



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3331047

4 Arlington Road, Petersham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW10 7BY

- 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 & Mrs Christoph & Amalia Hilpert against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/1548/HOT, dated 6 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is Hip-to-gable extensions to left and right of the property, rear dormer extension, installation of solar panels, reduction in size of window to front of house, removal of chimney to front of property to comply with Building Regulations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Hip-to-gable extensions to left and right of the property, rear dormer extension, installation of solar panels, reduction in size of window to front of house, removal of chimney to front of property to comply with Building Regulations at 4 Arlington Road, Petersham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW10 7BY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/1548/HOT, dated 6 June 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100_C; 101_C; 102_C; 103_C; 200_C; 201_C.
 - 3) No new external finishes (including fenestration), including works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the existing, except where indicated otherwise on the submitted application form and approved drawings.
 - 4) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Statement received by the Council on 6 June 2023 unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit construction work was taking place at the site, including hip to gable extensions. I have no further details of the scheme under construction, and I have determined this appeal based on the drawings and

other information I have before me, as submitted to and determined by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey, detached dwelling located in a road comprising mainly of detached and semi-detached dwellings. Most of the dwellings in the road have a hipped roof form although a notable exception is 6 Arlington Road, adjacent to the appeal site, which has undergone hip to gable extensions to both sides of the dwelling. Other nearby properties have also been altered by way of various roof additions, including at 2 Arlington Road which has a prominent dormer window on its front elevation.
5. The Council's non-statutory House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (May 2015) (SPD) advises that hip to gable extensions are not desirable and will not be supported. This is especially so when the roof-scape and space between buildings are important features of the character of that part of the street.
6. The appeal proposal would result in the dwelling having a similar appearance in the street scene as the adjacent dwelling, 6 Arlington Road. Whilst the Council make the distinction that the hip to gable extensions¹ to No 6 were constructed under permitted development rights², the dwelling as extended clearly forms part of the established street scene as well as being indicative of the type of extension that can be constructed under permitted development.
7. The appeal proposal would result in a gable ended dwelling which would be viewed in the same context as 6 Arlington Road where the dwellings would be read as a pair of similarly designed detached dwellings. Whilst there would be some reduction in the space between the dwellings at roof level, a gap would nonetheless be retained between the flank walls of the dwellings. A gap would also be retained between the appeal property and the hipped roof form of 2 Arlington Road.
8. I agree with the Council's assessment that the other aspects of the appeal proposal are acceptable and on balance, given the similarities between the appeal proposal and the design and appearance of No 6, I find that the proposal would not have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Moreover, I am also mindful that hip to gable extensions are, in many cases, able to be constructed under permitted development rights.
9. Thus, despite some conflict with the SPD, I conclude that the proposal does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which requires all development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality which respects, contributes and enhances the local environmental character.

¹ LPA ref. 20/3473/PS192

² The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. I shall also impose a condition requiring the implementation of the Fire Safety Strategy in the interest of public safety.
11. The Council also suggest a condition controlling the type of plant or machinery used during construction but has not justified this in terms of adopted policy. I do not find this condition to be reasonable or necessary having regard to the domestic, small-scale nature of the proposed development.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR