The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

**by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 27 October 2016**

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/16/3148810**
**201 & 203 Hanworth Road, Hampton, Middlesex TW12 3ED**

- 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 & Mrs Jim and Sue Doherty and Riitta & David Shipton-Lehtovaara against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
- The application Ref 15/4406/HOT, dated 12 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2016.
- The development proposed is part single, part first floor rear extensions.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by a shorter version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to be usefully more succinct and I have therefore used it within this decision.

3. I have been referred to a previous appeal decision on the site dated 5 January 2016 (ref. APP/L5810/W/15/3136337). The proposal considered by this previous appeal included an extension to the rear of the properties with a gable pitched roof and flank extensions set back from the proposed gable. The differences between this previous scheme and the current appeal proposal include the removal of the gable, the introduction of a partial pitch to create a crown roof over two dormer extensions to the rear which would be separated by a recess. As the previous Inspector considered matters of character and appearance I have had regard to this previous decision when reaching my conclusions.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of two dwellings located in a terrace of six properties. The dwellings in the terrace have semi-detached ground floor outriggers to the rear which have pitched gable roofs which give the terrace an attractive rhythm in views along the rear. At the time of my site visit, there were no extensions

at first floor level on the rear of the terrace to detract from the character and rhythm of the terrace.

6. The outrigger to the rear of 201 Hanworth Road is largely unaltered. A flat roofed extension has been constructed to the side of the outrigger of 203 Hanworth Road up to the boundary with No 201.

7. At ground floor level, it is proposed to extend across the gap between the outriggers, with a ground floor extension to No 203 projecting further to the rear. The ground floor elements of the proposal would not be readily visible from the surrounding area and would therefore not be visually intrusive.

8. However, it is also proposed to extend at first floor level to the rear of the properties. This includes the creation of a flat roofed extension across the full width of the properties, with a further extension projecting to the rear but set back from the side boundaries. The latter part of the proposal would have a chamfered roof with an inset on the boundary between the appeal properties. The extension would be set below the eaves line of the main roof of the host dwellings.

9. The variation in the roof design of the extension as well as the various degrees of projection of the different elements of the proposal would mean that the extension would appear as an angular, contrived and incongruous addition to the rear of the dwellings. Due to the height of the two-storey extension it would be prominent in views from nearby properties and along the rear of the terrace, including views from Dean Road to the west. The proposed extension would therefore detract from the character and appearance of the host dwellings and of the whole terrace.

10. I acknowledge that the scheme is a response to the concerns expressed by the previous Inspector in relation to the prominence and bulk of a previous appeal scheme, particularly in relation to a proposed gable. Furthermore, I accept that the flanks of the extension have been set back to reduce the impacts on the outlook from the windows of neighbouring properties. However, the resulting design of the proposed extension would appear as an awkward addition which would be at odds with the character of the host dwellings and the terrace.

11. There is a similar block of terraced properties located to the west of the appeal site which has the same characteristic of regular gable roof outriggers in views along the rear. It was apparent at my site visit that the westernmost property on this adjacent terrace had been significantly extended including a two-storey extension and dormer window to the rear. However, I have not been provided with the planning history of this property or the context within which the extensions were considered. Furthermore, due to the distance from the appeal site and the location of the property at the end of a separate terrace, the extensions to this property do not alter my conclusions on the appeal scheme.

12. I note the comments from the resident of a neighbouring property in support of the proposal. I have also had regard to the undertaking submitted by the appellants in relation to the concerns of the Council about the completion of the proposal as a single operation. However, these matters do not overcome the harm I have identified above.

13. I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames (LBRUT) Core Strategy 2009 and Policy DC1 of the LBRUT Development Management Plan 2011. These policies state that development should be of a high design quality and recognise local character. These policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to secure high quality design. The proposal would also not comply with the advice of the LBRUT House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015 which states that extensions should reflect existing character and detail and complement the existing dwellings and the neighbourhood.

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*David Cross*

INSPECTOR