

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2017

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

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

Decision date: 28 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3165437
6 Mayfair Avenue, Twickenham TW2 7JG

- 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 Miss C Robb against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref: 16/3757/HOT dated 22 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey side rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side rear extension at 6 Mayfair Avenue, Twickenham TW2 7JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16/3757/HOT dated 22 September 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 plan: 1319 01.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached property on the west side of Mayfair Avenue, close to the junction with Tranmere Road, and within a predominantly residential area, characterised by similar semi-detached dwellings. There is a regular spacing to these dwellings, with gaps between each pair, particularly at first floor level, which contributes to the predominant pattern of development.
-

4. Many of the houses in the immediate and wider local area have been extended to the side, mainly with single storey side extensions incorporating extended porches with garages or additional accommodation, many of which project forward of the original building line. I have noted from the information provided by the Council that there is not evidence of planning permission for all of these, but it is my view that these alterations and extensions to dwellings, including side extensions which project forward of the original building line, are now part of the existing pattern of development which contributes to the character and appearance of the local area.
5. The property as existing has an attached, flat roofed garage which is broadly in line with the front elevation (excluding the front bay). The proposal seeks to wrap a single storey extension across the rear of the property, following the demolition of existing small rear additions, and along the side, incorporating the existing garage. The front of the garage would be replaced with a projecting bay window and the whole extension would be under a pitched roof, which would wrap around the front to create a porch over the front door.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *House Extensions and External Alterations* 2015 (SPD) sets out at 1.1 that it is intended to provide a clear set of guidelines with appropriate illustrations on how various household changes should be designed. However, the introduction is clear that because of the diversity of house styles within the borough it is neither possible nor desirable to cover every type of addition or eventuality. The scheme proposals and in particular the forward projection of the side extension with its proposed bay window would not accord with some of the detailed guidance in the SPD, for example, the guidance at 5.2.2 sets out that where an extension is to be subordinate to the existing house, it should normally be set back by at least 1 metre behind the front elevation. However, the existing garage which is to be converted into habitable space, does not accord with the same guidance.
7. Moreover, I am satisfied that the modest width, scale and form of the proposed side extension, including the front additions, would be seen as a subordinate addition to the existing property. The design detailing would respect the character and appearance of the existing property.
8. The semi-detached pair of the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour, at No 8 is unbalanced, as existing, because of the garage at No 6, but the symmetry of the pair is read and would continue to be read at first floor level. I am also satisfied that the proposed development, particularly given its modest width and proportions, would respect the predominant pattern of development in the local area, which as set out above includes a variety of projecting side additions.
9. I agree with the Council that the proposed rear extension would be appropriately designed and remain a subservient addition to the existing property. It would be a broadly comparable depth with other rear extensions undertaken in the local area and as a result would have no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the local area.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the local area. There would be no conflict with Policy CP7 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy 2009, Policies DM DC1 and

DM DC5 of the Council's adopted Development Management Plan 2011 as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which seek a high quality of design which respects the local context and local distinctiveness. I have found that the development would not fully accord with some of the detailed guidelines within the Council's SPD, but in the particular circumstances of this case I consider that there is sufficient justification for an exception to be made to the advice in the SPD.

11. In terms of conditions, matching materials with the existing dwelling are required in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. I shall also add a condition to list the approved plan for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR