
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3162914

62A Olive Tree House, Anlaby Road, Teddington TW11 0PA

- 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 Ms Julia Russell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/2643/HOT, dated 1 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension to existing single storey split level dwelling.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 44d Hampton Road in respect of any loss of outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated in a residential area of mixed character and design. It is a single storey infill dwelling that stands between 62 and 64 Anlaby Road, to the rear of 44d Hampton Road. The latter forms part of a larger building which along with 46 Hampton Road has been subdivided into flats. The rear garden of 44d, a ground floor flat, abuts the southern boundary of the appeal site. No. 44 is also a *Building of Townscape Merit*.
 4. The dwelling on the appeal site was granted planning permission in 2012 following the refusal of several applications for planning permission for a 2 storey dwelling on the site. The small dwelling presently has 2 no. flat roofs at its western end, the larger of which would be replaced by the proposed asymmetrically pitched roof. The appellant pointed out that in the light of previous refusals of planning permission (09/2656/FUL and dismissed on appeal APP/L5810/A/10/2126673 and 2011/11/1033/FUL) this proposal would create a lower profile extension with a 'room in the roof' accommodation, rather than a full first floor.
 5. The wall of the proposed extension would be sited around 1.4m from the boundary with no. 44d. This would be further from the rear of no. 44d than the previous 2 storey proposals at the appeal site. Nevertheless, despite the reduction in height from the previous schemes, the off-set from the boundary
-

and the use of a “green” roof, in my judgement, the additional height of around 1m to the eaves and 2.4m to the ridge (which would sit around 3.7m from the boundary) would mean that the proposal would stand in close proximity to the rear garden and dining room window of no. 44d. When viewed from these areas the proposal would appear over-bearing and would harmfully change the outlook and thus the living conditions of the occupiers of this dwelling.

6. I note the appellant’s argument that the outlook from the rear of no. 44d and from its garden is currently constrained as it is enclosed on 3 sides by existing built form. Nevertheless, despite the use of a low profile roof, I consider that the proposal would add sufficiently to the sense of enclosure to create an overbearing effect that would harm the living conditions of the occupiers. Accordingly the proposal would conflict with Policy DM DC 5 of the adopted Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan 2011.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard McCoy

Inspector