

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2017

**by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 24 May 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3170375**  
**8 Walpole Place, Teddington, TW11 8PL**

- 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 Mark Noblet against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
  - The application Ref: 16/4215/HOT, dated 2 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2017.
  - The development proposed is rear first floor extension and single storey side extension.
- 

### Procedural Matter

1. The description of the development cited in the header above is derived from the planning application forms. As the development is to the rear of the property, I consider a more accurate description is single storey and first floor rear extension.

### Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey and first floor rear extension at 8 Walpole Place, Teddington, TW11 8PL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/4215/HOT, dated 2 November 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: Drawing No: A9766PA-01: Existing Ground Floor Plans; Drawing No: A9766PA-02: Existing First Floor Plan; Drawing No: A9766PA-03 Rev A: Proposed Ground Floor Plan; Drawing No: A9766PA-04 Rev A: Proposed First Floor Plan; Drawing No: A9766PA-05: Existing Section; Drawing No: A9766PA-06: Proposed Section; Drawing No: A9766PA-07: Site Location Plan; Drawing No: A9766PA-08: Existing Photographs; Drawing No: A9766PA-09 Rev A: Existing and Proposed Rear Elevations; Drawing No: A9766PA-10: Existing and Proposed Side Elevations.
    - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no part of the roof of the
-

extension hereby approved shall be used as a balcony or terrace, nor shall any access be formed thereto.

- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or other openings shall be formed in the flank (side) walls of the first floor extension hereby approved without express planning permission.

### **Main Issue**

3. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

### **Reasons**

4. The first floor extension would occupy the full width of the rear of the property, with a slight chamfer to one side and would have a maximum projection of 1.63 metres from the original rear façade.
5. From my site inspection, I saw no other first floor extensions on properties to the South side of Walpole Place other than at the end of the block of terraces to the East (identified as No 24 in the appellant's statement). However, views of the rear of Walpole Place are confined to a narrow back street, where the first floor rear facades are seen as a backdrop to a miscellany of more prominent single storey, mostly flat roofed, rear extensions. Because of this and bearing in mind the very limited depth of the proposed first floor addition, I consider the flat roof would not be particularly evident or appear out of place. Given its limited scale and height, it would appear as a subordinate addition to the appeal property, even in conjunction with the ground floor extension. Consequently, it would appear as an inconsequential element in the street.
6. I thus conclude on the main issue, that the proposal would integrate comfortably with the host property and wider character and appearance of the locality in which it sits. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy CP7 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009), Policy DM DC1 of the Local Development Framework Development Management Plan (2011), or Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (Publication Version for Consultation 4 January-15 February 2017). These seek to secure high quality design in new development, which respects distinctive local character and townscape. It would not comply with the guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document: *House Extensions and External Alterations* (May 2015), which seeks to avoid two storey rear extensions that are more than half the width of the original building. However, given the limited depth of the first floor addition and its discrete siting relative to the public domain, I am satisfied that it would not conflict with the objective of that advice to ensure that extensions do not over-dominate the original scale and character of buildings.
7. The Council suggest a condition confining the approval to the submitted plans, which is necessary for certainty. A condition is suggested requiring external finishes to match the existing. However, this is superfluous as the application forms indicate London stock brick to match existing and any material deviation therefrom would require further permission. A condition withdrawing permitted development rights for the use of the roof of the extension as a balcony or

terrace is necessary to protect the privacy of adjoining occupants. An additional condition is imposed withdrawing permitted development rights for the insertion of openings in the flank walls of the first floor extension is to protect neighbours privacy. The main parties were canvassed and no objections raised.

*ALISON ROLAND*

INSPECTOR