



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: 13 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3352880

Westbourne, Marlborough Road, Hampton TW12 3RX.

- 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 Robert Honeyball against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/1546/HOT
 - The development proposed is single storey side, front and rear extensions. Raising of ridge to create a new storey at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side, front and rear extensions; raising of ridge to create a new storey at first floor level at Westbourne, Marlborough Road, Hampton TW12 3RX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 24/1546/HOT and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. I understand that the description of development, as set out on the Council's decision notice was agreed with the Appellant at the application stage and slightly differs from the description of development on the application forms. I have used the agreed description of development in my decision.
3. Revised plans were submitted during the application process and my decision is based on the plans as determined by the Council.
4. Notwithstanding the agreed description of development, the Council has made references in the Officer's report that the proposals would result in a new dwelling rather than extensions to the existing dwelling. However, from the submitted plans and all the information before me, I consider that the proposal should be considered as submitted, namely as extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling.
5. 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a detached single storey dwelling on the east side of Marlborough Road at its northern end, with a side return facing towards Old Farm Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a varied mix of both detached houses and bungalows, a number of which appear to have been the subject of alterations and extensions. The existing property sits on a good sized plot and is modest in scale and proportions and of relatively utilitarian design.
8. The proposal would extend the existing property on its northern side and to the rear, together with a modest front extension. It would raise the ridge height to create first floor accommodation with roof lights to the front and two gables to the rear with a lower dormer set between the gables.
9. Section 12 of the Framework together with Policy LP1 of the Council's Local Plan, Policies D3, D4 and D6 the London Plan as well as the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Alterations 2015 (SPD) all emphasise that development should be of a high quality design that respects local character and distinctiveness. The Council has identified where the proposals would not adhere to the guidance in its SPD. However, the guidance is clear at the outset at Paragraph 1.1.1 that the examples given are only indicative of the Council's approach and are not intended to stifle sensitive and imaginative design. Paragraph 5.2.1, under Side and Rear Extensions, for example, acknowledges that there are alternative methods for achieving a well designed extension, including integrating with the existing house or, alternatively, being an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure. The SPD, therefore, as is to be expected from such design guides, sets out a flexible rather than rigid set of guidelines to be followed.
10. I consider that the proposed extensions would be well designed to secure a sensitive and integrated solution. The proportions, scale and massing and therefore the overall composition would sit comfortably within the plot, retaining appropriate margins to the front, side and to the rear. From the front the property would retain its modest proportions, appearing as a single storey property with rooms in the roof, whilst from the rear the property would appear as a balanced two storey composition.
11. This approach would be similar to the design and form of the adjoining property at Tanglewood which is identified by the Council as a Building of Townscape Merit and has itself been the subject of extensions and alterations. The proposal before me would relate appropriately to the adjoining property in terms of overall roof height, scale and massing, but would retain variations in design and detailing to reflect the individual nature of the properties in the local area.
12. The dwelling as proposed to be extended would still be of modest scale and proportions in relation to some of the surrounding properties and, given its unified design, I consider that it would be readily assimilated into the varied street scene. It would not be a visually obtrusive and incongruous form of development within the

street scene, either when approaching from along Marlborough Road or from Old Farm Road. In terms of appearance, I consider that the proposed design would result in a visual enhancement of the existing building to the benefit of the street scene.

13. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extensions and alterations would respect and enhance the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. There would be no conflict with Policy LP1 of the Council's Local Plan (2018), Policies D3, D4 and D6 the London Plan (2021) and the Framework and in particular Section 12.
14. The Council has also referred to Policy 28 of the emerging Local Plan (Regulation 19 version June 2023), and weight can be afforded to that policy in accordance with the stage of the Local Plan progress. I am satisfied that the proposals would also accord with that policy which carries forward similar objectives to the existing development plan policies to secure high architectural and urban design quality in all developments.
15. The proposals would not accord with all the detailed guidance in the SPD. However, I have concluded that the proposed design would be a sensitive approach to extending the existing building taking full account of the relationship with the adjoining building and the varied character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. It would, therefore, accord with the objectives of the SPD to secure a high quality design which respects the local context. In the particular circumstances of this case, the instances where the proposals would not strictly follow some of the guidance in the SPD would not justify a refusal of planning permission.
16. The Appellant has drawn my attention to other permissions granted in the vicinity for extensions and alterations to individual properties, but my assessment has been specific to the proposal before me.

Conditions

17. In terms of conditions, the proposed materials should accord with those set out on the approved plans to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. Although the schedule of materials provides for some alternatives for some of the materials, given the variety of materials in the local area, including the adjoining Building of Townscape Merit, I see no reason why further details and samples need to be submitted and approved by the Council. The approved plans should be listed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning.
18. The side facing window at first floor serving the en-suite bathroom should be obscure glazed and fixed shut to a height of 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the room to protect the amenities of surrounding neighbours. Similarly, a condition to require that no part of the roof of the extended property should be used as a balcony or sitting out area is required to protect the amenities of surrounding neighbours.
19. As the proposal is for extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling, it is not necessary to require landscaping details to be submitted and approved by the Council. Similarly given the scale of the householder project and the good size of

the plot, as well as other relevant legislation, I see no planning justification for requiring a construction management plan or a condition relating to refuse storage.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions (1- 5 inclusive)

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall accord with those set out on Plans PR04 Rev B and PR05 Rev B.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: EX00; EX01; EX02; EX03; EX04; OS01; PR00 Rev A; PR01 Rev B; PR02 Rev B; PR03 Rev A; PR04 Rev B; PR05 Rev B, PR06 Rev A and PR07 Rev A.
- 4) The proposed first floor window in the side elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass and fixed shut to a height of 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the room in which the window is installed and thereafter so retained.
- 5) The roof area of the extensions hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.