the set back at the front and inset at the side would offset that prominence.
7. As a result, even though the footprint of the dwelling would not increase, taken in combination with the dormer window and the substantial width and depth of the first floor extension the overall proposal would add significant bulk and massing to the original dwelling. These factors would result in an unduly prominent and bulky extension that would not appear subservient to the host dwelling despite the use of sympathetic materials and general architectural detailing.
8. This would be contrary to the guidance in the Council's *House Extensions and External Alterations* and the *Whitton and Heathfield Village Planning Guidance* Supplementary Planning Documents which seek to ensure that extensions are in proportion to the house and its features and do not dominate the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the proposal would further unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses and lead to an incongruous, harmful form of development with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposal would remove previous extensions that are not sympathetic to the architectural composition of the dwelling and it would provide additional accommodation for a large extended family. However, I am not satisfied that this scheme is the only way in which those objectives could be addressed. Moreover, these factors do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of extensions constructed in the surrounding area. I do not know of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. Whilst I accept that such extensions have had an impact upon the general character and appearance of the area as a whole, such proposals tend to be determined upon individual site circumstances. Furthermore, nothing that I saw persuaded me that the development subject of this appeal is acceptable in this location. As such I attribute little weight to them and in any case I am required to determine the appeal on its individual merits.
11. In conclusion the proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such it would conflict with Policy CP7 of the Richmond upon Thames Core Strategy, Policy DM DC1 of the Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan and the *House Extensions and Alterations* and *Whitton and Heathfield Village Planning Guidance* Supplementary Planning Documents which in combination seek to ensure that new development is of a high architectural and urban design quality that is compatible with local character.

Conclusion

12. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D. Boffin

INSPECTOR