
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3228148
30 Priory Gardens, Hampton TW12 2PZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Griffin against the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/0080/HOT is dated 10 January 2019 was refused by notice dated 4 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of garage and erection of a double storey side extension and the demolition of current single storey rear extension and erection of new single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of garage and erection of a double storey side extension and the demolition of current single storey rear extension and erection of new single storey rear extension at 30 Priory Gardens, Hampton TW12 2PZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 19/0080/HOT, dated 10 January 2019, and 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 534-P1.101, 534-P1.102, 534-P1.103, 534-P1.104, 534-P1.105, 534-P1.106, 534-P1.107, 534-P1.108, 534-P1.109, 534-P1.110, 534-P1.111, 534-P1.112, 534-P1.113 and 534-P1.114.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the effect of the proposed development upon

the living conditions of the occupiers of 31 Priory Gardens, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property located within an established residential area. Many of the surrounding properties have incorporated two storey side extensions and single storey rear extensions of differing designs.
5. The side extension would follow the same style and design of the existing dwelling. Also, as the attached semi-detached house at No 29 has a two storey side extension which is not set back or down from the original house, it would provide for a more balanced and symmetrical view from the street scene. The proposed pitched roof of the development is a sympathetic design and is an improvement to the current flat roof developments on site and this further enhances the quality of the dwelling. The proposed development would also harmonise well with the existing dwelling and local character by virtue of utilising matching materials.
6. Whilst the proposed development does not accord with the setbacks from the side boundary, from the front elevation or from the ridge, as outlined within the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, it does accord with the clear expectations as set out within Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan which requires development to be compatible with local character. Furthermore, there could be no terracing effect as there is no development to the side elevation of 31 Priory Gardens.
7. Based on the reasoning above, the proposed development would not result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore would not conflict with Policy LP1 as described above.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed development would span a considerable distance along the boundary of 31 Priory Gardens. However, the proposed two storey extension would follow the same form of the original dwelling and wouldn't go significantly further back than the rear of No 31. It would also maintain a substantial distance from the side elevation of 31 Priory Gardens. This combined with the modest height and rear projection of the proposed single storey rear extension, would mean the development as a whole would not be overbearing or visually intrusive when viewed from the neighbouring garden.
9. Moreover, the fenestration arrangement along the side elevation of 31 Priory Gardens consists of a few small windows, none of which appear to serve habitable rooms. In any case I am satisfied that the gap between them and the proposed extension would ensure the development does not appear obtrusive when seen from them.
10. Based on the reasoning above, the proposed development would not harm the outlook from 31 Priory Gardens such that the living conditions of the occupiers of that property would be adversely affected. It would not conflict with Policy

LP8 of the Local Plan, which requires all new development to protect the living conditions of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties.

Conditions

11. In the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary to ensure the development is carried in accordance with the approved plans and within three years of the date of this decision. Furthermore, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure matching materials are used.

Recommendation and Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend the appeal is allowed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR