



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3308939

41 Lock Road, Richmond TW10 7LQ

- 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 J Lewin against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref: 22/2538/HOT, dated 15 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof extension to main roof, raising height of first floor rear extension including addition of a second storey above first floor rear extension. Rooflight on front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Lock Road comprises residential properties of different styles and ages. No.41 forms part of a group of two pairs of semi-detached properties (Nos.37-43) which are of the same traditional design with a hipped roof and gable projection to the front. To the rear the properties have been extended, however unlike the pitched roof to the other three, the two-storey element to No.41 has a flat roof.
4. The appeal proposal would change the main roof to a gable end and would add an extension to the rear projection extending up to just below the ridge line. While I agree with the appellant that the rear of No.41 is already an anomaly and has a negative impact on the character and appearance of the group, it does however have a subservience. The design of the extension would introduce further differences with the existing properties in terms of the roof form, alignment of the eaves line, and the introduction of windows at the upper level. These details together with the increased height and scale of the rear projection would increase its prominence which would be accentuated by the metal cladding.
5. There is a fallback in this case which includes the hip to gable roof alteration and a dormer window to the rear which is supported by a Lawful Development Certificate (Council reference 22/2257/PS192). As such, I accept that the

alteration to the main roof form and the visual appearance in the street scene would be the same under the fallback. I also saw from my site visit that dormer windows are a prevalent feature of the area, although they sit within the original roof form. In contrast the appeal proposal would result in extensive bulk at roof level, fully encompassing the main roof slope and extending some distance to the rear.

6. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the extensions of a contemporary design which have been added to No.31. That property is of a different style, and whilst the changes do contrast with the original property it is of note that the two-storey rear extension has a tiled hipped roof reflecting the form of the neighbouring semis, Nos.37-43.
7. Lock Road is not within a conservation area and does have a diverse mix of properties, and many have been extended. Nonetheless in this case, the scale, form and design of the proposed development would be an unsympathetic addition which fails to integrate with the existing property. Thereby, contrary to the appellant's view, I do not find that the removal of the existing first floor flat roof would be an enhancement as the extension would result in a top-heavy form which would both dominate the host property and be harmful to the character of the cohesive group of semi-detached properties.
8. In conclusion, the proposal would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, it would conflict with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan, July 2018 and the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD, which seeks development of high-quality design that recognises the surrounding character and context of the immediate and wider area, respects, contributes to and enhances the local environment including in terms of scale, massing, form, materials, and detailing.

Other Matters

9. The appellant indicates that the existing first floor layout is awkward and cramped. However, there is nothing before me to suggest that the bedrooms are particularly small or are unusable, nor that the type of accommodation sought by the appellant could not be achieved in a different way.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR