



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2023

by R Lawrence MRTPI, BSc (hons), PGDip (TP)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3317408

26 Burtons Road, Richmond Upon Thames, Hampton Hill TW12 1DA

- 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 and Mrs Taylor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref DC/EWI/22/2729/HOT, dated 7 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is for 1) Single storey extension, 2) Existing loft storage turned into habitable space and 3) Minor remodelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the header is taken from the original planning application form. I note that the description in the Council's decision notice and on the submitted appeal form refers to it being for a single storey rear extension and rooflights to the front and rear roof slopes, this is consistent with the submitted plans. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. I note that the proposal includes the provision of roof lights, and that the Council has not raised any objection to this element of the scheme. I find no reason to disagree and therefore the main issues in this case relate to the effect of the proposed rear extension.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - i) the effect of the proposed rear extension on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area
 - ii) the effect of the proposed rear extension on the living conditions of the occupants of 24 Burtons Road in terms of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is a corner plot located at the junction of Burtons Road and Links View Road and comprises a two-storey end of terrace property. Notwithstanding its single storey form and modest depth, the height of the proposed roof peaks would project significantly above the ground floor element of the host property. The irregular roof form with tall peaks together with the gable front, would result in an excessively bulky appearance. I accept that the

roof height on the side nearest to No 24 would be minimised, however this would do little to address the bulk of the roof form.

6. The irregular roof form is interesting in so far as it appears different to the most common roof types. However, the roof form differs significantly from the surrounding roofscape which is characterised by traditional pitched roof forms. The effect is a visually dominant roof form which would contrast with its surroundings to the detriment of the character of the area.
7. The proposed materials including cladding, would contrast with the white finish on the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties. There is a high degree of uniformity of materials within the street scene, as such, this contrast would add to the prominence of the extension.
8. Due to the location of the appeal site, at the junction of two roads, the proposal would be visually prominent within public vantage points. The host dwelling sits within a relatively uniform terrace of properties; therefore, the contrasting materials and proportions of the extension would result in it appearing unduly prominent, in a manner that would be harmful to the character of the area. The prominence of the extension would be increased in comparison with the existing conservatory, the prominence of which is limited by its modest scale and distance from the boundary.
9. I accept that there is support within planning guidance for modern extensions which contrast with the style of the host dwelling. The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises that appropriate designs can include extensions designed to "appear as an obvious addition". However, the guidance in the SPD also advises that extensions "should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours". As set out above, I find that the proposed extension would dominate and detract from the appearance of the existing property, in conflict with guidance in the SPD.
10. There is an opportunity to improve upon the appearance of the property through the replacement of the existing conservatory, however, given my above findings, the proposed extension would result in a negative visual impact rather than a beneficial one.
11. My attention has been drawn to a number of examples of ground floor extensions (including some of a contemporary design) which have received planning permission. There is insufficient detail in terms of the wider context of these examples and their prominence within the street scene to draw comparisons from, as such these have not altered my findings in terms of the appeal scheme. In terms of the example at No 63 Burtons Road, whilst there are similarities in terms of the scale and proximity to a side road, the form and style of the extension are materially different, and as such this has not been determinative to my assessment of the appeal scheme.
12. Policy LP1 of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018 (LP) requires development to, in general terms, preserve the local character of the area including in respect of proportions, form and materials. The proposal, having regard to the above considerations, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area, in conflict with Policy LP1.

13. The Council's refusal reason also refers to the Hampton Hill Village Planning Guidance Draft Supplementary Planning Document March 2017. This describes character areas within Hampton Hill; however, my attention has not been drawn to any wording in it that relates to the main issue. It has not therefore been determinative to the appeal.

Living conditions of the occupants of 24 Burtons Road in terms of outlook

14. The proposed extension would extend up to the shared boundary with No 24 Burtons Road in very close proximity to rear doors and windows serving a ground floor habitable room, as well as part of the rear garden area. Whilst the eaves height on the boundary would be minimised, the extension would be of an increased height and scale compared with the existing conservatory to be replaced. The proposed peaks, whilst slightly set away from the shared boundary, add to the prominence and scale of the extension, as would be viewed from No 24. I note that there is an existing single storey projection to the rear of No 24, on the opposite side to the appeal property. This gives an existing sense of enclosure and some restriction on outlook from the nearest windows and rear garden. However, given the scale of the extension, this would worsen the existing situation to an unacceptable degree, resulting in an overbearing impact on the outlook.
15. The proposal would therefore have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 24 Burtons Road in terms of outlook. The proposal therefore conflicts with LP Policy LP8 which seeks to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

16. I understand that the proposal would deliver improvements to the thermal efficiency of the host property, particularly in comparison with the existing conservatory. Furthermore, it is suggested that the proposal would provide increased natural daylight and access to the garden. I find no reason to dispute these benefits, however, there is no substantive evidence that the same improvements could not be achieved through alternative proposals.
17. Similarly, I note the suggestion that the appeal scheme represents the best solution for the site, with alternative designs likely to result in increased bulk and potential harm. It is not for this appeal to consider the merits of alternative schemes which would be assessed on their own merits, in the event an application for planning permission was made.

Conclusion

18. The appeal scheme would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other matters which indicate that planning permission should be granted. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Lawrence

INSPECTOR