
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3174432

79 & 79A Elmfield Avenue, Teddington TW11 8BX

- 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 Linda Trevijano and Steve & Jo Hackett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/4067/HOT, dated 20 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof extensions incorporating new rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses and on the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. This is a joint appeal in relation to a pair of semi-detached houses on the north-western side of Elmfield Avenue. The road is characterised mainly by semi-detached houses of varying design with some detached houses. Many have undergone hip to gable roof extensions and a variety of side and rear dormers and some front dormers can be seen from the road. These numerous additions are now part of the established character of the road. There is a chalet bungalow at 77 Elmfield Avenue, adjacent to no.79, one of a short row of bungalows that present a different appearance in the streetscene.
4. It is proposed to make a hip to gable roof extension to the side of both properties; the gable ends would each have a small barn hip. Two dormers would be provided within the enlarged rear roof slope to both houses.
5. The semi-detached house at 81 Elmfield Avenue, adjacent to no. 79A, has undergone a hip to gable roof extension with the addition of a large flat roofed box dormer. In this respect, the proposal would not be out of keeping with the modified character of the road. However, the hip to gable extension at no.79 would be seen against the lower profile of the chalet bungalow at no.77. The large expanse of new gable wall would be a bulky and conspicuous feature viewed over the lower roof of the bungalow, far more prominent than most hip to gable additions in the road.

6. The four rear dormers would be of identical design, each having pitched roofs with a flat top. They would nonetheless be bulky in appearance and their large windows would not relate well to the smaller windows at first floor level. They would also appear as conspicuous features when viewed from neighbouring back gardens, at variance with the original hipped roof character of the pair.
7. Core Strategy Policy CP7 encourages new development to recognise distinctive local character and contribute to creating places of high architectural quality. Development Management Plan Policy DM DC 1 relates to design quality and principles including the spacing between buildings. Although the character and appearance of the road has changed over time with the addition of many roof alterations, the development would nonetheless still have a significant adverse effect for the reasons I have outlined. The proposal would therefore not be in accordance with these development plan policies or with the adopted Supplementary Planning Document (May 2015) Design Guidelines for House Extensions and External Alterations.
8. The appellants have drawn my attention to the many and varied hip to gable extensions and rear dormers in Elmfield Avenue and in other roads nearby. These undoubtedly now form part of the character of the area. I am also mindful of the aspirations of the joint appellants to enlarge and improve the accommodation in their homes. But these factors do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the building and to the surrounding area that I have identified.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the concerns expressed in a representation about the impact on light and privacy for the occupiers of the adjacent bungalow at 77 Elmfield Avenue. However, the Local Planning Authority has not raised an objection to the development on this ground and I have no reason to disagree with their assessment in this respect.

Conclusion

10. The proposed hip to gable roof extensions incorporating rear dormers would be harmful to the character and appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses and to the surrounding area. As such, the appeal should be dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR