

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24th April 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3169829

71 Oak Avenue, Hampton, Richmond upon Thames, TW12 3PQ.

- 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 Sara Frisby against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/0460/HOT, dated 7 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to side and rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension to side and rear of property, at 71 Oak Avenue, Hampton, Richmond upon Thames, TW12 3PQ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/0460/HOT, dated 7 February 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 Plan 1:1250@A4; Block Plan 1:200@A4; Plan No: EH 2603/02: Titled Planning Proposals (Existing Plans and Elevations & Site Location Plan 1:50 & 1:1250); Un-numbered Drawing Rev 2: Proposed Plans & Elevations 1:100@A1.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached chalet style dwelling situated in a backland position relative to surrounding houses and accessed by a private drive. The proposals would result in a sizeable two storey extension to one side of the property, with a partially hipped roof. It would retain a small set back from the front elevation and have a ridge line extending to the existing ridge of the roof.
-

4. I accept the Council's case that the extension would not appear as a subordinate addition to the property due to its scale and massing and particularly its height. They thus maintain it would not comply with the guidance in the *House Extensions and External Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) as it would dominate the existing house. However, the example given at figure 5 of that document depicts an extension which would have a consistent ridge line with the house and would not appear as a subordinate addition thereto. Indeed, the advice suggests that this type of approach can work well with detached houses, as is the case here.
5. This is especially the case, as the appeal property occupies something of a standalone position, in a visually discrete backland location relative to the surrounding houses and has been built in a unique style. Moreover, the extension would scarcely if at all be evident from public vantage points and where it would be seen from the rear of nearby houses, would simply appear as a somewhat larger version of the current one off design.
6. For these reasons, I conclude in relation to the main issue that the proposal would integrate comfortably with the host property and wider character and appearance of the area. I thus find no conflict with Policy CP7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009), Policy DM DC1 of the Local Development Framework Development Management Plan (2011), or the guidance in the SPD, which seek to secure high quality design which respects local character.
7. The Council suggest a condition requiring implementation in accordance with the submitted plans, which is necessary for clarity. A matching materials condition is also suggested, but as this is indicated to be the case on the submitted application forms, it is superfluous.

Other Matters

8. A mature tree to the property frontage is protected by Tree Preservation Order No 187. From my site visit it appeared to me possible that some minor trimming back of its canopy may be required to construct the extension or erect related scaffolding. However, I have no reason to believe or evidence to suggest that the proposal would prejudice its long term retention.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR