



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/17/3179089 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 16/3112/HOT was refused by notice dated 11 April 2017.
- The development proposed is described as a re-planning of the space to include a two storey extension to the north side of the property infilling over an existing office and up to the boundary access to 1A and 1B Warwick Close to create a downstairs wc and cloakroom and an extended first floor bedroom; a two storey extension to the south side of the property to include gym at ground floor and extension to the current master bedroom at first floor, leaving a 1m wide passageway between front of house and garden along boundary with 105 High Street; a single storey extension to the rear garden to create open plan living and dining space at 3.5m deep when measured from the existing back wall of the house, including bi-fold doors; a two storey rear elevation on the south side of the property acting as a guest facility for family and friends including open plan living at ground with a small kitchenette and two bedrooms at first floor; an extension of second floor living accommodation to include a further bedroom towards the front of the property. The frontage of the house and its extensions aligns with other properties along High street including 103, 103a and 105 High Street before the character and position of the houses changes along Warwick Close.

Elevation treatment

It is recognised that 107 High Street is not an attractive property externally and as part of these works it is intended to undertake the following as indicated on the supporting drawings: replacement of existing bay window with square fronted bay window; Introduction of smooth finish painted render at ground floor and painted feather edged timber cladding at first floor; replacement of all roof tiles with anthracite grey clay roof tiles; creation of new, better proportioned window openings, with painted sash frames and timber surrounds; new rose window to second floor bedroom and Velux roof lights; new entrance porch; PPC Aluminium bi-fold doors and glazing system to rear of property; new windows as indicated on drawings.

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.

¹ Ref APP/L5810/D/17/3179088

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 issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 105 High Street with particular regard to outlook and visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is a largely 2-storey detached dwelling of traditional design that faces High Street in a predominantly residential area. It stands within a generous-sized plot and forms part of a row of buildings along the same side of High Street that vary in style, type, scale and general appearance. Consequently, there is considerable variety in the existing built form within the local street scene to which No 107 belongs.
6. The proposal is to enlarge the appeal dwelling with extensions on all 4 main sides together with the introduction of a new roof form, external cladding and windows. The submitted design aims to transform the existing house into a single homogenous entity with some architectural features of the existing dwelling incorporated into the proposed building such as a pitched roof with hipped ends and a tall gable above a 2-storey front bay. Taken together with the regular pattern of fenestration and use of appropriate external materials, the completed dwelling would be broadly acceptable in its design.
7. With the new built form in place, No 107 would continue to be set back from High Street behind a tall boundary wall and established vegetation. As a result, public views of the proposal from this highway would be limited. Although no higher than the existing dwelling, the proposal would, however, substantially increase the scale and mass of the building and enlarge its footprint. The considerable width of the new 2-storey front façade, together the long ridge and eaves lines and deep flank walls would, in combination, visually emphasise the size and bulk of the new building notwithstanding its hipped roof form.
8. This would be most pronounced in views from Warwick Close on the immediate approach to the site. From this location, the lengthy 2-storey front and side elevations of the finished dwelling would be visible with an expanse of new roof slope and an uninterrupted eaves line at the side. The new 2-storey flank wall up to and along the site's side boundary would also be evident, as would the limited space between the completed building and the adjacent driveway. Together, these aspects of the appeal scheme would cause the finished dwelling to appear overly wide and large for the plot even with a good-sized garden at the rear and amongst the varied built form in the local street scene. Consequently, the completed dwelling would not be readily assimilated into the street scene and it would be obtrusive in the local area.
9. According to the appellant, the footprint of the finished dwelling would occupy about 27% of the plot. Based on the statistics provided by the appellant, this level of site coverage would compare favourably with other nearby properties. Even so, and acknowledging that the figures provide a helpful guide to the

spatial characteristics of the area, the main determining factor in this appeal is whether or not the proposal would integrate with the prevailing character and appearance of the local area. For the reasons given, I consider that the proposed development would not do so.

10. There would be limited public views of the new rear façade with the ground floor largely visually contained within the site by the existing boundary treatment. The new upper rear elevation would be visible from some nearby properties and the drive that serves the properties just beyond the rear of the site. From these vantage points, existing vegetation would visually soften and partly screen the proposal to some extent and it would generally be seen beyond the rear garden. In that context, the new extension and external alterations at the rear of the property would not unduly draw the eye.
11. Nevertheless, taking the proposal as a whole, I conclude on the first main issue that it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, the appeal scheme conflicts with Policy CP7 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) and Policy DM DC 1 of its Development Management Plan (DMP). 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.
12. The Council raises additional concern that the proposal would harm the setting of the Hampton Village Conservation Area (CA). However, as few details of this designated heritage asset have been provided, including its boundary, I am unable to reach a definitive opinion on the effect of the proposal on the CA.

Living conditions

13. The proposal would introduce a 2-storey flank wall close to and broadly parallel with the shared rear boundary between the site and 105 High Street. From what I saw, this adjacent detached dwelling has several windows in its rear and side elevations from where parts of the new development would be likely to be visible. While the height, scale and depth of the new flank wall would be significant, views of it from the rear and side windows of No 105 would mostly be at an oblique angle and, in some cases, partly filtered through existing vegetation. The main direction of outlook from the windows of No 105, which would be either across the rear garden of this neighbouring property or towards the side of the appeal dwelling would not be significantly affected.
14. On balance, I conclude on the second main issue, that while visible from some windows of No 105 the proposal would not visually dominate outlook nor be so imposing as to overbear on the occupiers of No 105. Consequently, the living conditions of the occupiers of this adjacent property would not be materially harmed. Therefore, I find no conflict with DMP Policy DM DC5 insofar as it aims to safeguard residential amenity. My finding on this matter does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the first main issue.

Conclusion

15. 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