



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2007

by **James Ellis LLB (Hons) Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
31 October 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/A/07/2046011

83 Hanworth Road, Hampton, Middx TW12 3EA

- 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 and Mrs Simon Hampton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
- The application Ref 07/0408/HOT, dated 1 February 2007, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2007.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion and first floor bedroom extension above a garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 81 Hanworth Road in terms of outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house with a two-storey front bay, and lies on the south side of Hanworth Road. The house has a single-storey side extension on its eastern side which extends towards the plot's boundary with 81 Hanworth Road. The south side of Hanworth Road is characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached houses which have a mix of architectural styles. The houses are staggered and at an angle to the street. Consequently, No 83 stands forward of No 81 by more than 6 metres. A number of the houses, in addition to the appeal property, have been extended, including No 85 (attached to No 83) which has a two-storey side extension.
 4. The proposal would involve the building of a first floor extension over the existing side extension at the appeal property for the full depth of the existing house. The hipped roof over the existing house would extend over the extension with eaves and ridge heights to match those which exist. The roof would be extended at the rear to provide a dormer which would have a double ridged gable roof with a central valley. Three velux windows would be fitted to the front roof elevation and one velux and a solar panel to the rear. Three more velux windows, including one with a cabriolet system, would be fitted to the side roof elevation.
-

5. The proposed extension would broadly follow the design of the two-storey side extension to 85 Hanworth Road and, in this context, the proposal could be said to provide symmetry to the pair of houses. Nevertheless, I consider that there is a significant difference between the extension to No 85 and the appeal proposal. The flank elevation of the extension at No 85 does not stand out in the street scene because the extension at No 85 is set back from the street in its plot and its flank elevation is, to a large extent, screened by 87 Hanworth Road which stands forward of No 85. However, the same cannot be said for the appeal site, where the flank wall of the existing single-storey side extension is already prominent in the street scene because of its projection forward of No 81.
6. In my opinion, the proposal because of its (two-storey) height, massing, proximity to the appeal site's boundary with 81 Hanworth Road, and forward projection would be read an intrusive and dominant feature in views towards No 81 and the appeal site from that part of Hanworth Road to the east of the appeal site. I consider that the harm arising from this would far outweigh any benefit which might stem from symmetry being restored to Nos 83 and 85 Hanworth Road. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would have a damaging impact on the character and appearance of the area and that it would be contrary to Policy BLT 11 of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames Unitary Development Plan - First Review, adopted in 2005 (the UDP).
7. Turning now to the outlook enjoyed by the occupiers of 81 Hanworth Road, the proposal would be seen from windows in the front elevation of that property, but views towards it would be oblique. Again, the proposal would be seen from the front garden of No 81, but the private amenity area at that property, where sitting out etc. would take place, is its rear garden. Consequently, I consider that the impact of the proposal in terms of the outlook enjoyed by the occupiers of No 81 would not be significant. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 81 Hanworth Road and that, in this respect, the proposal would not be contrary to Policy BLT 16 of the UDP.
8. In arriving at my decision, I have been mindful that the houses on the south side of Hanworth Road display a variety of architectural styles, the proposal has been designed by an architect, and symmetry between 83 and 85 Hanworth Road was encouraged by the Council's officers. However, none of these points, whether singly or in combination, is such as to outweigh the cogent harm to planning objectives that I have found.
9. Other issues raised by third parties include excessive accommodation, an increase in on-street parking, loss of light, overlooking, closure of a prominent gap, and lack of overhanging eaves. These issues have not, however, been material to my decision making.
10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

James Ellis

Inspector