
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3172506
2 Wensleydale Road, Hampton TW12 2LW

- 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 and Mrs Gatehouse against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/4544/HOT, dated 22 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor rear extension following demolition of existing kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Procedural Matter

3. I note that the Council has referred to policies in the Local Plan Publication Version for Consultation 4 January – 15 February 2017 in its reason for refusal. However, this has not yet been adopted and does not yet form part of the development plan and therefore in determining the current appeal I have given it limited weight. In any case the emerging policies do not significantly change the Council's approach from those in the adopted plan.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow situated adjacent to the junction of Tudor Road and Wensleydale Road. It is within a mixed use area, comprising residential properties and retail with other commercial uses. I noted at my site visit that there is a variety of residential properties in the locality, including mainly two storey detached and some semi-detached houses of different periods, designs and materials.
5. The site is in a very prominent position, highly visible from nearby Tudor Road on the approach towards Wensleydale Road where the road is higher than the appeal site. The existing pitched roof bungalow is constructed with a flat roofed rear dormer roof extension and a rear projection which slopes downwards in a pitch from the main roof pitch, giving a continuous pitched roof form. The proposed rear extension would run the length of the existing rear

elevation and would have a hipped roof with an area of flat roof linking it to the original property.

6. Due to its scale, height and prominence the proposed extension would dominate the rear of the property and, owing to the gap between the two different roof forms it would appear as an incongruous addition, at odds with the character of the bungalow. The hipped roof form of the extension would conflict with the pitched roof form of the original building which would be harmful to the setting of the property.
7. There is little evidence that the form of the existing building has been taken account of in designing the proposal for a different shape and profile roof which would not integrate well or be compatible with the form of the host property. Given its prominence the extension would create a particularly conspicuous building which would be unsuitable for its immediate context.
8. Therefore, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy Adopted April 2009, Policy DM DC1 of the Development Management Plan Adopted November 2011 (DM Plan), the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations May 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Among other objectives these seek to ensure that new development recognises local character, is of a high architectural quality, connects with its surroundings and ensure that rear extensions should not dominate the existing house and harmonise with its original appearance. In terms of character and appearance I find there to be no conflict with Policy DM DC5 of the DM Plan which relates to neighbourliness, sunlighting and daylighting.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR