



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 May 2020

by Martin Small, BA (Hons), BPI, DipCM, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3243918

110 Sixth Cross Road, Twickenham, TW2 5PE

- 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 Vasoulla Michaels against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/2637/HOT, dated 22 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Single storey rear extension and previously approved first-floor extension (planning ref 17/2604/HOT)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and first-floor extension at 110 Sixth Cross Road, Twickenham, TW2 5PE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2637/HOT, dated 22 August 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: Proposed Location Plan and Proposed Block Plan, Existing Plans and Elevations and Proposed Plans and Elevations.
 - 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.
 - 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 part of the roof of the ground-floor extension hereby approved shall be used as a balcony or terrace nor shall any access be formed thereto.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, the Council's Officer Planning Report notes that the first-floor extension to the appeal property approved under Ref: 17/2604/HOT has a flat roof, not the pitched roof shown on the drawings submitted for the proposal before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted drawings. I have used the description of the proposed development from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as more accurately describing the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Background

4. Planning permission was refused under reference 16/3719/HOT for the erection of a first-floor rear extension to the appeal property with a part pitched / part flat roof in December 2015. A subsequent appeal against that refusal was dismissed in May 2017, the Inspector concluding that *"the development would result in a roof form which is not characteristic of the host property or the surrounding area. It would also result in an awkward junction between the roof of the proposed extension and the dormer window"*¹.
5. Planning permission was subsequently granted under Ref: 17/2604/HOT for works including the erection of a first-floor extension with a flat roof. I observed during my site visit that this has not been constructed. The roof form of the proposal before me differs from those previously refused and approved in that the roof as shown on the submitted drawings is fully pitched with a hip. This permission and the revised roof form are material differences in circumstances from those pertaining to the previous appeal.

Character and appearance

6. Sixth Cross Road has housing along one side and allotments and a golf course to the other. The dwellings are semi-detached and of 2-storeys, many with rooms in the roof space, and predominantly with pitched and hipped roofs. The appeal property has been previously extended to the rear and side and has a hip to gable roof extension with a rear box dormer.
7. The proposed single-storey extension would run the full width of the dwelling. It would therefore be slightly wider than the existing rear extensions but would be no deeper or higher. Consequently, it would not significantly adversely affect the character or the appearance of the host dwelling or of the area. I note that the Council considers this element of the proposals to be acceptable.
8. From the evidence before me, the proposed first-floor extension would be similar in depth and width to that approved under Ref: 17/2604/HOT. It would be higher due to the pitched roof but the increase in height would not be substantial. The proposed extension would thus not be significantly more intrusive than the approved extension. Even with the increased bulk of the pitched roof, being set in from one side of the host dwelling and set back from the ground-floor extension, the proposed extension would not dominate the rear elevation of the substantially extended appeal property.
9. I observed during my site visit that pitched roofs with hips are characteristic of the host dwelling and the area and that the neighbouring property has a first-floor extension with a pitched roof. Accordingly, in this respect the revised roof form would not be harmfully at odds with the character of the host property or the area, which distinguishes it from the proposal before the previous Inspector.

¹ APP/L5810/D/17/3171626

10. The ridgeline of the proposed roof would abut the existing rear box dormer which would result in a slightly awkward junction between the two. However, given the modest size of the proposed roof I do not consider that this junction would be materially harmful to the character or appearance of the host property or the area.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the host property or the area. Given that the roof form of the proposal before me differs from that before the Inspector that dismissed the previous appeal for the appeal property, I am satisfied that it is justifiable for me to reach a different conclusion to that of my Inspector colleague.
12. I therefore find no conflict with Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018)², which sets out that the Council will require all development to be of high architectural design and urban design quality and that proposals will be assessed against, amongst other things, compatibility with the local character including scale, height, proportions, form and detailing. Neither would the proposed development conflict in this respect with Policy LP8 of the Local Plan which requires, amongst other things, proposals not to be visually intrusive. Furthermore, I do not find any conflict with the objectives or guidance of the Twickenham Village Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested conditions were planning permission to be granted. I have considered these conditions in light of the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. I have amended the Council's suggested condition 4 to reflect the approved development.
14. Planning permission is therefore granted subject to the standard three-year time limit condition. It is also necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. The restriction of the use of the roof of the ground floor extension is, exceptionally, necessary to safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

Martin Small

INSPECTOR

² London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan As adopted by Council 3 July 2018