



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2020

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/20/3247452

34 Westbank Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1QD

- 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 Paolo Basombrio against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/3501/FUL dated 16 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and new window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and new window at 34 Westbank Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1QD in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 19/3501/FUL, dated 16 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within a period of three years commencing on the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL01, PL02, PL05 and PL06 received the 18 November 2019;
 - 3) No new external finishes (including fenestration), including works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are i) the impact of the proposal upon the host building and ii) the impact of the proposal upon the character of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Impact upon the host building

4. The appeal site is a maisonette property which occupies the ground floor of an end of terrace property and is accessed off Westbank Road, which is a cul-de-sac, with pedestrian access only (shared with no. 36). To the West is Longford River. The property benefits from previous extensions which are clearly demonstrated on the submitted block plan (SK101/B).

5. The cumulative impact of the existing extensions has already resulted in a complete loss of the original form and original character and appearance of the host dwelling. As a result of this I find that it not realistically possible to further erode the existing property, in terms of its original character, when this is acknowledged by the Council to already have been completely lost as the site currently stands.
6. The appeal proposal is modest in scale. It is sited to the rear of the host property but does not occupy the full width and does not extend built form any further to the South in line with an existing extension. The materials proposed are, and could be conditioned to be, matching the existing dwelling. The proposal has been designed to match the existing rear extension in terms of roof pitch, etc. whilst maintaining some rear garden space with sufficient distance off the Eastern boundary.
7. The proposal would add to the cumulative extensions however, the extension is relatively small by comparison and I do not find that it would contribute to/result in an impact upon the host property to such an extent that it would warrant refusal. The erosion, to the detriment of the original property has already occurred. Overall, I do not find that the proposal would result in a dominant and unsympathetic form of development which is to the detriment of the host building when considered alone, or with the existing extensions, given the site history discussed above.
8. The proposal would be consistent with London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy LP1 which requires development to respect, contribute to and enhance the local character in relation to scale, height, massing, proportions, form, materials and detailing.

Character of the surrounding area

9. At the time of my site visit I parked in Park Place and walked around to the appeal site. The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by rows of terraced dwellings which, from the submitted plans before me, generally occupy long, narrow plots.
10. The plot associated with the appeal site, in the ownership of the applicant, is of notable contrast to the surrounding residential properties in that it is, overall, a much larger plot with a shape which is at odds to surrounding properties. The existing site is already an exception to the development pattern of the locality. As result of the site layout, plot shape and its general size I do not find the proposal presents as a cramped form of development nor overdevelopment on the site given the overall plot size. I do not find the development is to the detriment of the surrounding area or its character for these reasons.
11. The proposal would be consistent with LP Policy LP1 which requires development proposals to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to existing its context and respect the local environment and character.
12. The House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015 (SPD) acknowledges that the document cannot cover every type of addition or eventuality. Whilst the SPD encourages retention of original form this has, as outlined above, already been lost regardless of this appeal proposal. In this case the site is already a contrast to the surrounding

character of the area, however, I find the proposal is consistent with the general design aims of the SPD so far as they can be applied to the site.

Other Matters

13. I note that there is a third-party comment which has been submitted in response to this appeal. It is not clear whether this comment is meant for this appeal proposal, however, I have outlined my reasons as to the acceptability of the proposal and believe this addresses concern over scale. The Council make no reference to the impact of outbuildings within their assessment.

Conditions

14. I note the Council recommend three conditions. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required in order to control and define the development which is granted consent. A time condition is attached to comply with section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, I have attached a condition requiring materials for the external elevations to match that of the host building.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR