

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3337007

22 Park Drive, East Sheen, London SW14 8RD

- 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 and Mrs McKinlay against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref 23/2877/HOT, dated 24 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is for a Loft conversion, erection of dormer to the rear and addition of gambrel roof dormer to the rear roof addition with roof lights to the front roof; Erection of part single, part two storey rear and side extension; Addition of basement to the property, together with replacement of windows and doors throughout the house; and the Installation of solar panels on the roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within a pleasant, leafy residential street predominantly comprising semi-detached two storey houses, many of which have been altered and extended over time, including two storey side and rear extensions, as well as roof enlargements.
4. The proposal from the street would appear quite bulky by virtue of the hipped roof form and lack of subordination, although such principles do not appear to have been adhered to on some other examples within Park Drive. However, on balance, the Council has raised no objection to the scheme in this respect.
5. I note that the two storey rear extension, at first floor level, would be slightly wider than that advocated by the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) but in itself would appear relatively in proportion. However, the proposed gambrel roof extension above would render it essentially three storey in appearance and when combined with the other extensions would give it an incoherent and jumbled appearance that would fail to meet the aim of the National Planning Policy Framework (the

'Framework') to create high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings (paragraph 131).

6. With regard to roofs for extensions, the SPD states that it is generally desirable to use a pitched roof on all two storey side or rear extensions, to ensure compatibility with the host dwelling. In this case, I consider that the rear elements of the proposal would appear alien to the simple architecture of the host dwelling.
7. I note reference to the dimensions of the combined roof extensions and also to the Framework on the provision of mansard roofs being a suitable type of roof extension for buildings which are part of a terrace of at least three buildings, with a parapet running the entire length of the front façade, however that is not the case here. I understand the key inspiration behind the proposal in order to make the subject dwelling more energy efficient, although I am not convinced that the scheme before me is the only way to achieve that aim. Whilst the roof forms as proposed would be suited to the installation of solar panels, nonetheless in many ways what I see before me is a case of form following function with an incongruous form of development that does little to respect the traditional architecture of the host dwelling itself, and I say this having regard to the models that have been provided.
8. I acknowledge the examples of other mansard roof type constructions within the locality, however ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.
9. In conclusion on this matter I find that the proposed gambrel roof extension would represent an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would negatively impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area and conflicts with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which requires all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality and to be compatible with local character, whilst having regard to the advice set out within the SPD. I find similar conflict to Policy 28 of the Local Plan Publication (Regulation 19) however this can only be afforded moderate weight at this stage.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellant and third parties in support of the proposal, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR