



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2005

by A N Pykett BSc(Hons) PhD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ 0117 372 6372  
e-mail: enquiries@planning-  
inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date

- 5 JAN 2006

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/E/05/1188358

Plot adjacent to 373 Sandycombe Road, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3PR

- 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 Pan Euro Sys Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
- The application Ref: DC/JCO/05/0050/FUL, dated 10 January 2005, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2005.
- The development proposed is the erection of a new 3 bedroom detached house with surrounding gardens and parking space.

### Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

### Reasons

2. The appeal site occupies land at the junction of Sandycombe Road and High Park Road. It is an attractive and very visible location within the Kew Gardens Conservation Area – especially taking account of the London Plane trees and the pedestrianised parts of Station Parade which lie opposite the site. The parade leads to Kew Station and is characterised by a mixture of shops, cafés and offices – with residential property. Together they form an appealing part of the area and act as a contrast to the uniformity and traffic of the surrounding streets.
3. The appeal site forms part of the curtilage of 373 Sandycombe Road – a large 3 storey brick house with a notably complex series of interlocking hipped roofs. The house faces west onto Sandycombe Road, but it has been sub-divided into 9 self-contained flats. Four of these occupy the northern end of the building, with a number of windows overlooking the appeal site. The appeal proposal envisages the construction of a detached house on 3 floors.
4. Taking account of the area and shape of the site, the dwelling would be a complex design including a multi-faceted living room and principal bedroom and 4 chamfered corners. The location of the site would result in the building having 3 public elevations; the complex footprint demands a similarly complicated roof including some steep pitches; but the need for internal space would impose a requirement for 2 flat roofs.
5. In my view the design of the proposed development would certainly be an ingenious way of turning the corner from Sandycombe Road to High Park Road. The proposed building would have a distinctive roof, and I recognise that the roofs of the adjacent building are a

notable feature of its appearance. But I agree with the council's urban design consultee that, in effect, there would be an inconsistency between the roof form of the proposed building and the 6 facets of the living room/bedroom. I fear the extent of the overhanging eaves at the corners would have a considerably greater impact on the appearance of the house than the elevation drawings suggest, and that the roof would become an over-dominant part of the building. Although I believe the construction of a dwelling at this location could enhance the appearance of the corner, and hence be of benefit to the conservation area, I consider on this basis that the proposed scheme would have a harmful impact in conflict with paragraph (b) of Policy BLT2 of the *London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005*.

6. I have taken account of the other matters which the proposed development raises. Policy ENV 9 seeks to protect the trees within the plan area. I saw on my visit that these do make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the locality. However, although the scheme may necessitate some pruning of branches on the south-west side of the closest tree in the footway of High Park Road, I consider this would be sufficiently limited not to spoil its appearance. Similarly, although the site is currently available for off-street parking, I agree with the council that there is no reason to oppose the net loss of space which would be involved in an area so well served by public transport.
7. The council has referred to a UDP policy designed to promote the construction or formation of small residential units. However, I have received no details of this policy, and under the circumstances I am unable to take it into account. The existing flats in the adjacent building constitute such small units, and I have taken account of the impact the scheme on the living conditions of their occupants. I believe there would be an adverse impact in terms of the quantity of daylight reaching the north facing ground floor windows of flats A and B, but I consider (as proposed by the appellant) that this could be largely overcome by the installation of new windows. In view of its ownership this could be achieved by an appropriately worded condition. The orientation of the flats is such that I do not believe the effect of the scheme would be overbearing.
8. I conclude that notwithstanding the positive aspects of the scheme to which I have referred, these are insufficient to outweigh the harm I have also identified in relation to the appearance of the building at this important junction in the conservation area. It is for this reason only that I have concluded the appeal must be dismissed.
- M-001



INSPECTOR