



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3309282 40 Priory Gardens, Hampton TW12 2PZ

- 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 Steve McStea against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref: 22/1975/HOT, dated 21 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage and erection of a double storey side/rear extension with rear dormer roof extension. Canopy shelter at side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached house located at the end of Priory Gardens. There is a wide space to the side of the property which adjoins the rear garden of No.121 Priory Road.
4. All the properties in Priory Gardens are semi-detached with a mixture of hipped and gabled roof forms. The character of the road is derived from the pattern and cohesion of the architecture and the materials of red brick and tile hanging to the bays. A large proportion of the properties have been extended to the side including the other half of the semi, No.39, which has a full height side extension with a half-hipped roof.
5. The proposed side extension would be wider than that of its neighbour's, although space would still remain to the side of the property. The extension would also slightly project to the rear with a gable end and a large box style dormer added to the original roof. Unlike No.39, the design would not replicate the bay windows of the host property, however other extensions in the road generally do not, and there is limited consistency where both sides of the semi-detached pairs have been extended. Nonetheless, these existing extensions match in terms of materials, and the proportions or subservient form to maintain the original property as the predominant element.

6. I acknowledge that there are different approaches to extensions and that the guidelines in the House Extension and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document¹ (SPD) are examples to be applied flexibly based on the site context. However, primarily both the SPD and the Hampton Village Planning Guidance² seek to maintain and enhance the distinctive local character of the area. As a guiding principle the SPD explains that the external appearance of any extension must be carefully designed in order to avoid the visual confusion that can result when the style and materials of the original house are ignored.
7. The proposed alterations include several elements which do not reflect the form of the host property and/or exceed the SPD guidelines. For example, the width of the extension, the fenestration which includes two Juliet balconies, the scale and position of the dormer, and the proposed materials. I accept that individually some of these features are found in the surrounding area. However, collectively they would have a dominating effect, significantly changing the appearance of the appeal property which would further unbalance the semi-detached pair and disrupt the prevailing character of Priory Gardens. Additionally, due to its location the property is more noticeable and is seen in views from Priory Road. As a result of the proposal, a rendered side extension which would be out of keeping with the appearance of the rest of the road, would effectively demark the entrance to Priory Gardens.
8. The appellant advises that the dormer window is subject to a Lawful Development Certificate and represents a fallback. However, that is just one element of the proposal, and it is the cumulative impact of the alterations which amounts to a development which would not appear subordinate and unsympathetic to the appearance of the property. This would also be the position if the dormer window had already been implemented and therefore does not alter my findings.
9. Overall, the combined extent and form of the alterations would dominate the host property and fail to harmonise with the prevailing character of the area. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan, 2018, the SPD and the Hampton Village Planning Guidance. Together these aim to ensure that development promotes a high standard of design, respects and enhances local character, and is not visually intrusive.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out and having regards to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

¹ Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document May 2015

² Draft Supplementary Planning Document March 2017