



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3323580

78 Clonmel Road, Teddington, Richmond Upon Thames, TW11 0SR

- 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 Chiechi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/0204/HOT, dated 23 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is Hip to gable rear dormer loft conversion, installation of French door with Juliet balcony, front roof lights and new gable end window.
-

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. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located at the junction of Clonmel Road and Stanley Road. The dwelling has a two-storey extension to the side, with a hipped roof over both its main roof, and the roof of the extension. The appeal site is located within an area comprising of detached and semi-detached dwellings which display both hipped and gable roof forms, including some with rear loft conversions.
4. The adjoining dwelling, 76 Clonmel Road, has a recently completed hip to gable rear dormer loft conversion¹. The proposed hip to gable roof extension at No 78 would therefore result in the semi-detached pair having a more balanced appearance in this regard.
5. The proposed roof dormer would also be of a similar size to the large dormer on the rear of No 76. Notwithstanding this, the dormer would not comply with the design guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (May 2015) (SPD) which states that roof extensions should not dominate the original roof and dormer windows should be smaller than that of windows on the floor below. Whilst not statutory, the SPD provides useful design guidance.

¹ Lawful Development Certificate ref. 22/2219/PS192 granted on 6 September 2022

6. The hip to gable extension to the main roof and to the roof over the existing two storey extension, together with the large dormer, would in combination, result in a significant increase to the scale, bulk and mass of the dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed extensions would result in the dwelling having a rather 'top heavy' appearance which would detract from its original scale, form and character. This would be further accentuated by the large windows, french doors and Juliet balcony on the rear dormer which would exceed the size of all other openings on the rear elevation of the dwelling and would also be contrary to the SPD guidance.
7. The dwelling is located in a prominent location at the junction of Clonmel Road and Stanley Road. The proposed extensions would be particularly apparent when viewed from Stanley Road and would combine to appear as overly dominant and unsympathetic additions to the dwelling which I consider would also be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. I acknowledge that there are some similarities between the appeal proposal and the extensions to 76 Clonmel Road although the proposed hip to gable extension over the existing two storey side extension would add additional volume. Furthermore, the appeal property is in a more prominent location given its closer proximity to Stanley Road where the flank and rear elevations are both highly visible due to the siting of the dwelling at an angle to the road. Whilst there are other land uses and large scale buildings along Stanley Road, the proposed extensions would be seen in the same context as the other residential dwellings on the western side of Stanley Road and along the start of Clonmel Road where they would appear as overly bulky, incongruous additions to the dwelling.
9. The appellant has also highlighted examples in the local area of hip to gable extensions and rear dormers. However, I have identified that it is the cumulative effect of the proposed extensions together with their prominent siting, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which requires all development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality which respects, contributes and enhances the local environmental character. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the SPD.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR