



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3342547

87 Hospital Bridge Road, Twickenham, TW2 6DG

- 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 Ms Lisa Wilson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref. is 23/3115/HOT.
 - The development proposed is hip-to-gable roof extension with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest single storey detached dwelling on the west side of Hospital Bridge Road (B358) in the section between the junction with the A316 and the junction with Percy Road and Powder Mill Lane. It has a hipped roof with a single storey flat roof extension to the rear. It is within a mixed area with both residential uses as well as commercial and community uses. There is a service road serving the property and the adjoining pairs of semi-detached bungalows to the immediate south.
4. The proposal would seek to raise the height of the roof ridge and change the roof form from a hip to gable to introduce a loft conversion. There would be a large area of flat roof with a wide rear dormer window in the sloping rear roof slope.
5. The proposed extension, given its scale and form, would result in a very bulky and cumbersome roof extension. As a result of its proportions and dominant massing at roof level, it would appear as a top-heavy addition to the existing property which would be harmful to its character and appearance.
6. Whilst I agree that the property as existing is modest in scale in the street scene, and the surrounding area is mixed in character and appearance, the property as extended would appear very bulky. The roof form with its massing and cumbersome form would be very visible in the street scene when approaching from both the north or the south as well as from the front of the

property. As a result, it would stand out as visually intrusive and overly prominent in the street scene.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. This would conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan, Policy LP1 of the Council's adopted Local Plan, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations and the National Planning Policy Framework, and particularly Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

8. I have noted the family related reasons for seeking the proposed extension. However, I am not persuaded on the information before me, that this would be the only design solution to achieve improved accommodation at the property. The harm I have concluded does not therefore outweigh these personal reasons.
9. I agree that the proposal would not affect the amenities of the surrounding residents, but this does not override the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area.
10. The Appellant has drawn my attention to other permitted developments in the local area. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits, but in so far as the information has been made available to me, I have taken them into account. However, I do not consider that they are directly comparable with the proposal before me and they do not therefore lead me to a different conclusion.
11. My assessment has been based on its planning merits; any concerns regarding the manner in which the application was processed should be directed to the Council.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR