
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2016

by Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3156610

45 Park Road, Hampton Wick, Kingston upon Thames KT1 4AS

- 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 Scott Hillman against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1041/HOT, dated 15 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Modified first floor extension. The design substantially reduces the impact of the extended areas and responds to the Inspector's decision by providing: a smaller structure which is no longer "box-like"; reduced width and depth (c. 2.5 by 2.6m); the reduced roof and pitch to the end provides an improved integration with the dwelling as a whole; and removal of the window considered to be "wide and incongruous"'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 45 Park Road, Hampton Wick, Kingston upon Thames KT1 4AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1041/HOT, dated 15 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, SAH14001-45PR-1-Exist GA Rev 001, SAH14001-45PR-5-PROP & EXIST GA Rev G and SAH14001-45PR-6-PROP GA Rev H.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall match in colour, form and texture those of the existing building.
 - 4) The proposed first floor windows in the southern elevation of the building hereby approved shall at no time be openable or glazed, otherwise than in obscured glass, below a minimum height of 1.75 metres above the relevant floor level.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Scott Hillman against the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames. This application is the subject of a separate decision.
-

Procedural matters

3. The description of development was amended by the Council at the application stage to refer to 'first floor rear extension'. I agree that this more accurately describes the proposed development and this is the description I have therefore used in my decision.

Main issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character of the Hampton Wick Conservation Area (CA) and the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

5. Hampton Wick CA is an urban village, which has retained its own identity and sense of place. The village survives today as a triangular wedge constrained by the River Thames to the east and Bushy and Home Parks to the west and is bounded to the north by the periphery of Teddington. Park Road is a quiet residential street with a character formed by the juxtaposition of a wide selection of building styles. Buildings in contrasting styles sit happily next to each other, their appearance unified by use of common materials i.e. brick, render and slate, and by a common intimate scale. The houses are predominantly C19th and are two storey semi-detached pairs or short terraces set behind small neatly kept front gardens which are well defined by a combination of railings, hedges, fences and low walls.
6. It therefore rests with me as the decision maker to apply the intended protection for heritage assets as specified in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
7. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with modest rear garden. The rear elevations of the host dwelling No 45 and the adjoining property No 43 have been altered substantially. At first floor level both have rear extensions and there are a number of windows and rooflights inserted into the rear elevations.
8. I have carefully considered the Council's concerns in relation to the design, size and bulk of the proposed first floor extension. However, the revised contemporary design (reduction in length and mono-pitch roof) and the removal of the rear facing window would allow the extension to be reduced in size and bulk whilst still adequately relating to the host dwelling as extended, when compared to the previously refused scheme (APP/L5810/D/15/3135612).
9. Furthermore, given the modest scale and siting of the proposal, it would not dominate the host dwelling or result in material harm to the symmetry and balance of the pair of semi-detached houses when compared to the existing situation. Moreover, the scale and siting of the extension also ensures that it would not be readily visible from Park Road or the wider CA. It is for these reasons that the proposal would have a neutral effect on the CA.
10. Having reached the conclusions above, the proposed first floor rear extension would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would therefore preserve the character and appearance of the Hampton Wick Conservation Area. I therefore find that the proposal is consistent with Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Core Strategy and Policies DM DC1 and DM HD1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan. I also find that there is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework. In reaching my conclusions I have also taken into account the Council's SPD House Extensions and External Alterations.

Other considerations

11. Local interested parties have raised the issues of overlooking and the effect on light and outlook (tunnelling effect). In relation to overlooking I have applied a condition that requires the proposed first floor windows in the southern elevation of the building to be non-openable and glazed with obscured glass. However, based on the evidence before me I am not persuaded that there would be an increased tunnelling effect when in the rear garden or passage of No 47 or that light would be unacceptably reduced to rear windows or the garden area. This conclusion is consistent with that of the Local Planning Authority.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary for the avoidance of doubt, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the scheme and to protect the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary for the materials used to match those of the original building.
13. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR