



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3312032

23 Ennerdale Road, London TW9 3PE

- 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 Lars Olsson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/2633/HOT, dated 25 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022
 - The development proposed is the erection of side extensions at ground and first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kew Gardens Conservation Area (KGCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached house which has been designated by the Council as a Building of Townscape Merit and includes a large single-storey addition to the rear. It is located in a residential street within the KGCA, which contains a mix of red and yellow brick detached houses of similar age and appearance interspersed by more recently constructed blocks of flats. The differing building forms are softened to a large degree by the well-vegetated frontages and mature street trees which, together with the handsome houses, creates a high-quality residential environment that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the KGCA.
4. The appeal property forms part of a group of four red brick houses. It is likely these would have been identical when originally built, with the main exception being that the appeal property includes a 2-storey side wing. All four houses now have garages attached to their sides, two of which also have upper floors above with street-facing gables. Despite these additions, the group of houses maintain a high degree of unity, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
5. The garage and 2-storey wing to the side of the appeal property are set a significant distance behind the line of the front and rear elevations. As a consequence these elements are clearly subordinate in scale to the host

- property and they are modest elements in views from the street and the rear garden. The proposal would comprise the erection of an additional floor above the garage together with the construction of a 2-storey addition to the rears of the original side wing and garage. The former would have a pitched roof with a side-facing gable whilst the rear parts of the extension would have a flat roof.
6. The proposal would reduce the size of the gap between the main side elevation of the appeal property and the neighbouring block of flats. Whilst the gaps between houses in the street are an important aspect of the area's appearance, they are generally narrow. The gap between the proposal and the neighbouring flats would be similar to those elsewhere and the elements to either side of this gap would be set behind the main building line of the neighbouring buildings. In this particular respect I am satisfied that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the KGCA and the host property.
 7. However, the proposal would extend to the rear so as to align with the main rear elevation of the house. Above this a flat roof would be formed. These elements would be at odds with the form and appearance of the group of houses and severely compromise the definition between the main body of the appeal property and the side elements. Due to their siting, height, form and appearance these aspects of the proposal would result in an overly dominant and incongruous form of extension that would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and fail to preserve the appearance of the KGCA.
 8. For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which, amongst other matters, seek to maintain or enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Kew Village Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2014) and the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015). Most notably the latter states that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house and should harmonise with the original appearance, which should be taken as the starting point for any future changes.
 9. Whilst the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the KGCA, the harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal would provide additional private living accommodation there are no public benefits associated with it.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR