



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2021

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3281653

12 Monmouth Avenue, Hampton Wick, Kingston Upon Thames KT1 4HR

- 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 Miss Lucy Isherwood against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1759/HOT, dated 14 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Redevelopment of chalet bungalow. Extension of living space in the first floor roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development given on the appeal form is different to that shown on the application form and decision notice; I have utilised the original description.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and,
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring property, particularly nos. 9 and 10 Monmouth Avenue.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a chalet type bungalow situated within a spacious corner plot, in a residential cul-de-sac. The bungalow is constructed in brick and render and has a dual-pyramid roof form, with dormers within the side and rear. There are a variety of building types, scales and designs within the cul-de-sac, including extended dwellings and another chalet type bungalow adjacent to the appeal site.
5. The appeal scheme would introduce a two-storey rear and side extension. The design of the scheme is in simple block-form additions, which would lack articulation to reduce the appearance of mass. Although the proposed height

would not exceed the overall height of the roof, its flat roof form would project above the eaves height of the existing dwelling, exacerbating its massive and dominant appearance. The site has capacity for extensions, and effort has been made to follow the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance by ensuring that the extension would be clearly distinguishable from the original dwelling, and that the pyramid roof form would be retained. Unfortunately, for the reasons outlined, the resulting design would entirely fail to integrate with the host bungalow and would appear as a massive, incongruous addition.

6. The simple, massive and utilitarian design of the proposal seeks to reflect the appearance of the school buildings located behind the appeal site. Whilst the school buildings are visible within the streetscene of the cul-de-sac, due to distance and perspective they are not a prominent feature. In contrast, the appeal scheme would dominate the host bungalow and would have a prominent, incongruous appearance within the streetscene. The streetscene has a mixed character and there are other prominent examples of extended dwellings within the immediate built context. However, the other extensions are well-integrated and proportionate to their host dwelling.
7. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would fail to respond the character of the host building and surrounding area. Therefore, the scheme is contrary to policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Local Plan (LP), adopted 2018. This policy seeks, amongst other things, development of high-quality design which is compatible with local character.

Living conditions

8. The host bungalow is situated close to its shared boundary with no. 9 Monmouth Avenue, however, no.9 Monmouth Avenue benefits from a single-storey flat roof extension which extends up to the shared boundary. There is a large solar array mounted atop flat roof of no. 9 Monmouth Avenue, which projects above the shared boundary fence. Whilst the appeal scheme would introduce a massive two-storey built form close to the shared boundary, the relative siting and orientation of the appeal site and no. 9 Monmouth Avenue would avert any overbearing or direct overlooking effect on living conditions.
9. The scheme would introduce a massive two storey extension with five new windows at first floor level into the south (flank) elevation. Several of those windows would be large and would provide the primary outlook for the three bedrooms which they would serve. Whilst the southern flank wall of the property is orientated towards the shared boundary with no. 10 Monmouth Avenue, the extended elevation would align with the windowless two-storey flank elevation of no.10, and thus would not overbear nor achieve additional overlooking into the dwelling itself. Moreover, the appeal site and no. 10 Monmouth Avenue benefit from splayed plots by virtue of their end of cul-de-sac location and, as such, the garden area of no. 10 Monmouth Avenue is at a distance and angled away from the flank elevation of the host bungalow. Therefore, the scheme would not overbear, nor create any unacceptable degree of overlooking to the garden area of the no.10 Monmouth Avenue.
10. For these reasons, the scheme would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring property and would accord with policy LP8 of the LP in this respect. Policy LP8 seeks, amongst other

things, development which protects the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR