



Appeal Decision

Site visit held on 22 September 2005

by M C Bradshaw

MA (Cantab) DipTP MRTPI Hon FRIBA

The Planning Inspectorate
Room 417
Temple Quay House,
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@
planning-
inspectorate.gsi.
gov.uk

Date 30 SEP 2005

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/A/05/1184037

70 Broughton Avenue, Ham, Richmond, Surrey TW10 7UR

- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr C E Cook against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
- The application (Ref: 04/3505/HOT) dated 29 October 2004 was refused by notice dated 23 December 2004.
- The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and roof conversion.

Preliminary Matters

1. I note from what is before me that an amended proposal was submitted to the Council subsequent to its decision on the original application on 23 December 2004. This later proposal does not appear to have been considered by the Council and, for clarification, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of drawing No EH 2512/02 Rev. A dated 14 October 2004.

Decision

2. For the reasons given below, I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

3. The extension would be a structure similar in scale to the existing dwelling and would in effect more or less double its width. This would in turn bring it within very close proximity to the back of the pavement on the flanking street, Ashburnham Road, over the full depth of the extension.
4. I do not consider there need necessarily be an overriding concern with maintaining precise building lines in both directions on a corner plot when an addition to an existing building is proposed. However, in this case, the extension would occupy virtually the whole of the space to the side of the dwelling and would protrude almost 6 metres in front of the present building line on Ashburnham Road, which is evenly maintained over a considerable

distance. I find this to be so far beyond the line as to make the intended development appear visually discordant and very intrusive within the street scene. This effect would be accentuated by the considerable bulk of the proposed scheme, which would not be subordinate to the existing dwelling either in overall size, height or setback, as the Council's Design Guidelines advise.

5. I have taken note of the extensions on Ashburnham Road and Broughton Avenue, which are claimed to be comparable to that now proposed, and to establish a precedent, but do not find the circumstances to be similar. In these cases, the extensions are, in my opinion, comparatively modest in terms of width, do not overpower the parent building, and sit comfortably within the street scene. I have in any event dealt with the present proposal on its own merits.
6. Having regard to the above, and all other matters drawn to my attention, I conclude that the scheme would, by reason of its excessive size and proximity to the Ashburnham Road boundary, be unsympathetic to the parent building, appear cramped within its site, and out of place in the street scene. It would therefore be in conflict with Policy BLT11 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan (First Review 2005) and inconsistent with the Council's Design Guidelines for Extensions.



INSPECTOR