
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2017

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3179088
107 High Street, Hampton TW12 2SX

- 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 Samuel Senbanjo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/3110/HOT was refused by notice dated 11 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of one outbuilding on the north eastern boundary of the rear garden and in its place the building of stand-alone accommodation for family guests. The garden building shall include lounge and kitchenette, bathroom and bedroom design to lifetime homes standards and garden store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. I have dealt with another appeal¹ on this site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.
3. The main parties have referred to various policies within the Council's emerging Publication Local Plan (LP). As the LP is yet to be adopted, its policies may change and so I attach limited weight to them.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

5. The proposal is to erect a detached pitched roof building within the rear garden of the appeal property, which is a mainly 2-storey detached dwelling that stands within a generous sized plot in a predominantly residential area. The new addition would stand to one side of the rear garden of No 107 close to the existing boundary wall and some distance from the rear façade of the main house. An outbuilding nestled into a corner of the garden would be removed to make way for the appeal scheme, as would some low quality trees and shrubs.
6. The proposal would be a sizeable addition. It would be considerably larger than the building to be replaced with a roof that would well project above the

¹ Ref APP/L5810/D/17/3179089

adjacent boundary wall. Consequently, the upper part of the new building would be visible from beyond the rear garden.

7. From High Street, the proposal would not be readily evident given the screening provided by the existing dwelling and the front boundary wall and vegetation. From this highway, the main house would remain as the principal structure on the plot with the new built form in place. The new building would, however, be seen in oblique views from Warwick Close on the immediate approach to the site. It would also be visible from the drive that runs alongside the site and serves 2 properties just beyond the rear of the appeal property, which are referred to as 1A and 1B Warwick Close.
8. From these locations, the new addition would appear as an uncharacteristically large domestic structure within rear garden space. In particular, the considerable expanse of roof with a long uninterrupted ridgeline well above the boundary wall would accentuate the considerable scale of the appeal scheme and its solid built form. The new addition would draw the eye because its size and bulk would noticeably contrast with domestic outbuildings typically found in residential gardens that in my experience are often smaller and less substantial structures. Having viewed the site from Warwick Close and the driveway that serves Nos 1A and 1B, I consider that the proposal would appear as an overly large and a visually disruptive form of development within rear garden space.
9. In reaching this conclusion, I acknowledge that the proposed development would be subordinate in scale, mass and height to the main house and that its footprint would be much smaller than that of the host building. A good-sized back garden would remain with the new built form in place. I also observed other sizeable outbuildings including just beyond the rear of the site that appear to be associated with Nos 1A and 1B. Even so, the proposal, due to its scale, bulk and height would appear incongruous and visually disruptive in its residential context. Additional planting could mitigate the visual impact of the proposal to some extent. However, by adding a sizeable new building, as proposed, and even taking into account detailed design matters, the proposal would be a discordant addition to the local area.
10. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policy CP7 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policy DM DC 1 of its Development Management Plan. These policies aim to ensure that new development respects local character and connects with, and adds to, its surroundings, thereby contributing to creating places of high design quality.
11. It would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, which places considerable importance on securing high quality design and states that development should respect local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

Conclusion

12. Overall, for the reasons given above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR