



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 November 2020

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/20/3253051

1 Oakhurst Close, Teddington TW11 0JP

- 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 Peter Charalambous against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0798/HOT, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear dormer roof extension at 1 Oakhurst Close, Teddington TW11 0JP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0798/HOT, dated 16 March 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Unnumbered Location Plan scale 1:1250, OC/01A, OC/02A, OC/13A, OC/42A and OC/43A.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. A rear roof extension has already been constructed. This was the subject of an appeal¹ which was dismissed. The appeal scheme proposes amendments to the rear dormer as set out in the submitted drawings. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the submitted drawings.
3. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to Policy LP8 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan). However, the Officer Report confirms that the proposal would not lead to a detrimental loss of privacy, overshadowing or loss of light to neighbouring residents. I have therefore contained my assessment of the proposal to the matters outlined in the main issue below.

¹ APP/L5810/D/19/3240740

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the Hampton Road Character Area (HRCA).

Reasons

5. Number 1 (No 1) is an end of terrace house situated to the eastern end of Oakhurst Close. It is located within the HRCA which is a residential area, characterised by properties of various designs and scale. A private route serving the houses and an area of open space at the rear separates the appeal property from 24 Hampton Road (No 24). Apart from the appeal property, the rear roofslopes of houses within Oakhurst Close retain their original roofshape.
6. The existing rear roof extension extends above the original ridgeline of the roof and across the full width of the property. The dormer cheeks are finished in brickwork, the outer flank of which is a continuation of the flank wall of the original dwelling. The main difference between the appeal scheme and previously dismissed scheme would be the set in of the proposed dormer extension from the outer wall of the host dwelling. This would be tile hung in materials to match the existing tiling on the roof.
7. The set in from the flank wall and the use of tiles would make the proposed dormer appear more visually subservient and sympathetic to the original building. With the flank wall of the house retained in its original form, the proposed extension would be less visually intrusive when viewed from the south and the east, including from the garden of No 24 and the street. It would also have a similar visual impact, when viewed from this direction, as a scheme for a rear roof extension granted a certificate of lawful development² (the permitted scheme).
8. The raised ridgeline would be below that of the front roof extension and would not therefore be visible from the street. The flank wall of the extension between No 1 and 2 Oakhurst Close (No 2), would be built up in brick. This would be visible in views of the house from the north and west, including from the garden to No 2. However, the proportions of the proposed dormer extension and the windows in the rear elevation would appear similar to those of the permitted scheme. The previous Inspector concluded that this would not lead to a greater extent of visual harm in these views than the permitted scheme and I have no reason to disagree with this.
9. I conclude the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the HRCA. It would therefore comply with Policies LP1 and LP8 of the Local Plan, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations 2015 and the Hampton Wick & Teddington Village Planning Guidance. Together these policies and guidance require all development to be of high architectural quality and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of building, including the relationship to existing townscape, scale, height, massing, proportions, form, materials and detailing; ensuring that proposals are not visually intrusive. In particular, dormer windows should be set well in from the side of roofs.

² Council Reference: 17/3693/PS192

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match existing.

Conclusion

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

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR