



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2021 by A J Sutton BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3275721

36 Raleigh Road, Richmond, TW9 2DX

- 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 Chris Freeman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/0003/HOT, dated 28 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a rear single-storey lean-to extension and loft consisting rear dormer with return and roof lights to front elevation.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. The comments received have been taken into account within the appeal decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. Raleigh Road has a distinct and cohesive character which is derived from the late 19th Century architectural style of the terraced properties which line the street. The appeal property is a stock brick, period dwelling forming part of one of the terraces. It has been extended to the rear to form a two-storey pitched roof outrigger. Whilst not an original feature it is similar in style to rear extensions at the neighbouring dwellings, Nos 38 and 40. Moreover, although greater in depth than these nearby extensions, it appears, in terms of form, fenestration and materials, sympathetic to the original architectural style of the

- property. The coherency in architectural style is most evident to the front of properties on the street. However, the period character of No 36 is still discernible from the rear, when viewed from Windham Road.
6. Roof level modifications are a common feature in the area with dormers on main roofs generally covering the full width of the rear roof space. However, this proposal would also cover more than a third of the roof slope of the outrigger. The resultant flat roof form on the outrigger, whilst set down from the proposed dormer on the main roof, would protrude above the ridge of the existing two-storey rear extension. This incongruous feature would unsympathetically alter the simple existing profile of this aspect of the dwelling, and in doing so would not be sensitive to the existing character of the property.
 7. The Juliette balcony in the main roof slope would not in itself appear as an uncharacteristic feature in the wider street scene. However, the proposed large opening above the existing outrigger would fail to balance, in respect to shape or size, with the Juliette balcony. Moreover, this aspect of the proposal would not harmonise in terms of rhythm or proportion with existing windows at the rear first floor of the dwelling. The resultant effect would be a confusing pattern of fenestration that would not reflect the hierarchy or style of openings characteristic of the original dwelling and immediate neighbouring properties. As such, the poorly designed structure would dominate the rear roof space and harmfully change the appearance of the property.
 8. Public views of the harmful development would be limited and localised to the rear of the property. The fenestration of the development would also be partially screened by the apex of the outrigger. However, the high level, visually dominant feature would be observable from Windham Road. For the reasons outlined above, the insensitive modification, with discordant design details, would be distinctly different from roof additions on other dwellings near the appeal property and at odds with the character of the local area. The use of matching materials would not diminish this harmful effect on the appearance of the dwelling and the character of the area.
 9. I conclude therefore that the proposal would harm unacceptably the character and appearance of the area. It would thus conflict with policy LP 1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (Local Plan) which requires all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality.
 10. It would also be inconsistent with guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (SPD) which advises that the external appearance of any extension must be carefully designed, and in respect to roof extensions, amongst other matters, they should ensure sensitivity to the existing character.
 11. I have had regard to the extracts from the Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance 2016. Whilst focusing on changes affecting the front of dwellings the guidance is advisory and does not justify poor design in other aspects of the built form.

Other Matters

12. The flat roof extensions at the rear of other properties in the terrace are all limited to two-storeys. Whilst some may have large openings at first floor they

do not have additions above this level. They are distinctly different in this respect and not comparable to this proposal.

13. I note that an alternative, less extensive proposal has been submitted to the Council but I have no information as to the outcome of that application and do not take it into account. I determine this appeal strictly on the merits of the larger scheme before me.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and agree with the recommendation. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR