

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2017

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 9th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3165010
88 Oldfield Road, HAMPTON, TW12 2HR.

- 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 Clare McNeish against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application ref: 16/3992/HOT, dated 13 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue here is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The property comprises one of a pair of semi-detached houses located within a mixed residential area. It has been the subject of a roof extension with rear-facing box dormer.
4. The proposed extension would largely sit upon the existing ground floor side addition but be set back from the front elevation and by 450mm from the flank boundary with no. 86 next door. That property has a similar ground floor structure extending close to the common boundary.
5. In views from the street there is an open aspect above the flat roofs of these two single storey structures.
6. Policy DM DC 1 of the adopted DMP¹ confirms that in assessing the design quality of a proposal the Council will have regard, amongst other matters, to "*space between buildings and relationship to the public realm.*" The Council

¹ London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework: Development Management Plan (adopted November 2011).

also has an adopted SPD² which, at paragraph 5.2.3, specifically refers to the infilling of gaps between dwellings. It states:

"Development which would result in the significant reduction of an existing important space or gap between neighbouring houses is not normally acceptable. In conjunction with existing extensions to neighbouring buildings this can have a terracing effect on the street. Consequently, two storey side extensions should be sited 1m from the side boundary."

7. I acknowledge that there is no definition of what constitutes an important gap. Nevertheless, the open aspect between these two houses at first floor level is of benefit to the appearance of the street scene by creating a clear separation between nos. 88 and 86 Oldfield Road. The grant of permission in this case would seriously impact on that openness and may well set a direct precedent for a similar extension to no. 86.
8. During my site visit I was able to note the unfortunate effect created by two similar extensions to nos. 82/84 Oldfield Road. These have completely closed the gap that existed between the two dwellings, thereby creating a terracing effect. I understand that both were permitted prior to national policy in the Framework³, which requires a high standard of design in all new development, and to adoption of the Council's DMP and SPD referred to above.
9. Accordingly, I have found in relation to the main issue that the first floor side extension, with its minimal gap of 450mm, would adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, development as proposed would be contrary to Policy DM DC 1 of the DMP and the Council's adopted SPD.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

² London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan: Supplementary Planning Document "House Extensions and External Alterations" (May 2015).

³ The National Planning Policy Framework.
