The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA MRTPI

Decision by M Seaton BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3243784
450 Chertsey Road, Twickenham TW2 6LR

- 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 and Mrs Thatcher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
- The application Ref 19/2800/HOT, dated 12 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2019.
- The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and single storey rear extension at 450 Chertsey Road, Twickenham, TW2 6LR, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/2800/HOT, dated 12 September 2019, and 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 approved plans:

   097-3-010, 097-3-011, 097-3-012 and 097-3-014

   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 Council do not object to the single storey rear extension and having considered this matter I have found no reason to reach a different conclusion. The main issue in this appeal therefore is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site occupies a corner plot on the junction of Chertsey Road and Gloucester Road. The surrounding area consists of a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings of different styles. Due to the open nature of the junction at Chertsey Road and Gloucester Road there is a sense of spaciousness in this location which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document, House Extensions and External Alterations, May 2015 (SPD), suggests that the ridge of a two storey side extension should be set down from the main ridge of the host dwelling. The SPD states that it is desirable to set a two storey side extension back by 1 metre behind the front elevation and that its width should not be greater than half the width of the original building. The proposed two storey side extension does not comply with this guidance.

6. However, the appeal property currently has a gabled end side elevation which dominates the appearance of the dwelling and significantly unbalances the semi-detached pair of which the appeal dwelling forms part. Moreover, given the prominent corner location of the appeal site, these works appear highly visible and incongruous within the streetscene.

7. The proposed two storey side extension would reintroduce a hipped roof form, significantly improving the design and appearance of the appeal dwelling. Moreover, the proposed materials and the bay windows would match the existing dwelling and would create a pleasing sense of symmetry for the host property. As a result, the proposal would improve the appearance of the host property and the semi-detached pair and would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

8. While the proposed two storey side extension would extend the host property towards the junction of Chertsey Road and Gloucester Road, it would be set in from the side boundary of the appeal site. Given the width of the junction, any sense of encroachment into its open nature would not be significant and its spacious character would remain. I also observed that properties at other junctions in the area project towards the boundary of their plot. While I do not have details of those properties before me, including their planning history, they inform the current context to the appeal proposal. Given this context, the appeal proposal would respect the existing character of the area.

9. In conclusion, the proposal is acceptable and would comply with Policy LP 1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan, as adopted by the Council on 3 July 2018. This requires, among other things, development to take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings. It would also comply with the aims of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to design. Although the proposal would conflict with the guidance set out within the SPD, it would nevertheless comply with the broad aims of that document in improving the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Conditions and Recommendation

10. The Council have suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see in the event that the appeal is allowed. For clarity, I shall attach the standard plans condition, although it is not necessary to include the existing drawings. A condition is also suggested that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building. This will ensure that the extensions are finished in a manner that is appropriate to the host dwelling and I shall attach this condition accordingly.

11. I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out above.

Scott Britnell

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 subject to the conditions set out above.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR