
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3174369

43 School House Lane, Teddington TW11 9DP

- 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 Ms Lina Graham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/4704/HOT, dated 8 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension above an existing single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Procedural Matter

3. I have noted that the Council has referred to the Local Plan Publication Version for Consultation 4 January – 15 February 2017 in its reason for refusal. However, this has not yet been adopted and does not yet form part of the development plan and therefore, in determining the current appeal I have given it limited weight. In any case the emerging policies do not significantly change the Council's approach from those in the adopted plan.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a mid-terraced two storey residential property situated in a predominantly residential part of Teddington. This part of School House Lane is formed of a single terrace of similar properties, many of which have been altered or extended in various ways at ground floor to the rear.
5. Based on the evidence before me and my observations on site there are currently no first floor rear extensions along the terrace. However, in the wider vicinity I observed a number of first floor rear extensions including pitched and flat roof alterations.
6. There is uniformity in the design and roof form of this particular row of terraced properties which gives a consistent and attractive appearance. The proposed flat roof box form of the extension would be at odds with the host property and the wider terrace. Furthermore, as a consequence of its height and siting the flat roof would create an incongruous addition to the rear of the terrace.

7. Although not a large extension its flat roof box design and poor relationship with the existing roof form of the host property and the terrace generally would be clearly visible and intrusive from neighbouring gardens and the alleyway which links the front of the terrace with the rear access path. The close relationship between properties in the locality means that the proposal would be prominent and overbearing.
8. Concern is expressed in the Council's amended officer report regarding the effect of the visually intrusive and overbearing proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of nearby residential properties. However, living conditions are not specifically identified in the reason for refusal. Nonetheless, it is clear to me that the proposal would be overbearing in its immediate context and as such would be intrusive to nearby residents. I accept that the proposal would not cause unacceptable overshadowing and loss of outlook to neighbouring residents.
9. I understand that the appellant wishes to invest in the property and that the proposal would provide more convenient internal arrangements. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified with respect to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy Adopted April 2009 and Policies DM DC1 and DM DC5 of the Development Management Plan Adopted November 2011. Among other objectives these seek to ensure that new development recognises local character, is of a high architectural quality and ensure that rear extensions do not dominate the existing house and harmonise with its original appearance. Adjoining properties should be protected from visually intrusive developments.

Conclusion

11. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR