
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2017

by Stephen Roscoe BEng MSc CEng MICE

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

Decision date: 06 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3179488

198 Waverley Avenue, Twickenham, London TW2 6DL

- 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 Tony Martin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 17/0412/HOT, dated 31 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2017.
 - The development proposed includes a new side/front extension, a rear extension and a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant has suggested, in the appeal representations, that a hipped roof arrangement could be introduced to the proposed side and rear dormer. This would not prejudice any interests of acknowledged importance, and I have taken this possibility into account in my decision.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues in this case to be:
 - i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area; and
 - ii) whether the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers in relation to visual intrusion and daylight

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. Waverley Avenue is a residential road containing a variety of property types and varied side and roof extensions. The appeal property contains a semi-detached house with a hipped roof arrangement. The proposed two storey side extension would be situated in close proximity to the side boundary of the appeal plot.
5. The combined side and rear roof dormer would occupy over half of the depth of the existing house with its side elevation, which would contain one window. At the rear, the dormer would occupy virtually all of the existing width of the

house and would contain two windows and french doors with a juliet balcony. The single storey rear extension would include a shallow pitch gable feature on its rear elevation.

6. The elements of the proposal comprise a combination of various extension types found elsewhere along Waverley Avenue. In these other locations, each element is not necessarily harmful to the character and appearance of the property concerned. When taken together however, as they would be with the appeal proposal, their totality would be out of proportion and out of character with the existing house. Moreover, the resulting extensions would appear top heavy, not subordinate to the original house and would not harmonise with the original dwelling in terms of appearance, form and proportion. The unsympathetic nature of the proposal would also be readily visible from the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Core Strategy¹ (CS) Policy CP7, Development Management Plan² (DMP) Policy DM DC1, Publication Local Plan³ (PLP) Policy LP1, to which I attach significant weight given the nature of the policy, and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document⁴ (SPD).
7. The house at No 200 Waverley Avenue also has significant roof side and rear roof extensions which are somewhat unsympathetic. The proposal would accentuate the negative effect of these extensions by drawing further attention to them, and any symmetry that could result from the appeal proposal would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. The property at No 202 Waverley Avenue comprises a bungalow. Again, this serves to visually isolate the appeal house and No 200, which would emphasise the harm that I have identified, and a cat slide roof on No 196 Waverley Avenue would have a similar effect. In particular, this cat slide roof would leave the side elevations of the proposed extensions readily visible in the street scene, and the side and rear roof dormer would also be readily visible from the side road near to the appeal property.
9. The proportions of the proposed extensions do not represent high quality design, and any use of high quality materials would not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Furthermore, the horizontal and vertical setbacks would not be sufficient to render the proposal subordinate to the original building. The suggested hipped roof arrangement would not reduce the upper volume of the roof sufficiently to reduce the harm to an acceptable level.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. I further conclude that it would thus conflict with CS Policy CP7, DMP Policy DM DC1, PLP Policy LP1 and the Council's SPD.

Living Conditions

11. The side elevation of the house at No 196 Waverley Avenue which faces the appeal property includes the main entrance to the house and an obscure glazed

¹ London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames: Local Development Framework: Core Strategy: April 2009

² London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames: Local Development Framework: Development Management Plan: November 2011

³ London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames: Local Plan: Publication Version for Consultation: 4 January – 15 February 2017

⁴ London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames: Local Plan: Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations: May 2015

ground floor window. The proposed extension would be in close proximity to this elevation and would represent a considerable volume of built development virtually on the boundary between the properties. This would be unacceptably visually intrusive in conflict with CS Policy CP7, DMP Policy DM DC5, LP Policy LP8, to which I attach significant weight due to the nature of the policy, and the Council's SPD. There would also be some daylight loss, but I am not satisfied that this would be unreasonable. Even so, the absence of harm in this regard, and indeed the fact that the current occupiers of No 196 support the proposal, would not outweigh the other harm that I have identified.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers in relation to visual intrusion. I further conclude that it would thus conflict with CS Policy CP7, DMP Policy DM DC5, LP Policy LP8 and the Council's SPD.

Conclusion

13. Having taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision, and my conclusion is based on the evidence before me in terms of policy as a whole. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Roscoe

INSPECTOR