



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2019

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3234794

37 Heath Gardens, Twickenham TW1 4LY

- 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 James Watson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/1227/HOT, dated 12 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a rear roof extension on return element together with refurbishment of existing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear roof extension on return element together with refurbishment of existing dormer at 37 Heath Gardens, Twickenham TW1 4LY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1227/HOT, dated 12 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 541-PL-000; 541-PD-21; 541-PD-22; 541-PD-23; and 541-PD-24.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on the eastern side of Heath Gardens, which is a predominantly residential street, containing garden-fronted, traditional brick dwellings of various sizes and designs. Many of the dwellings in the area have been extended. To the rear of the appeal building there are a significant number of box dormer windows on the rear elevations of dwellings.
4. The appeal building is a traditional 2-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a smaller-scale 2-storey outrigger to the rear and a box dormer window on the rear roofslope. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling to the south – No 39 – largely mirrors the rear of the appeal building above ground floor level, with a similar box dormer window and rear outrigger.

5. 33 Heath Gardens, the next door property to the north is a detached dwelling, set-back a much greater distance from the highway than is typical by a walled front garden area. Notwithstanding the presence of some mature trees on the front boundary, the position of this dwelling affords views of the rear outrigger of the appeal building along Heath Gardens from the north.
6. The appeal development would entail the provision of a flat-roofed, zinc-clad extension onto the roof of the rear outrigger. It would be joined to a refurbished and similarly zinc-clad box dormer on the rear roofslope of the main dwelling, of a similar design, scale and massing to the existing box dormer. The proposed extension would span the full width of the outrigger roof but would be set back a short distance from the end. It's roof height would be lower than the refurbished box dormer roof, which in turn would remain below the height of the main roof ridgeline.
7. I note from the evidence that the proposal would not be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A and B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO)¹.
8. However, were the proposed roof extension to the rear outrigger to be narrowed, so as to be set back 0.2metres from the eaves, the extension element would be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the GPDO. Such a change could be made without significantly affecting the function of the proposed extension and would be a genuine fallback option.
9. The proposed development would be a modern addition to the appeal dwelling, visible in views from the rear and from parts of Heath Gardens. However, the difference between the proposed outrigger extension and a slightly narrower version would be insignificant, in terms of the effect upon the character and appearance of the area.
10. The proposed window on the part-rear elevation of the refurbished box dormer would be of a different design to the traditional first floor window beneath it, and somewhat larger in size. However, it would accord with the modern design and materials of the overall appeal development, which would not be out of keeping with the large number of dormer and other extensions in the area.
11. For these reasons the appeal development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would generally accord with Policy LP1 (local character and design quality) contained in the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan 2018. There would be very limited conflict with guidance contained within the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015. However, with reference to what the Government has determined to be acceptable development, as set out in the GPDO, this is not significant.

Other Matters

12. Reference is made to the appeal site's location within the Strawberry Hill Village Character Area (SHVCA) and the associated Supplementary Planning Document for this area. This document is not in the evidence before me and neither it, nor the appeal building's location within the SHVCA - which I note is

¹ Paragraphs 2.16 and 2.17 of the appellant's Grounds for Appeal.

not a Conservation Area², cause me to reach a different conclusion with regard to this appeal.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition specifying the approved drawings would be necessary for reasons of certainty.
14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR

² Under section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (designation of conservation areas).