



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2020

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/20/3256418

91 Wyatt Drive, Barnes, London, SW13 8AN

- 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 D Buyanovsky against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref: 20/1420/HOT, dated 27 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is works including dormer extensions to create rooms in the roof, single storey extension to the rear and internal alterations (Resubmission).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal building has an extant permission ref: 20/0271/HOT for enlargement of existing single storey rear extension, 2 x rear dormer extension and front facing rooflights.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is part of a modern housing development. The appellant advises that the appeal site is not in a conservation area, any designated area of character or area of design quality. However, it is adjacent to Metropolitan Open Land, which includes a small part of the rear garden. It is also part of a group of 4 large dwellings which have similarity in form, design and use of materials.
5. The building has already been extended to the rear with a flat roofed single storey extension which has a depth of around 3.4 m. The appeal proposal would involve increasing the depth of the extension by around a further 3.4 m. This would result in an unduly large rear extension which would be out of scale, prominent in the rear garden, and would fail to be subservient to, or harmonise with the original appearance of the main building. It would therefore conflict with guidance for house extensions in the Council's *House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document*.

6. The proposed side dormer windows would appear as prominent additions to the roof and would detract from the appearance of the front elevation of the building and that of neighbouring properties in the group. Two small rear dormer windows have been allowed by the Council under application ref: 20/0271/HOT. The appeal proposal includes a large flat roofed dormer which would occupy much more of the rear roof slope than the already approved dormer windows. It would appear out of scale with the first floor windows in the rear elevation and as an incongruous addition to the roof because of its size, form, and design. The proposed rear dormer would fail to comply with guidance in the Council's *House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* which advises that dormer windows should not dominate the original roof and should be smaller than that of windows of the floor below.
7. The proposed development would cause no significant harm to neighbouring properties in respect of loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, or loss of outlook. However, overall the proposed extensions would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, contrary to Richmond Local Plan policy LP1 which seeks to ensure that development respects, contributes to, and enhances the local environment and character.

Conclusion

8. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR