



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3232254

Selmond Ray, 75 Oak Avenue, Hampton 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 Mr Sehajpal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/0377/HOT, dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the reconstruction of roof, incorporating front and rear dormer windows, front and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the reconstruction of roof, incorporating front and rear dormer windows, front and rear extension at Selmond Ray, 75 Oak Avenue, Hampton TW12 3PQ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 19/0377/HOT, dated 4 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SG/75/2019EX; SG/75/2019PRO.
 - 3) 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading and in my decision is taken from the application form, albeit omitting elements which are not a description of development.
3. On the site visit I noted that the existing roof had been removed and works have been undertaken at the appeal site though aspects of those works differ from those shown on the submitted plans. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted with the application and on which the Council made its decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The site is a detached single storey property which is set back substantially from the front boundary to Oak Avenue, and largely screened from the street by existing mature planting. There is a wide variation in the sizes and designs of properties in the vicinity of the site and, with adjacent properties on Oak Avenue, aside from the setback from their front boundaries, there is little continuity within the streetscene.
6. The proposals incorporate the use of a crown roof and therefore, whilst it will be substantially extended to the rear, the ridge height and angle of the hipped roof would largely remain similar in appearance to that of the existing dwelling.
7. Due to the setback of the property, existing landscaping and positioning of adjacent properties, views of the extended roof from the wider area would be limited. Therefore, when viewed from the street the overall bulk and massing of the roof would not appear to be altered significantly, and it would still be possible to appreciate the form of the original dwelling.
8. The proposed front dormer windows and extensions would however alter the appearance of the dwelling. The more traditional bay windows would be squared off providing wider flat roof projection to the frontage, echoing the character of the original bays. These additions and alterations, along with the flat roof dormers proposed, would give the property a more modern sleek appearance.
9. Whilst the existing property has some character, it is not exceptional, and due to the setback and screening to the site frontage its contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area is limited.
10. On my site visit I saw examples of both pitched and flat roof dormers in the vicinity of the site. The front dormer windows are not excessive in size, they sit well within the roofslope, breaking up its overall mass and would add character to the dwellings frontage. The rear dormer will not be clearly visible from any public vantage points and as such its impact on the wider area is limited.
11. The proposals would not result in a significant change to the overall scale, bulk and massing of the dwelling, when viewed from the street. As detailed above there is a wide variety of design within the streetscene and considering this, the setback of the dwelling and existing landscaping the proposals would not be prominent or visually intrusive and as such would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
12. The proposals would accord with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan 2018, which seeks to ensure that developments respect the local character, and the guiding principles within the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations which recommend developments are sympathetic to the original dwelling and character of the street. In addition, the proposals would also meet the high-quality design aims of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. Reference is made to the '*Hampton Hill - Village Planning Guidance draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) March 2017*' though from the details submitted it would appear the appeal site is not within the area boundary of this SPD and therefore it would not apply.

Other Matters

14. I have considered the concerns raised by neighbours in relation to the building being too intimidating, impact on light and disturbance from construction noise. The dwelling at the appeal site is inset from the southern site boundary, whilst the inset to the north is reduced there is still reasonable separation between the dwellings themselves. The roof extension would slope away from the site boundaries, thereby reducing any visual impact from its overall bulk and mass. Considering this, orientation of the site and separation to the site boundaries, the proposal would not be overly dominant and there would be no significant shading effects. I note the Council have also raised no concerns in this regard.
15. Whilst the construction process is likely to result in noise and general disturbance it would be short-term and is not a reason to withhold permission. These other matters, therefore, do not lead me to a different conclusion.

Conditions

16. I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and to provide certainty. A condition relating to matching materials is also necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR