



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 November 2021

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3281855

75A Cambridge Road, Teddington TW11 8DW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Isabel Luckett against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/2253/GPH07, dated 22 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of an additional storey by approximately 1.89m in height (10.59m overall maximum height).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice. While different to the application form, it is more precise and is also used on the appeal form.
3. The principle of development is established by the GPDO and the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of it do not require regard to be had to the development plan. I have had regard to the policies of the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) only in so far as they are a material consideration relevant to the prior approval matters.
4. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the GPDO, planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys subject to limitations and conditions.
5. The Council have not identified conflict with these other than paragraph AA.2(3)(a)(ii) of Part 1 of the GDPO that requires the local planning authority to assess the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse. From the evidence before me I have reached the same finding.
6. Therefore, the main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

7. There is variation in design and scale between the different blocks of built form in Cambridge Road and the surrounding streets. Nonetheless, there is a

consistency and often symmetry in the appearance of each individual block or row. This creates a pleasant flow to the streetscene.

8. The appeal property currently contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area by forming part of a row of near identical properties. The introduction of an additional storey at the site would unbalance the row it forms part of and disrupt the existing consistency.
9. The external materials and pattern of fenestration would be appropriate. Notwithstanding this, the scale and form of the extension would fail to complement the existing simplistic and discrete roofscape of the property and the row. Despite the existing height of the building, as it would span across the whole of the roof, the extension would add considerable bulk to a consistent and plain roofscape.
10. The incongruity of the addition would be clearly obvious from the surrounding streets and fail to relate to the existing appearance of the property or others it would be seen with, including at its principal elevation.
11. Therefore, the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. Insofar as they are a material consideration, the scheme would fail to accord with the design aims of Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan and the Framework.

Other Matters

12. There is limited evidence to indicate the design would replicate others in the borough or the period of the original building. There are no plans of a scheme copying the appearance of the storeys below or details to indicate such a proposal would represent a realistic fallback position.
13. There is already considerable overlooking of the nearby properties due to existing windows at the property. Nonetheless, a lack of harm to the living conditions of nearby residents is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the scheme. The scheme would provide additional living space for the appellant. Nevertheless, this, and any other benefits of the proposal do not alter or outweigh my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

14. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR