



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2019

by D Hilton-Brown BSc (Hons) CIEEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/19/3230560

20 Second Cross Road, Twickenham TW2 5RF

- 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 Dheeraj Parashar against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/0725/FUL, dated 4 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new first floor mansard roof addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the first-floor extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated in a well-maintained residential street of a suburban nature, which consists of a wide range of detached and semi-detached properties constructed from a variety of brick and rendered facades. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house of modern appearance and is divided into two separate flats, Nos 20 and 20A. It is constructed of red brickwork, modern UPVC windows and doors and has off road parking to the front. To the rear of the property is a long mature garden, that is utilised by both flats. Both halves of the semi-detached property have undergone two-storey flat roofed rear extensions. The design of these extensions appears to be similar in scale and appearance in both Nos 20 and 22.
4. The proposed development would result in a further extension to the rear of Nos 20 and 20A. The appellant has recently obtained planning permission for a ground floor extension to the rear of this building. This appeal relates to a first-floor extension to this recently approved ground floor development. This new element would provide an additional bedroom and en-suite. It would have a mansard roof, which would extend slightly over the existing building line to the side of the house.
5. From my site visit it was evident that there is some variety in the style and design of the houses along Second Cross Road. There are a number of properties in the locality which have extensions and alterations. However, as a pair of semi-detached houses, Nos 20 and 22 have retained their uniformity

- and have a clear sense of balance and symmetry. The creation of a two-storey extension with a mansard roof at the appeal property, would unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses and remove the sense of symmetry.
6. Many of the neighbouring properties have single storey rear extensions, which blend in with the existing suburban setting, and do not appear inappropriate within the long mature gardens. This proposed first-floor extension would be incongruous with the local setting and detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling and the other half of the semi-detached pair (No 22). In addition, mansard roofs were not apparent on any of the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties. It would therefore be an unsympathetic form of development, which would be out of character in this rear garden setting. The height and massing of the building would also create a sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No 22.
 7. The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames (LBoRUT) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'House extensions and External Alterations' (2015), recommends that extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours and should harmonise with the original appearance. I consider that this development would fail to follow this guidance.
 8. I have had regard to the appellant's statement pointing out that planning permission has been granted for a variety of extensions in the area. I acknowledge that two-storey rear extensions were visible on Chestnut Road, which backs onto the other side on Second Cross Road. However, it was clear from my visit, that there were no comparable two-storey extensions visible from the rear garden of the appeal property on Second Cross Road. In any event, I am not aware of the particular circumstances of any cases and must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits. The existence of other two-storey extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified above.
 9. The appellant also references the lack of objections from neighbours; this also does not justify the harm I have identified or alter my decision.
 10. I therefore conclude that the development is contrary to policies LP1 and LP8 of the LBoRUT Local Plan (July 2018) and the 'House extensions and External Alterations' SPD. The above policies require development to take account of local character and design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons detailed above I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hilton-Brown

INSPECTOR