
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2016

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3153832

25 Strathearn Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond upon Thames TW2 6JT

- 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 Barry Yardley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1077/HOT, dated 16 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and single storey side extension and erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and single storey side extension and erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension at 25 Strathearn Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond upon Thames TW2 6JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1077/HOT, dated 16 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - ii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - iii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 104, 105, 106.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Barry Yardley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council, in its decision notice, refers to its Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations (the SPD). I have afforded some weight to that document due to its role in supporting the relevant development plan policies.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No 25 is a semi-detached property within a street characterised mainly by such dwellings but where, particularly in the near vicinity of the site, there are some detached houses in corner locations. The gaps between the pairs of semi-detached houses or between them and the detached dwellings, together with the small front gardens, contribute towards a pleasant degree of spaciousness to the street scene. However, those gaps have been eroded to some degree by a number of first floor side extensions, although not to the extent that terraces have been formed. The adjoining detached property at No 27 is a case in point where its two storeys extend to within fairly close proximity of the boundary with No 25.
6. The proposed two storey side extension would not be set off the side boundary by the 1 metre set out in the SPD. However, it would still be set in to a degree at first floor level such that the overall gap between it and the side of No 27 would be clearly evident, maintaining a sense of separation between the two buildings. Such a relationship would also be seen in the context of some other similar or slightly smaller gaps between other properties in the vicinity of the site, including cases where there is a semi-detached house adjacent to a detached one, such as at Nos 24 and 26 opposite. In that context, the proposal would not be an unexpected feature and would not have a jarring effect within the street scene.
7. I have also had regard to the current situation whereby the semi-pair comprising Nos 23 and 25 has an unbalanced appearance with No 23 already having a similar flat roof side extension to that proposed at No 25, albeit not set back to the same degree at first floor level or set in at the side at that level. The proposed extension would therefore provide for an improved balance to the pair's appearance which in turn would be beneficial to the general street scene.
8. The side extension would have a flat roof which would not reflect the pitched roof designs of the original houses in the street. However, together with the balancing effect it would have with No 23, it would not be unexpected in the context of a small number of other flat roof extensions in the street, including opposite at No 26.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it would accord with policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy and policy DM DC1 of the LDF Development Management Plan, and would not be at odds with the aims of the SPD, which together relate to maintaining and improving the local environment and to ensuring that new development is of a high design quality.
10. The Council has suggested three conditions that it considers would be appropriate were I minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these in the light of advice in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance. The standard time condition is required in this case and for the avoidance of doubt and in the

interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans would also be required. A condition to ensure that the materials proposed to be used in the construction of the external surfaces match those used in the existing building would also be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR