
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by William Fieldhouse BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3160836

12 Ashley Drive, Twickenham

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Martin Chow against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application ref 16/2335/PDE, dated 10 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) ("GPDO") for a single-storey rear extension at 12 Ashley Drive, Twickenham in accordance with the details submitted with application ref 16/2335/PDE dated 10 June 2016 pursuant to the GPDO.

Main Issue

2. Paragraph A.4 of the GPDO requires the local planning authority to assess larger house extensions in accordance with paragraph A.1.(g) solely on the basis of the impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. Accordingly, the main issue in the determination of this appeal is the effect that the proposal would have on the amenity of the occupants of nos. 10 and 14 Ashley Drive.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey semi-detached house in a row of similar properties. The proposed single-storey rear extension would match the width of the existing house, have a depth of 6 metres, and a maximum height of 3.2 metres.
4. No. 14 is set slightly further back on its plot than no. 12 meaning that the proposal would project around 4.5 metres beyond its rear elevation. This would exceed the distance of 3.5 metres referred to in Council guidance¹. However, its eaves would be no higher than 2.8 metres and it would be set around 0.8

¹ House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015).

metres from the boundary. Therefore, whilst the upper part of the structure would clearly be visible above the existing boundary fence and wall from the rear windows in, and back garden of, no. 14, it would not be unduly overbearing or be likely to lead to a significant loss of afternoon or evening sunlight to that property other than during a limited part of the year. The boundary fence and wall would provide an effective screen meaning that there would be unlikely to be any loss of privacy due to overlooking from the proposed side windows.

5. The proposal would adjoin, and project no further to the rear than, a similar extension at no. 10 meaning that it would have little effect on the amenity of that property.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the occupants of nos. 10 and 14 Ashley Drive.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and approval granted. The appellant should note that GPDO paragraph A.3 requires the materials to be used in any exterior work to be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse, and paragraphs A.4 (13), (14) and (15) require the development to be completed on or before 30 May 2019 and that the developer shall notify the local planning authority in writing of the completion of the development as soon as reasonably practicable after completion. Such notification shall include the name of the developer, the address or location of the development, and the date of completion.

William Fieldhouse

INSPECTOR