



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2025

by **N Perrins MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/25/3359547

64 Ormond Avenue, Hampton, Middlesex TW12 2RX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with a condition subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Kamaran Sheikh against the decision of London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/2836/VRC.
 - The application sought planning permission for demolition of existing detached house and erection of new detached house containing 5 bedrooms at 64 Ormond Avenue, Hampton, Middlesex TW12 2RX without complying with condition U0158482 attached to planning permission Ref: 23/0197/FUL.
 - The condition in dispute is U0158482, which states: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: SK/22-100; SK/22-106; SK/22-112; SK/22-113; SK/22-114; and Application Form, received 23rd January 2023, 101 REV B; 103 REV A; 104 REV A; 105 REV A; 107 REV A; 108 REV A; 109 REV A; 110 REV A; 111 REV B, received 22nd May 2023.
 - The reason given for the condition is to accord with the terms of the application, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Planning permission was granted under Ref: 23/0197/FUL for a replacement dwelling at the appeal site with a hipped roof with central front gable. As observed on my site inspection, works at the site have commenced but not yet completed. The appeal proposal sought planning permission to vary the approved drawings for Ref: 23/0197/FUL and make several alterations. These comprise changing the roof type from hip with flat middle roof section to gable with flat middle roof section, the porch landing window to a larger apex window, the front windows appearance from 4 section to 3 section, roof windows on side slopes of the hip to flat roof windows and adding air source heat pumps to the ground floor.
3. Whilst the proposal comprises several elements, the Council are mainly concerned that the proposed changes from a hip roof to a gable roof would result in a significant increase in the size, mass and bulk of the proposed dwelling that would harm the character of the street scene and immediate locality. As such, my reasoning below is mainly directed to assessing the proposed changes to roof structure and form. Consequently, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated on the southern side of Ormond Avenue. The previous bungalow at the site is in the process of being replaced with a new dwelling with construction works underway. The character of the area comprises detached, semi-detached and flatted dwellings of varying designs.
5. Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018 (LP) requires development to be of a high architectural quality and to be compatible with local character. The site is located within Character Area 3: Gloucester Road and the Ormonds of the Hampton Village Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD). This SPD identifies that there is much design variation in Character Area 3 but many common features. Ormond Avenue is noted as having a higher proportion of large, detached houses.
6. I have considered the information before me carefully including carrying out an inspection of the site and the wider character area to review the various examples provided of roofscape in the area. It is evident from this that whilst there is some variation in roofscape character across the SPD character area, many properties on Ormond Avenue comprise hipped roof forms with front gable projections.
7. Where side gables exist on Ormond Avenue they generally rise to a central ridge point such as at Nos 56, 71, 75 and 84, or maintain an angled slope to a flat roof such as at No 61. These designs enable roof form to not appear as unduly bulky in the street scene. Where side dormers and flat roofs have been added, such as at Nos 70 and 76, they are set within the roof structure and proportionate in their scale. As such, roofs with side dormers do not appear as crown roofs in the same form and scale as that proposed in this appeal.
8. In contrast to the prevailing roofscape character on Ormond Avenue, the appeal proposal would introduce an uncharacteristic crown roof design with upright side gable ends and large flat roof area. Although the height remains consistent with the approved design and lower than adjacent properties, the proposed depth of the gables to create the middle flat roof section would add significant bulk and mass to the roof structure's side profile.
9. This would appear, visually, at odds with the prevailing roofscape where bulk and mass is contained on side roof profiles by the design techniques referred to above. Moreover, the uncharacteristic and deep flat roof gable ends would be prominently visible in the street scene due to spacing that exist on either side of the site. The resulting effect would be an overly large, bulky and conspicuous roof form that would unacceptably jar with the prevailing scale and form of roofscape character along Ormond Avenue.
10. I have considered the references provided to crown roof structures in the wider area that are similar in design to the appeal proposal. However, the examples on Ormond Drive and Ormond Crescent are some distance from the site where the urban grain is slightly tighter in terms of spacing between properties than where the appeal site is located. This enables them to assimilate into the street scene in design terms without appearing as overtly incongruous. Accordingly, whilst they are in the same SPD character area, the other examples provided do not provide justification for the appeal proposal, which needs to be assessed in terms of its impact in its own site-specific context.

11. I acknowledge that the proposal has been submitted to improve light and usable space within the loft, enhance the potential for solar energy, improve privacy to neighbours and would avoid the need for future changes by balancing it out at this stage. However, the approved design would still be a substantial property in terms of internal space and was deemed acceptable in terms of its renewable energy credentials, privacy to neighbours as well as its appearance in the street scene. The information before me, therefore, does not demonstrate that the proposal would provide such a material enhancement in these respects compared to the approved design that they would justify the harm identified to the street scene.
12. I note the Council also raise concerns that the proposed two rear dormers would be overhanging rather than being set within the dormer structure. This design feature would, however, not be prominently visible from the street scene due to being on the rear elevation and would not result in any perceptible harm to the character and appearance of the area. I also agree that all the other changes proposed to the design are acceptable. However, finding no harm in these respects does not justify the adverse impact that would occur from the incongruous crown roof design.
13. In summary, having carefully considered the circumstances of this case, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and represent inappropriate roof design for its specific context that would be prominently visible within the street scene. Accordingly, the proposed amendment from a hip to gable roof would not accord with Policies LP1 and LP9 of the LP or guidance within the Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document 2006, Small and Medium Housing Sites Supplementary Planning Document 2006 and Hampton Village Planning Guidance SPD. The proposal is also contrary to Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework that requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other matters

14. Reference has been made to an administrative error being made by the Council that incorrectly identified the site as being within a Conservation Area. I am satisfied that this was duly corrected during the appeal process and as such does not raise any issues determinative to this decision.
15. I also note that an objection was submitted raising concern over the location of the air source heat pumps. This is a matter that could have been resolved by conditions had I found the appeal to be acceptable. As I have not, I do not need to consider this further in this decision.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the street scene contrary to the provisions of the development plan. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR