
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by Paul Singleton BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3167240

237 Uxbridge Road, Hampton Hill, Hampton TW12 1AS

- 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 Alexandra Elwood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/3749/HOT, dated 21 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 237 Uxbridge Road, Hampton Hill, Hampton TW12 1AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/3749/HOT, dated 21 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans Reference 16/047: 01 Existing Plans and Elevations; 02 Block Plan; Proposed Plans and Elevations (unnumbered) all received on 28 September 2016.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no part of the roof of the extension hereby approved shall be used as a balcony or terrace nor shall any access be formed thereto.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The Council's House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2015) advises that two storey extensions should not be wider than half the width of the original building but that guidance does not
-

appear to apply to single storey side additions. The proposal complies with the SPD requirement that side extensions should not project beyond the existing front elevation of the house but not with the guidance concerning a set back by at least 1 metre (m) behind the front elevation. That guidance is given in support of a key objective of the SPD that the overall shape, size and position of side extensions should be such that they do not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. The use of the words '*it is usually desirable*' to introduce the suggested 1m set back indicates that this is to be taken as guidance and that a judgement is required in each case as to whether the proposal would dominate the host property or any neighbouring building.

4. The design includes a mansard type roof to screen the flat roof of the extension but its maximum height would be substantially less than that of the high pitched roof to the dormer bungalow. The proposal would add significant width at ground floor level but, due to its limited height relative to the existing building, would appear as subservient to the host property when viewed from Uxbridge Road. The overall height of the proposal would only be marginally greater than the 2m high fence that currently encloses the side garden to the bungalow and I consider that it would not be particularly prominent when viewed from the main road.
5. I note the Council's concerns that the roof would come close to the cill of the first floor window in the gable elevation. Although that is how it appears in plan form, the mansard roof section would be offset from the gable by almost the full width of the extension and a clear gap would remain between the top of the roof and the window cill. The narrow band of mansard roof would be seen against the large expanse of the brickwork framing the window within the gable elevation. Seen in this context the proposed extension would not appear over-dominant or out of proportion with the host building or its neighbour.
6. The proposal would be visible from the junction of Uxbridge Road with Ringwood Way. However, as it would be set back from the side boundary of the plot by about 2m, I do not consider that it would appear as cramped or over-dominant in that view. It would not be out of place with the pattern of development on the opposite corner of the junction, where both end houses have side garages and the space between them is filled by an electricity sub-station and land used for parking. In my judgement the proposal would not have a material effect on the current sense of openness at this road junction.
7. There is a run of similar, chalet style properties extending from Number 243 Uxbridge Road around the corner into Ringwood Way. I saw on my site visit that a number of these have been extended or altered and that there is significant variation in their external appearance. A clear visual break between each pair of semi-detached properties exists at first floor level, although this appears to have been narrowed by upper floor extensions to some of the dwellings. At ground floor level most of the pairings are connected by side garages or extensions and a mono pitch roof extending between the adjoining properties. In that context neither the single storey side extension nor the use of a mansard type roof to its three elevations would appear out of place or incongruous in the street scene.
8. For these reasons I find that the proposed extension would cause no material harm to the character and appearance of the host property, any adjoining dwelling or the surrounding area. I therefore find no conflict with Policy DC 1

of the Richmond-Upon-Thames Development Management Plan (2015), which requires that new development should be of high architectural and urban design quality that respects local character, or with Policy CP 7 of the Richmond-Upon-Thames Core Strategy (2009), which states that all new development should recognise local character and contribute to creating places of high architectural and design quality.

Conditions

9. In the interests of certainty a condition is needed to tie the planning permission to the approved plans. I have also attached a condition which requires that the materials used in the external construction should match those of the existing dwelling so as to ensure that the extension is of complementary appearance. Because the proposal will create a flat roofed area with potential access from the bungalow a condition is also needed to prevent this area being used as a terrace or balcony. This is necessary to protect the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

Other Matters

10. A third party has raised concerns regarding the additional parking space and access from Ringwood Way. The Council has raised no objection to this element of the scheme and I saw nothing on my site visit to suggest that this would have an unacceptable effect either on the availability of on-street parking or the safety of highway users. There are no other objections to the proposal.

Conclusions

11. I find the appeal proposal to be in accordance with the development plan and that there are no material considerations to indicate a decision contrary to the provisions of the plan. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework the proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development means and should be approved without delay.
12. I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Paul Singleton

INSPECTOR