



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2023 by Darren Ellis MPlan MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3322298

21 Park Road, Hampton Hill, Richmond Upon Thames TW12 1HG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Barry Coffey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/0606/GPH07, dated 20 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'floor addition to existing detached bungalow'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The above mentioned legislative provisions (GPDO) permits development consisting of the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of up to one additional storey, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of one storey. This is subject to, amongst other things, an assessment of the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. It has been held that such an assessment extends to the context of the dwellinghouse. This forms the main issue of the appeal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site consists of a detached bungalow on the corner of Park Road and Edward Road. The local area is predominantly two-storey properties. Designs vary but there appears to be a conventional proportionality to them in terms of roof pitch to wall plane which lends a pleasant consistency to the street scene. This accordingly contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
 5. The proposed additional storey has been designed with matching features, roof form and materials to the existing building. As a bungalow, the existing building has a broader all round footprint and thus, in the case of the appeal
-

building, a noticeably steeper roof profile than surrounding two storey buildings. Replicating this profile on a two storey building (with rooms in the roof space) would give the impression of the resulting dwelling being larger in scale and have something of an unconventional and awkward bulky roof shape. This would stand out as being top heavy and incongruous in the context of its neighbours, resulting in harm to the area's more traditional consistency. Particularly when viewed against No 23 Park Road and No 1 Edward Road.

6. Planning permission was granted for the raising of the roof¹ at No 91 Wensleydale Road, Hampton. It is not clear however if the new roof in this case is the same pitch or scale as the roof at the appeal property. In any case, No 91 has a noticeably more balanced and proportionate roof.
7. Two of the photographs provided appear to show historic buildings while the other four show very modern and contemporary ones. The appeal property doesn't fall into either category. In addition, the buildings in the photographs are of different architectural styles. Further, their location is not disclosed. They do not appear to have any bearing on the street scene at the appeal site. For these and the above reasons, I am not led to recommending the appeal be allowed.
8. As the external appearance of the dwellinghouse would not be acceptable, the proposal would fail to accord with the requirements of paragraph AA.2.(3)(a)(ii) of Class AA of the GPDO. The proposal would thus conflict with the design related criteria of Policies LP1 and LP2 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018, insofar as they are relevant to the matters of prior approval, including that development is compatible with local character with regards to scale and massing and roofscape. Moreover, the proposal would conflict with the general design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023. The decision notice also cites conflict with the London Plan 2021. However, no reference is made to any specific policy and no such policies have been provided, including D4 which is referred to by the appellant.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposal would cause harm to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. I therefore recommend that prior approval should not be granted having regard to the requirements of paragraph AA.2.(3)(a)(ii) of Class AA of the GPDO. Consequently, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all of the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning application ref. 12/3725/HOT