



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3350224

14 Ringwood Way, Hampton Hill, Hampton, TW12 1AT

- 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 Emily Craven against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Reference is 24/1438/HOT.
 - The development proposed is the enlargement of existing rear dormer, infill of existing front dormers, internal alterations with roof light and fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the enlargement of existing rear dormer, infill of existing front dormers, internal alterations with roof light and fenestration at 14 Ringwood Way, Hampton Hill, Hampton, TW12 1AT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/1438/HOT, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08 & 09.
2. The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Report, dated 18 May 2024, and retained as such thereafter.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the Appellant against the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. 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

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet bungalow with a steep pitched roof. It is in a street which has a considerable number of similar homes, along with more traditional two storey semi-detached properties. The road is of
-

established residential character and of pleasing suburban appearance. The proposal is as described above.

5. The Council is concerned that the increased front dormer scheme and the extension of the rear dormer onto the flat roof of the rear extension would represent overly dominant, visually intrusive and unsympathetic development.
6. I noted that this semi-detached pair are not presently symmetrical due to varied ground floor elevations and a differing approach to their dormers. Nevertheless, the impression is one of harmony as one looks at this scene and down the road and this is primarily because of the main roof pitch and the high, consistent ridges. The modest infill between dormers would not adversely impact upon this scene in my opinion. It would not appear jarring on the eye; where others have undertaken similar works it did not strike me as discordant. A merit of the planned frontage changes is that, contrary to the Council's report, the existing smaller of the two dormers, which is in poor condition and unusually clad, will be embodied in the new scheme and be enhanced with matching tile hanging.
7. The planned rear extension, which arguably stretches the term dormer, would be sizeable and somewhat unusual in form by partially sitting on the flat roof of the existing flat roof single storey rear extension. However, its roof height would broadly align with the adjoining structure and others locally. This means that the majority of the main pitch roof would continue to be above the new dormer and, as I note earlier, it is this main pitched form which primarily characterises these homes. Legibility of the original dwelling would continue. The revised side elevation would be accommodated without any sense of inappropriate dominance by the planned extra space. Whilst glimpsed from the street, just in passing between homes, extending upwards to this degree off the existing rear projection would not be problematic in design terms to my eye.
8. Policy D4 of the London Plan and Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) are relevant. Amongst other matters they call for good quality design with buildings which relate to context, protect local character and appearance, are of suitable scale and appearance, and are compatible with surrounding development patterns. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies. The Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations' has parallel objectives and, recognising that it cannot be expected to cover every eventuality in detail, I also conclude that the scheme would accord with the *aims* of that document.

Conditions

9. Along with standard commencement the Council suggests a condition requiring the development to be in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I would agree with this for the avoidance of doubt. For reasons of safety, I would also agree that a condition relating to the Fire Safety Report is applied. I see no need for intended external materials to be submitted to the Council for approval as the application content is quite clear that matching materials would be used.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR