



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

**by E Symmons BSc (Hons), MSc**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 01 August 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3229088**

**7 Tideway Close, Ham TW10 7YR**

- 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 Mrs Ushma Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
  - The application Ref 18/4275/HOT, dated 27 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2019.
  - The development proposed is for a rear extension to the ground and first floor.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a rear ground and first floor extension at 7 Tideway Close, Ham, TW10 7YR in accordance with the terms of application reference 18/4275/HOT, 27 December 2018, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 9007/ST1; 9007/R1; 9007/R2; 9007/R3A and 9007/R4, all received on 28 December 2018.
  - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property sits on the edge of a relatively new housing estate adjacent to a large area of open space designated as Metropolitan Open Space. The dwelling is typical of others on the estate being a two-storey detached property with a pitched gable end roof. The properties on the estate do not form regular straight orientations when viewed from the public areas. This results in mixed views of roof profiles, some gable end on and others showing a pitched aspect. The appeal property and its neighbour are off-set from Tideway Close which forms a loosely curving rear building line along this part of the street when viewed from the adjacent open space.
4. The extension would not be visible from Tideway Close but could be seen from the informal path within the adjacent open space which runs along the south

western edge of the estate and the side boundary of the appeal property. Views of the lower part of the proposal would be obscured by existing vegetation and the high boundary wall. The upper part of the extension, when viewed from this public land, would be seen against the background of the adjacent house, the intervening garages and the remainder of Tideway Close.

5. The House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document<sup>1</sup> 2015 (SPD) advises that two-storey rear extensions should not be more than half the width of the original house to prevent such extensions dominating the original scale and character. The proposal would protrude around 2.4m from the rear elevation, would have a step-in from the side of around 1m and its roof would sit below the ridge height. When viewed from public land it would be seen 'side on' and the width would not be significantly apparent. The neighbouring property at 6 Tideway Close is separated from, and sits at an angle to, the appeal property. Private views of the proposal would be from the garden and partly obscured by the intervening garage, fence and vegetation and no harm to their living conditions has been suggested. There would be no public views from this direction.
6. The roof of the extension would have a hipped design. Although this is not characteristic of the house style in the estate it would be subservient to the existing roof. When seen from the open land the view would be of a small sloped roof element which would be consistent with other views into the estate where gable end orientations sit next to sloping aspects of adjacent roofs.
7. When viewed from much further into the open space, the extension would be visible. However, within the context of the relatively large and open host plot; the mixed roof aspects seen from this viewpoint; the modest scale of the projection and the intervening vegetation, it would not be unduly prominent or dominant. Concern has been raised that the proposal would disrupt the rear curve of the row of dwellings. Whilst I agree with this assessment, the curved feature is not particularly characteristic of the estate when viewed from the open space and other end properties have various orientations.
8. Although the proposal would not accord with all of the advice within the SPD, in this case, due to the limited public visibility and mixed character of the estate when viewed from public land, the effect upon the character and appearance of the area would not be significant. The proposal would therefore not conflict with Policy LP 1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan 2018 which seeks that development maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area

## **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons stated above the appeal is allowed.

*E Symmons*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> London Borough of Richmond Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations May 2015.