



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2024 by M Long BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3331939

26 West Temple Sheen, East Sheen, Richmond upon Thames, London SW14 7AP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Jon Beill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 23/2303/HOT.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Demolition of first floor rear dormer, proposed first floor rear extension, loft conversion with rear dormer, floor plan redesign and all associated work with 26 West Temple Sheen, SW14 7AP.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The Government published in December 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The two-storey detached dwelling is in a residential area that has a variety of detached houses, each with individual characters and architectural styles. The appeal property has a more modest scale in comparison to its neighbours.

From the rear garden, I observed a number of extensions and alterations to the surrounding properties, including at the roof level.

6. The extension would have a large size and scale that would dominate the rear elevation. Even with the set back behind the rear elevations of the neighbouring houses, the additional bulk at loft level, combined with the lack of set down from the ridge, would have a disproportionate scale to the modest character of the appeal dwelling. While views of the extension from public vantage points would be limited, it would be visible from the surrounding properties where it would be viewed as a harmful addition.
7. In particular, the design of the extension at loft level would have an awkward appearance. The height of the proposed eaves would not relate sympathetically to those on the existing house, which are significantly lower. Furthermore, the shallow pitch of the proposed roof would not integrate well with the steeper roof profile of the main house and the existing single storey extension. As such, there would be conflict with the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015, which sets out that the eaves of rear extensions should line up with those of the existing house, or be lower, and the pitch of the roof should also be similar.
8. Although a scheme for a rear extension was previously consented at this site, from the plans included within the officer's report, I note that this scheme had a substantially smaller scale than the proposal. Furthermore, the steeper roof profile and lower eaves proposed in this previous scheme would have a more sympathetic relationship with the existing character of the host dwelling than the design of the appeal scheme.
9. While the proposed materials would relate well to the existing dwelling, this would not sufficiently mitigate the harm to character and appearance that would arise from the overall scale and form of the proposed development.
10. The appellant claims the proposal would modernise the property, in particular, that the proposed windows would be in keeping with the more modern styles of the kitchen and the neighbouring properties. However, the existing property is presentable and sits comfortably within the streetscene and for the reasons given, overall, the proposal would represent an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and the area.
11. The large extensions and alterations to the surrounding dwellings each have a design that relates to the individual character of the host dwelling. These developments have significantly different designs to the appeal scheme and, as such, are not considered to provide a precedent. While an extension to the appeal property may be possible, the scale and design of this proposal would not relate sympathetically to the character and appearance of the original dwelling. In any event, each appeal must be considered on its individual planning merits.
12. Given the above, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would be contrary to Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan, adopted July 2018, which requires all development to be of high architectural and urban

design quality. There would also be conflict with Policy 28 of the emerging Richmond Local Plan¹, which has similar wording.

Other Matters

13. I noted a window in the side elevation of No 24 that faces towards the site. It has obscured glazing, which limits the level of outlook and light available to this room. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in a harmful further reduction of light or outlook to the room served by this window. The Council have also indicated that this room is served by a rooflight. Nevertheless, the lack of harm identified with regard to this matter would not mitigate the harm identified above to character and appearance.
14. It has been suggested that there was a lack of communication from the Council during the application stage. However, this matter does not relate to the main planning merits of this appeal, which must be the focus of this report.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan, when considered as a whole. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR

¹ Publication (Regulation 19) Consultation Version, June 2023