



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3347070

12 The Garth, Hampton Hill TW12 1SR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Perkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/0319/HOT.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part one, part two, storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised in December 2024. I do not consider that there are any material changes in the Framework, pertinent to this appeal proposal. It is not therefore necessary to seek the views of the Appellant or the Council on the revised Framework.
3. The application forms recorded the applicant solely by the surname of Perkins, but I have taken the fuller title from the appeal forms.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and of the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached house on the south side of The Garth and with a side return to Uxbridge Road. It has a forward projecting garage and garden space to the side and to the rear. It has an existing fence in excess of 2m which wraps around the garden space to the side of the property, with a grass verge in front.
6. There are both two storey semi-detached houses and a terrace of three storey properties within The Garth and a broader mix of property styles along Uxbridge Road, including in terms of materials. There is also a varied building line to Uxbridge Road on the east side of the road, as well as boundary treatments, including brick walls, hedges and more open frontages.

7. The proposal would seek to build a part single and part two storey extension to the side. The ground floor extension would be built out to the side boundary with a flat 'green' roof and roof light. The ground floor extension and garden area would be contained within a brick boundary wall which would be some 2.33m in height and would replace the existing fence. The ground floor extension would be higher than the proposed boundary wall. The first floor extension above would be more modest in width and also set down from the existing roof ridge and set in from the front and rear building lines of the existing dwelling. The materials would be zinc cladding at first floor with brick walls to the ground floor.
8. The property, as existing, is contained by a fence in excess of 2m which is higher than most of the surrounding boundary treatments in the vicinity. It is, as existing, a noticeable feature in the street scene. The fence would be replaced by a brick wall some 2.33 m high which would appear to be the same if not higher than the existing fence. Furthermore, the ground floor extension, at 3m in height, would be higher than the top of the boundary wall, above which would be the green roof. The combined effect of the extent of the wall given its solid form and its continuous height, together with the additional height of the ground floor extension, particularly where directly abutting the wall on the side boundary would result in an over dominant massing along the boundary which would be out of scale and proportions to surrounding boundary treatments. Although there are other brick walls in the vicinity of the appeal site, these are generally more modest in height than the proposal before me.
9. As a result of its height and the massing of the extension protruding above along the side boundary, it would also be an overly prominent and discordant feature in the street scene. I do not consider that the bulk and massing of this element would be relieved by the addition of the green roof to the flat roof of the ground floor extension or the small depth of grass verge beyond the wall. I have taken into account the existing fence line but consider that the height and massing of the proposal would be materially greater than the existing fence and visually discordant in the street scene.
10. The first floor would be visually subordinate to the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling. Furthermore because of its modest width, it would retain a generous open gap to the side which would be seen when approaching from the north or the south along Uxbridge Road. The Council has noted that the set back from the front elevation would be less than 1m and has referred to the guidance in its Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (SPD) at 5.2.2 which refers to a set back of a side extension of at least 1m behind the front elevation. However, the guidance is clear that this set back is not a rigid requirement by the use of the words*it is usually desirable*..... Taking the combined set back of the front and rear walls of the proposed first floor extension in relation to the building lines of the existing property and set down of the roof ridge as well as its modest width I am satisfied that this element would be a subordinate addition to the existing property.
11. The proposed extension has been designed to be different in appearance and materials to the existing property, including in terms of the proposed fenestration. The selection of the proposed materials would not, on its own, be a justification for refusal, and there are many successful examples where contemporary designs have used contrasting materials to those existing, some examples of which have

been provided to me by the Appellant. The Framework and the Council's SPD also support innovative and imaginative design solutions. However, taken all together, the bulk and massing and particularly the height of the ground floor boundary wall and extension rising above, combined with the proposed selection of very distinctive and striking materials would all contribute to the over dominance of the proposed extensions in relation to both the existing property and within the wider street scene.

12. I therefore conclude that the overall proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the existing property as well as the local area. This would conflict with Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018), the SPD and the Hampton Hill Village Planning Guidance SPD as well as the Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

13. I have taken into account the Appellant's family related reasons for seeking accessible accommodation but there is nothing before me to indicate that these objectives could not be met through alternative design solutions. I have noted the sustainability credentials of the proposal which are to be welcomed, but they do not on their own outweigh the harm I have concluded.
14. The Appellant has raised concerns about the pre-application process it engaged with under the Council's Ref: 21/P0320/PREAPP, although I note that this was in respect of a proposed new dwelling. My consideration relates to the planning merits of the proposal before me.

Conclusion

15. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR