

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Stephen Hawkins MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21st September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3154251

5 Upper Teddington Road, Hampton Wick KT1 4DL

- 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 Mrs S Norton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1555/HOT, dated 21 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area.
 - The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining residential property, having regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The host dwelling is a detached property probably dating from the turn of the 20th Century. It has a gabled front elevation with projecting bay windows. The unbroken eaves and ridge lines of the host dwelling run parallel to the side boundaries of the narrow plot. The wide garden of 3 Teddington Road on one side and the low gabled roof of the commercial garage on the other side, have effect that the front elevation and parts of the side elevations of the host dwelling are open to views for some distance along Teddington Road. No 3 is one of pair of dwellings of similar age to the host dwelling.
 4. The proposed extension would have a similar gabled roof form to the host dwelling, it would be set well back from the front elevation thus retaining part of the existing roof, and it would utilise matching materials.
 5. Even so, the extension would raise the height of about two thirds of the roof and walls of the host dwelling, by around 1.8 metres. Consequently, the extension would add built form of significant scale and bulk and substantial
-

height above the existing eaves and roof of the host dwelling. It would also visually disrupt the unbroken roof plane and the roof and eaves lines and it would be a prominent feature on most of the roof area of the host dwelling. As a result, the extension would be seen as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling, in both close up and more distant views from along Teddington Road.

6. I accept that the appeal site is not in a Conservation Area, that the adjacent commercial garage is of more functional appearance and that the host dwelling is sited well away from No 3. I also acknowledge that development on either side of the road varies in terms of its design, height, overall scale, age and style. Even so, for the reasons identified above in my view the extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area.
7. The appellant has referred to the 'fallback' position of enlarging the host dwelling by constructing side dormer windows under 'permitted development'. However, in my view this would not cause similar or significantly more harm than the appeal scheme. Dormers on the side roof slopes of the host dwelling would generally be viewed against the background of the existing roof form and the existing eaves and ridge lines would be unbroken. Therefore, I have afforded the fallback position limited weight. I have also taken account of the appellant's comments regarding the dormers at No 3 and 13 Teddington Road. However, in my view neither example has a similar or worse effect than that which the appeal scheme would have.
8. Further, I have had regard to the 'similar' extensions repeated on houses of a comparable age and style to the host dwelling, in a street in an adjoining Borough. I also visited the street in question. These extensions appeared to have a lower eaves and ridge height in comparison with the appeal scheme and they also appeared to be set back further from the front elevation. Also, on the whole due to the narrow plots and proximity of adjoining built form the extensions were open to much more limited views in the street scene than the appeal scheme would be. Furthermore, I have not been provided with any details regarding the circumstances in which those extensions were permitted and am thus unable to make a more detailed comparison. For these reasons, I have also given these extensions limited weight.
9. Consequently, the extension would not accord with Policy CP7 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (CS) as it would fail to recognise distinctive local character, it would not contribute to creating places of a high architectural and urban design quality and it would not illustrate that it is based on analysis and understanding of the Borough's development pattern and the use of good design principles, including form and scale.
10. Furthermore, the extension would fail to accord with Policy DM DC 1 of the Council's adopted Development Management Plan (DMP), as it would not be of high architectural and urban design quality based on sustainable design principles, it would not respect local character including the nature of the particular road and would not contribute positively to its surroundings based on a thorough understanding of the site and its context having regard to its scale, height, massing, proportions and form.
11. The extension would also therefore be inconsistent with the guidance at section 8 of the Council's adopted 'House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document' (SPD), as it would raise the ridge of the

building and dominate the original roof. Moreover, the extension would therefore be inconsistent with the guidance in paragraph 17 and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) concerning the requirement for good design.

Living conditions

12. The side elevation of No 3 is around eight metres from that the host dwelling. The intervening space largely consists of part of No 3's reasonably spacious side and rear garden. There are no other residential properties which adjoin the appeal site.
13. The extension would raise the eaves and ridge height of a substantial part of the host dwelling in proximity to the common boundary with No 3. However, largely due to the distance involved, the extension would not appear substantially more dominant, overbearing or create any significant additional sense of enclosure in comparison with the existing situation, when viewed from the windows in the side elevation of No 3. Nor would it appear significantly more overbearing or intrusive compared with the height and bulk of the host dwelling when viewed from within No 3's side and rear garden. The spacious nature of the gardens would significantly offset the additional height and bulk of the extended host dwelling. Consequently, the extension would not cause unacceptable harm to the outlook currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No 3.
14. Therefore, the extension would not fail to accord with Policy DM DC 5 of the DMP, as it would protect adjoining properties from visual intrusion, and prevent overshadowing. It would also be consistent with the guidance in section 3 of the Council's SPD, as it would not create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms.

Conclusion

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

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR