



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by P Willows BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3230744

5 Ailsa Avenue, Twickenham TW1 1NF

- 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 Michael Brennan against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0525/HOT, dated 17 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including rear roof extension (matching neighbours) to create bedroom and en-suite facility to mid-terraced dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion including rear roof extension (matching neighbours) to create bedroom and en-suite facility to mid-terraced dwelling at 5 Ailsa Avenue, Twickenham TW1 1NF in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/0525/HOT, dated 17 February 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 plan: Drawing Nos. 1410/1, 1410/2, 1410/5C, 1410/8 and 1410/9.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling located on the southern side of Ailsa Avenue within an established residential area. Many of
-

the properties forming part of the terrace on the southern side of the road have rear roof extensions including the adjacent neighbouring properties at Nos 3 and 7.

5. The proposal would result in a loft conversion with a rear roof extension and three rear windows. Although the proposed extension would occupy the entire roof slope and would not allow for a small area of existing roof beneath the new dormer, it needs to be seen in the context of the neighbouring extensions. I find it would replicate the neighbouring roof extension at No. 3, giving balance and visual coherence to the terrace as a whole when viewed from the rear.
6. The proposal would not appear obtrusive and would fit in with the existing vernacular which features a large number of rear roof extensions, including many without a small setback above the existing roof. The 'House Extensions and External Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) recommends a setback. However, in this instance, I consider that the proposed development would not detrimentally alter the proportions of the dwelling or appear incongruous in the immediate area. Despite the lack of a setback and conflict with the SPD in this regard, the proposal would still respect the general thrust of the SPD in that the extension would reinforce the prevailing character to the rear of Ailsa Avenue given the prevalence of similar roof extensions.
7. Although the Council highlights that neighbouring extensions have been allowed under different consent regimes, they nevertheless exist and affect the setting of the proposed extension. In my view, this setting justifies the lack of a setback.
8. Given the above, the combined scale, bulk, height and mass of the proposed extension would be acceptable. I conclude that the proposal would respect its immediate context and would thus not harm the character or appearance of the area. It would therefore not conflict with policy LP1 of Richmond Upon Thames's Local Plan (2018) which seeks to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials match the existing building, to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Peter Willows

INSPECTOR