



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMi

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3335967

6 Cartwright Way, London, SW13 8HB

- 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 Julian Li against the decision of Richmond upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/2280/HOT, dated 17 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension, addition of new side window at first floor level, and front and rear rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The application form described the proposed development as "Two storey side extension, addition of new side window on ground & first floor level, velux windows on the rear of ground & first floor roof slope". The council changed this to the description used in the heading above. I have adopted it as it more clearly identifies the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Cartwright Way, constructed in yellow brick with a tiled, dual-pitched roof. It has a forward gable projection shared with its attached neighbour at number 8 Cartwright Way and has an attached side garage set back from the front elevation. It is part of a group of 5 similar semi-detached pairs. Many of the houses in the area have been extended and altered in various ways. The attached house, No.8, has a two-storey side extension, similar in design to the appeal proposal. The proposal would be set back 2.6m from the front elevation and would be set down from the main ridge of the dwelling. Thus, it would appear subordinate to the existing dwelling.
5. I am told that this group is part of development of 79 houses constructed in 1995. It is clear that very careful thought went into the layout and design with a consistency in character, although some of the houses are rather grander

than others. The semi-detached pairs in this part of Cartwright Way, are largely unaltered to the front, although some of the original single storey garages have been converted to habitable accommodation, with dormer windows set in some of their front roof slopes.

6. The attached garages in this group are set well back from the front elevations, which gives a sense of spaciousness in spite of their relatively wide front elevations of the houses, which is important to the character of the streetscene.
7. The Councils Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extensions and External Alterations' states that development which would result in the significant reduction of an existing important space or gap between neighbouring houses is not normally acceptable. The proposed two storey side extension would intrude into the wide open area above the garage. As I saw, the other half of this semi-detached pair has a two-storey side extension similar to the appeal proposal. However, that house is at the end of this run of houses, with a large garage court beyond. The garages flanking this house run at an angle, so that there is a triangular landscaped front garden area that contributes a good sense of openness.
8. The appeal proposal does not have such an open frontage, and although the extension would be set back to the same extent as the existing garage, the effect would be a loss of spaciousness, disrupting the rhythm which is an important characteristic. Whilst it is suggested that, in adding a similar extension to that on the neighbour, it would bring a returned balance to the pair, it would bring a most unfortunate change to the spatial relationship of the appeal house with its neighbour at No.4.
9. I have noted that permission for other two-storey extensions to houses on this estate have been granted, but that does not alter the factors that have led to my decision, and the photographs supplied are not persuasive of the point. The effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the streetscene would be harmful by disrupting the rhythm and closing down the space at first floor level between Nos.6 and 4. For these reasons the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR