
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3233052

36 Westwood Road, Barnes, Richmond SW13 0LB

- 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 Nicola O'Regan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/0325/HOT, dated 31 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage; new side and rear extensions, and Juliet balcony to existing roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has suggested that the appeal proposal could constitute permitted development. However, I am required to consider the scheme as a whole and this is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is open to the appellant to apply to have the matter determined under sections 191 or 192 of the Act. Any such application would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal.
3. The area of disagreement between the parties relates to a single storey side extension which would replace an existing garage. The Council do not raise concerns regarding the rear extension or juliet balcony to the existing roof extension and on the basis of the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the semi detached pair.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, along with the adjoining No 34 is set at the end of a residential street of pleasant, traditional semi detached dwellings of varying design.
6. The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (LBRTLP) (2018) amongst other things, requires that development be compatible with the local grain and frontages in terms of form and detailing.
7. The side extension would incorporate a hipped roof while the existing dwelling has a gabled roof.

8. Consequently, the proposed roof form would, as a result of the differing design, be significantly at odds in terms of its appearance with the host dwelling.
9. Whilst the host dwelling incorporates a two storey bay window to its front elevation, the provision of a single storey rectangular bay window of differing design would afford the side extension an undue sense of primacy in what should read as a subservient addition. The bay window would also be positioned off centre on the elevation which would give it an awkward appearance.
10. Consequently, the proposed elevation would compete uncomfortably with the main front elevation of the host dwelling. This effect would be worsened through the increased prominence which would be given to the extension by reason of only a very limited set back proposed from the front elevation of the existing dwelling and the off centre positioning of the bay window.
11. In combination, the above matters would result in the single storey side extension forming an incongruous feature which would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the semi detached pair, given that the appeal property shares a large degree of symmetry with No 34.
12. The Council are concerned with regards to the width of the extension. However, I note that guidance within the Supplementary Planning Document *House Extensions and External Alterations* (2015) (SPD) only specifically requires that two storey side and rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building and I find no harm in this regard.
13. However, for the reasons identified above, the proposal would be discordant with and significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the semi detached pair. It would therefore be contrary to Policy LP1 of the LBRTLP which seeks development of good design quality that is appropriate to local character. It would also be contrary to guidance within the SPD which suggests that side extensions should be set back at least 1 metre behind the front elevation.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has raised personal circumstances in support of the proposal. However, these have been raised in only very limited detail and appear to relate to a potential future need rather than a current one, and on that basis, I can only afford this matter limited weight.
15. I agree with the Council and appellant that the side extension would not have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of nearby occupiers. However, this is a neutral impact.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR