
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3236862
54 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BG

- 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 Tim Goode against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/1600/HOT, dated 17 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as single-storey side extension, new vehicular access.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description provided on the application included "new vehicular access." Neither the Council's decision notice nor the appeal form include 'new vehicular access' in the description. The submitted plans do not show a new vehicular access and plan Ref PL04 Rev D states "vehicular access omitted". The Council made its decision on the description of development being single-storey side extension and I have made my decision on that basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side extension, at 54 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BG, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/1600/HOT, dated 17 May 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: PL01, PL02, PL03, PL04 Rev D, PL05 REV A, PL06 Rev A, PL07 and PL08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

4. The site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling which has previously been extended to the rear and side. The original dwelling sits fairly centrally within a corner plot. The existing extensions are positioned mainly to the western side of the property and close to the boundary with 'Elm Court' to the rear. The site has pedestrian access off Broad Lane and vehicular and pedestrian access off Marlborough Road.
5. The site is located within a residential area characterised by a mix of properties that include detached, semi-detached and short terraces, of varying architectural styles, constructed of a mixed palette of materials. Plot sizes vary, and properties are mainly sited centrally within their plots with little space to the side boundaries or between neighbouring dwellings.
6. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would result in the overall width of extensions being a little wider than the original width of the house. However, the existing extensions are well set-back from the original front elevation of the property with varied heights, widths and depths, factors which ensure the extensions read as subservient to the original property. In addition, all the extensions project towards the corner of the site that is least visible from public vantage points. The proposed extension would extend further into this corner.
7. I consider that the original dwelling would still be legible, and, due to the factors described above, that the collection of extensions would not dominate it. The existing boundary treatments comprise a mix of timber fence panels, around 1.8m high, and hedges, including a particularly high hedge along the western half of the front boundary which would screen the proposed extension to an extent that it would be barely visible from public vantage points. I appreciate the Council's concerns regarding the ratio of built form to open curtilage. However, the plot would retain good sized garden areas to the front and eastern side, proportionate with the resultant dwelling footprint and overall size.
8. For the reasons outlined above I consider that the proposed development would accord with Policy LP 1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018), which requires, among other things, development to be of high quality architectural and urban design, compatible with local character and relating to the existing townscape and patterns of development, including scale, height, mass, proportions and form. I also consider that the proposal adheres to the guiding principles of the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Alterations (2015), in respect of side and rear extensions, which seeks, among other things, extensions to reflect existing character, maintain the street scene, retain the original appearance of the building and ensure that extensions do not dominate the existing house or its neighbours.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions listed.

J Williamson
INSPECTOR