



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21<sup>ST</sup> August 2024

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3345819**

**35 Windmill Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1QZ**

- 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 James Sheen against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Council.
  - The application Reference is 24/0672/HOT.
  - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is two storey hipped roof end of terrace home on a corner plot. The open front garden faces the main road of Windmill Hill and the open side garden return and parking space is to Vincent Row. Windmill Lane has a variety of types, sizes and ages of property and the appeal dwelling is akin to the age, design and siting of homes within Vincent Row. The overall scene with the combination of built form and gardens is one of established residential character and pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above, with a hipped pitched roof running up to the main building, a width of about 3 metres and a length of around 9m.
  4. I would agree with the Appellant that in the instance of a single storey side extension it is often not necessary to be over-zealous with the scale of a frontage set-back and I would not criticise the approach taken here. However, looking at the bigger picture I do have over-riding concerns about this scheme. Vincent Row is a very 'precise' form of development in terms of building line and the contribution of open gardens and this proposal would markedly intrude upon the cul-de-sac's layout, uniformity and aesthetic qualities. The open garden space to the side of the appeal property is an important one and makes a positive contribution to the streetscene. It is a prominent place on the corner and Vincent Row entrance. The planned extension would be disruptive to this with its non-characteristic projection towards the highway. As a secondary point, this would be compounded by the substantial length of the extension. A
-

fact visually exacerbated by the unusual form of an addition which, rather than being subservient, would have a larger dimension front-to-back than the host property. The development as a whole would appear incongruous in the immediate and wider context.

5. Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) is relevant. Amongst other matters this calls for good quality design with buildings which relate to context, protect local character and appearance, and are compatible with surrounding development patterns and spacing. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to this policy. I would add that nothing in the Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations' and 'Hampton Hill Planning Guidance' assuage my concerns. On the contrary, whilst acknowledging that they cannot cover every eventuality, to my mind the scheme would not accord with principal relevant objectives and aims of those documents.

*Other matters*

6. I understand the wish to extend this property and I can see that there has been thought given to matters such as external materials, roof design and window form. Residential amenity, flood risk and fire safety are not negatives in this instance. I do note that the scheme was reduced in size in an effort to satisfy the Council. I have considered the other works and permissions drawn to my attention but I find none directly comparable due to siting, size or immediate context and, in any event, I must determine this case on its own merits.
7. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters carry limited weight and taken independently or collectively do not outweigh the concerns that I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within that document.

*Overall conclusion*

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR