



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3340683

52 Down Road, Teddington, Middlesex TW11 9HA

- 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 Mr J Wild against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/3107/HOT.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

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 comprises a staggered mid-terrace house within a residential estate, the rear/side elevation of which is exposed to and highly visible from within the Hawkins Road street scene to the north.
4. The dwelling currently has a flat roof single storey extension/conservatory, set against the exposed element of the two storey flank elevation of 50 Down Road.
5. The first floor extension would be constructed in line with the rear elevation of no50. It would be of a greater width than half of the existing dwelling however the key views would be side-on and what would render the proposal most incongruous is the height of the flat roof solution proposed to be employed. I note reference to 28 Down Road which has had a similar extension to that proposed, and which is quite clearly visible from St. Mark's Road. However, whilst it is not normally for me to comment on the appropriateness of this or otherwise, it does demonstrate the incongruity of such a two storey flat roof scheme.
6. The flat roof design may well minimise the height of the extension and whilst it would be framed by the roof of the house behind, nonetheless by virtue of its height it would result in an incongruous development to the detriment of the appearance of the host dwelling and the wider terrace of which it forms part. Consequently I am not convinced that the flat roof is a superior design

approach. I also noted the examples of rear projections on houses fronting Elmer Drive, to the rear of the appeal site, however they are of a different design and lack the staggered layout that is found in Down Road. Notwithstanding the comparable proposal at no28, ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.

7. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the 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.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR