



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2024

**by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25<sup>th</sup> July 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3344062**

**43 Ferry Road, Barnes, Richmond Upon Thames, London SW13 3PP**

- 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 Kamyar Kaviani against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/0034/HOT.
  - The development proposed is a loft extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. No.43 is a semi-detached property with a hipped roof to the western side of Ferry Road. It reflects the style and general form of properties along the street, which have projecting two-storey, gabled features to the front. It is also evident that many have been altered and enlarged with a variety of extensions to the side and modifications to the roof.
4. The appeal property has an existing two-storey, flat roof element to the side. The proposal would add a roof integrating with that of the host property which would also be extended. The main ridgeline would be effectively doubled in length with the section over the side extension slightly set down with a flat roof element.
5. The Council's House Extensions and External Alterations - Supplementary Planning Document – 2015 (SPD) advocates both integrated and subordinate approaches to side extensions but seeks harmonisation with the appearance of the original property. Whilst there is no consistency to the design of extensions to other properties in the vicinity, the roof to the side extension primarily reflects the pitch of the host property or in some instances has been extended to form a gable end (or box dormer). In contrast, the proposed roof is designed with a steep angle, which responds with neither, and would create a mix of different pitches to the roof.

6. Currently, the top of the existing side extension is formed of a parapet wall which sits below the eaves line, and due to the varying positions of side extensions to other properties, there is a visual variation in the eaves line when viewed along the street. As such, I do not find that the proposed raised alignment would in itself be a prominent feature, nevertheless, it adds to the discordant form of the proposed development.
7. The proposed change to the roof profile and additional bulk would create an incongruous addition. Altering the shape and proportions of the original property there would also be a lack of coherence to the semi-detached pair. Through alterations, the symmetry between the pairs of semi-detached properties along the street has diminished, however, the overall character of the original property prevails. I acknowledge that there are a few examples of dominating additions, but these do not justify a poor standard of design or conflict with the development plan.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would be an unsympathetic addition which would fail to harmonise with the host property and its resultant appearance would be out of keeping with the prevailing character.
9. Therefore, the proposal would be harmful to the integrity of the semi-detached pair and the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore conflict with Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) and the SPD which seek high-quality design which respects the local character and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces and the local area.
10. Policy 28 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan Publication (Regulation 19) Consultation version Local Plan (2023) is also referred to in the reason for refusal, but as emerging policy it does not carry full weight and I have based my decision upon the adopted development plan.

### **Other Matters**

11. The development would provide increased accommodation for the occupants, but there is nothing before me to suggest that the design proposed is the only way to achieve this. The development would utilise materials to match the existing property, and there would be no adverse impact of the development on the amenities of the neighbouring properties. While there would be a lack of harm in these respects these are neutral factors and there are no other matters which outweigh the conflict with the development plan

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons set out, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR