



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2023

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3305484

8 Lime Grove, Twickenham TW1 1EL

- 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 Mrs Felicity Harris against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/1301/HOT, dated 21 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor roof extension to rear and side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The original planning application form was submitted with an incorrect name. Clarification has been sought and confirms that the name on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice is the correct name. I have therefore used this name in my heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. Lime Grove is a cul-de-sac comprising detached and semi-detached bungalows in modest plots, and a few larger splayed plots at its head. Pairs of semi-detached bungalows form an inverted 'U' shape due to front projections to the side, with entrance doors located in the recess between. On my site visit, I saw that many of the original gaps between bungalows at ground floor level are either absent or reduced due to the presence of side extensions and garages. However, open gaps at roof level have been maintained, largely through subserviently designed roof extensions, often with sloping roofs and/or modest side dormers. This permits open views, which reduces the impact of the front projections and contributes to a pleasant open character.
5. The host property is a semi-detached bungalow with existing single storey extensions to the side and rear, a 'hip to gable' roof extension and a rear dormer. There is a small gap of about a metre to the neighbouring bungalow. Due to its height and width, the proposal would effectively extend the existing roof extension of the host property in line with the existing gap at ground floor level. Due to its depth, it would meet the existing rear dormer. The proposal

would effectively extend the host property to almost the full width of the plot. Consequently, the open gap at roof level to the neighbouring bungalow would be significantly diminished, unacceptably harming the wider character of the area.

6. The original roof would be dwarfed by the combination of the proposal and the existing roof extension and rear dormer, to the extent that it would dominate the host property, and not appear subservient. Very little of the existing roof area would remain, to the extent that the original form of the host property would no longer be evident. Due to the combination of the proposal and the existing roof extension, it would result in an unbalanced appearance with the adjoining property and a discordant rhythm to the streetscene.
7. The appellant provided photographs of specific properties within Lime Grove in support of the appeal, and I visited all of them. The detached properties at the head of the cul-de-sac were not comparable due to their larger/splayed plots. In relation to the other examples, I agree that they demonstrate different designs for side extensions and a variance in gaps both at ground and roof level. However, none of the examples demonstrated the significant erosion of the gap at roof level that I find with the proposal. The appellant also referred to an example located over a mile from Lime Grove, but this area was of a different character.
8. For the reasons above, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. It would conflict with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan, adopted 3 July 2018, which seeks to ensure that development respects, contributes to and enhances local character. It also fails to follow the guidelines within the London Borough of Richmond Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document, House Extensions and External Alterations, adopted May 2015, which (among other matters) provides guidance to ensure that extensions are designed to respect important features of the character of an area and not dominate the existing property or its neighbours.

Other Matters

9. The appellant claims that the Council acted unfairly during the determination of the planning application process. This is a matter that could be dealt with through the Council's complaint procedures.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed development conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. No material considerations have been shown to carry sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

J Moore

INSPECTOR