



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3230771

25 Stanmore Gardens, Richmond, TW9 2HN

- 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 Andrew Mackover against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/0358/HOT, dated 1 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "changing the existing roof from two separate hipped roofs to front to back pitched roof with skylights and lower roof to existing side extension. Retain existing slope. Ridge to be raised."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on a highly prominent corner at the junction of four roads. It comprises a detached single dwelling house which benefits from a two storey side extension. The hipped roof of that addition is separate to the hipped roof of the main dwelling.
5. The host property with its bay windows and shallow hipped roof has a strong horizontal emphasis. The proposed new roof, including the raising of the ridge height would result in significant additional mass to the host dwelling. Due to its scale, massing and height the proposal would visually dominate the dwelling, imbuing it with a top heavy appearance. It would fail to respect the appearance of the host building in terms of its form and design and would result in an overly vertical emphasis. This would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
6. While I acknowledge that there is a mix of house types and heights in the wider area, the appeal property relates physically and visually to the properties in

Stanmore Gardens. This road has its own distinct character which is separate from Lions Gate Garden and Windham Road. Further, while properties on these roads may be taller than the appeal dwelling, their roofs are clearly in proportion to the host building. By contrast, the proposal would appear incongruous within the street scene. It would exceed the height of the neighbouring property on Stanmore Gardens where, in the vicinity of the appeal site, there is a general level of uniformity in terms of ridge height between the properties. The proposal would disrupt this uniformity, resulting in an incongruous and dominant feature within the streetscene. Given the prominent location of the appeal site this impact would be particularly jarring, and these unacceptable effects would be readily apparent in public views as well as in private views from nearby residential properties.

7. I have been referred to examples of hip to gable roof extensions at Nos. 1 and 2 Stanmore Gardens. While I have no detailed information relating to these works, I note that the extensions are to properties which are attached to others. I consider that they respect the height, character and appearance of the host dwellings and the attached buildings, as well as Stanmore Gardens in general. Consequently, they do not reflect the appeal proposal in scale or form, and I afford their presence little weight in my assessment of the appeal proposal.
8. The appellant also refers to a recently approved planning permission which includes works to the roof of the two storey extension at the appeal property. No details have been provided with regards to this consent and so I have been unable to consider what may have been consented as part of my assessment of the appeal proposal. I also acknowledge a number of other appeal decisions wherein the issue of roof alterations and extensions has been considered. None of these appeals relate to the immediate surroundings of the appeal site and while I have considered the findings that have been made, I am mindful that each appeal would have its own context. Moreover, every case must be considered on its own merits. Consequently, these decisions do not justify allowing the unacceptable development proposed under this appeal.
9. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and would conflict with Policy LP 1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015). These seek, among other things, to ensure that development respects, contributes and enhances the local environment and character.

Other Matters

10. The appellant refers to Class B of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO), which permits works to the roof of a dwellinghouse. It is argued that this establishes a fall-back position against which the proposal should be judged. However, I have not been provided with any drawings or information to compare what may be built under the GPDO with the proposals. I have therefore assessed the appeal on its own merits.
11. I have considered the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residents. The appeal property is adequately separated from most surrounding houses, nonetheless the proposed development would be close to the property immediately adjacent to the south. However, that property has been extended

some distance beyond the rear of the appeal dwelling, and the front elevations of both properties are in line. The proposal would therefore not be visible from windows to the front or rear of that property. There is a window on the side elevation facing the proposal, but this does not appear to be a principal opening. I do not therefore find any harm to residents' living conditions and this is not a determining issue in this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR