

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 February 2017

by M C J Nunn BA BPL LLB LLM BCL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd March 2017

Appeal A Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3166990
29 Cole Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 1HP

- 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 & Mrs Grewal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref: 16/2273/HOT, dated 8 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'double and single-storey rear extensions'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3166995
29 Cole Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 1HP

- 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 & Mrs Grewal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref: 16/2274/HOT, dated 8 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'double storey side extension'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission granted for the erection of a two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extensions at 29 Cole Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 1HP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16/2273/HOT, dated 8 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-001, PLR-001, PLR-002, PLR-003, PLR-004, PLR-005, PLR-006, PLR-007, PLR-008.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, except where indicated on the plans.
-

- 4) The roof areas of the rear extensions hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.
2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission granted for the erection of a two storey side extension and single storey side extension at 26 Cole Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 1HP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16/2274/HOT, dated 8 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-001, PLS-001, PLS-002, PLS-003, PLS-004, PLS-005, PLS-006, PLS-007, PLS-008.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, except where indicated on the plans.

Preliminary Matters

3. The descriptions in my decisions above are taken from the Council's decision notices rather than the planning application forms. I believe they accurately describe the proposals.
4. Two schemes are now before me. Appeal A proposes a two storey side extension, but also includes one and two storey additions to the rear. Appeal B comprises the two storey side addition, but omits the rear additions. It also includes a small single storey addition to the northern side of the property.
5. The appellant's Statement of Case refers to an application for a lawful development certificate for a rear loft conversion¹. To be clear, these two appeals do not relate to that scheme, and my decisions do not grant permission for it.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in both cases is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area, and host property.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a substantial detached property located on the west side of Cole Park Road, on a road bend opposite the junction with Lancaster Place. The house is of a pleasing design: there is a bay window to the front elevation, with a further angled corner bay. The property has elevations finished in render and red brick. The roof form is characterised by gables, although there is a modern dormer to the rear. A recent flat roofed single storey addition of a more contemporary design has been added to the south side elevation. This would be removed under the current proposals.
8. The surrounding area is residential comprising predominantly detached housing. Although certain of the properties are of a similar design to the appeal property, others in the road differ. A number in the locality have been

¹ Council Ref 16/2272/PS192

- extended. The road has an attractive verdant feel by virtue of the mature street trees.
9. The Council states that both schemes would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)² on house extensions. However, the SPD notes that there are different ways of ensuring that extensions harmonise with the existing house, without dominating it. It describes different approaches, noting that an 'integrated' approach, rather than one where the extension is made to appear as an obvious addition, and subordinate to the main structure, can work well on detached houses³.
 10. In this case, the two storey side addition has been carefully and sympathetically designed to reflect the composition of the original building. It proposes a similar, albeit smaller, front bay window and gable form that complements that of the original property, replicating the fenestration pattern. The side addition would be recessed from the main front elevation, thereby achieving an appropriate degree of subordination. The roof ridge aligning with that of the original dwelling, rather than being set below it, is appropriate in this instance. Although the addition is slightly over half the width of the existing house, its sympathetic design ensures that it would not appear incongruous, over-dominant or intrusive. An adequate gap is retained to the south side to ensure that the two storey side extension would not appear cramped.
 11. In respect of Appeal A, the design of the rear extensions would be uncompromisingly contemporary, incorporating substantial areas of glazing. The use of extensive 'lightweight' full length glazed windows would contrast with the 'heavier' materials, architectural detailing and structure of the original building. The rear fenestration would be quite different in proportion and style from that in the original building, and the extensions would be read as modern additions, but this would provide an interesting contrast with the original structure.
 12. Concerns from neighbours have been raised about the effect on the living conditions at the property to the south at No 27, in terms of privacy and light levels. Particular concerns are that the increase in the size of the rear windows and amount of glazing in Appeal A would allow greater opportunities for overlooking. However, I am satisfied that the intervening distances between buildings, and their relative positions to each other, are such as to avoid unacceptable dominance, overshadowing, loss of daylight and sunlight, or loss of privacy. In any event, views of the rear gardens of adjacent gardens are already possible from the existing upper rear windows and total privacy is unlikely to occur in a built up area. The appeal should not fail on these grounds.
 13. I conclude overall that these proposals would not harm the character and appearance of the area, or host property. They would comply with Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy, and Policies DM DC 1 and DM DC 5 of the Development Management Plan. Together, these policies require new development to be of a high quality architectural design, not to result in unreasonable loss of privacy,

² Local Plan: Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions and External Alterations

³ Paragraph 5.2.1

visual intrusion, or overshadowing to adjoining properties; and to enable sufficient sunlight and daylight to penetrate into and between dwellings. The proposals would also comply with the overarching principles of the SPD which has similar aims.

14. Commencement conditions are necessary to comply with the relevant legislation. Conditions to ensure the developments are carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for certainty. Conditions requiring materials to match those in the existing building, except where indicated on the plans, are necessary to safeguard the character of the building, as well as the wider area. In respect of Appeal A, an additional condition is necessary to prevent the use of the roofs of the rear extensions as balconies or amenity areas, in order to protect the living conditions at neighbouring properties, in accordance with the SPD⁴. Subject to the above conditions, I conclude that both appeals should be allowed.

Matthew C J Nunn

INSPECTOR

⁴ Paragraph 3.2.1