



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3330839

129 Staines Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 5BD

- 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 Mr J. Nortje against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/1922/HOT, dated 12 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as two storey side and rear extensions, removal and replacement of existing garage, alterations to boundary fence and gates along street and new gate to street.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. It has a two-storey flat roof outrigger to the rear which has been extended by a single storey lean-to extension. The appeal site is located at the end of a row of houses of a similar original design and appearance, although many have been subsequently altered and extended.
4. The proposed side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling by about 1m and would have a slightly lower ridge height than the host dwelling. The proposed side extension would therefore appear subordinate to the host dwelling and would comply with the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (the House Extensions SPD) in this respect.
5. The side extension would extend beyond the main rear wall of the dwelling as far as the end of the existing flat roof outrigger but not beyond it. The width of the rear projecting element would be slightly reduced but would combine with the existing outrigger to form a large rear projection, with a new hipped roof above.

6. In my opinion, the proposed built form, by virtue of its width and new hipped roof structure above would appear disproportionately large in relation to the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling, with the existing outrigger no longer appearing as a subordinate feature. The proposed extension would visually overwhelm the host dwelling, to the detriment of its original scale, character and appearance. This would be contrary to the advice contained within the House Extensions SPD which states that two storey side and rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building, to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the building's original scale and character (page 7).
7. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be prominently located and highly visible when viewed from Gothic Road, where it would appear overly large and unduly dominant and accordingly, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Although some of the dwellings along this stretch of Staines Road have had unsympathetic roof additions including extensions above their outriggers, this does not lessen my concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. I also acknowledge the examples where the outriggers on two adjacent dwellings combine to form wider rear projections however these tend to relate to flat roof outriggers that maintain the appearance and original form of the dwellings concerned.
9. Thus, I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy LP1 of the Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which, amongst other things, requires all development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality which respects, contributes and enhances the local environmental character. It would also be contrary to the design objectives of the House Extensions SPD and the Twickenham Village Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR