



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3268867

24 Redway Drive, Twickenham, TW2 7NX

- 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 Nishil Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 20/2206/HOT, dated 6 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of ground floor rear extension and first floor side extension with brick cladding and aluminium framed double glazed windows. Replacement of front garage door with window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of ground floor rear extension and first floor side extension with brick cladding and aluminium framed double glazed windows. Replacement of front garage door with window at 24 Redway Drive, Twickenham, TW2 7NX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/2206/HOT, dated 6 August 2020, 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: 1022-L01-Rev A, 1022-L02-Rev A, 1022-E01-Rev A, 1022-E02 Rev A, 1022-P01 Rev A, 1022-P02 Rev A, 1022-P03 Rev A.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) No part(s) of the roof of the building(s) hereby approved shall be used as a balcony or terrace nor shall any access be formed thereto.
 - 5) The upper floor windows in the side elevation of the building hereby approved shall at no time be openable or glazed, otherwise than in obscured glass, below a minimum height of 1.7metres (5'7") above the relevant floor level.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the existing semi-detached pair of houses of which it forms part and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, paired with 22 Redway Drive. At my site visit I observed that the garage to the side of 24 Redway Drive has been demolished. Notwithstanding the demolition of this part of the dwelling, the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings were not previously balanced and symmetrical, with No 22 displaying a gable end to the main roof and a large side dormer to the catslide roof as well as different fenestration and entrance porches.
4. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and comprises mainly of two storey semi-detached dwellings of various styles and designs. Many of the existing properties in the area have been altered and extended, some in a very similar manner to the appeal proposal. I also noted at my site visit that a large number of dwellings along Redway Drive have been extended to the side boundary of their plots, such that there is little uniformity in the street scene in terms of the gaps between dwellings.
5. Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) (LP) requires all development to be a high architectural and urban design quality, and to respect, contribute to and enhance the local environment and character. Detailed design guidance is set out in the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD). Whilst this document does not form part of the development plan, it does nonetheless provide a useful set of guidelines for extensions and alterations.
6. The SPD states (amongst other things) that the shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. This can be achieved by either integrating with the house (particularly in the case of detached houses or the end of uniform terraces) or alternatively, to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure.
7. The proposed side extension would reflect the design and appearance of the existing dwelling and would have the same ridge and eaves height as the existing two storey element of the host dwelling. It would continue to display a catslide element, with the remainder of the extension set back from the front elevation. In my view, the main feature of the existing pair of dwellings is the two storey front bays which would remain the most prominent feature of the front elevation. I therefore find that the proposed extension would be sufficiently subordinate to the main dwelling as required by the SPD and would not be inappropriate in terms of its scale or design. Accordingly, the proposed extension would not be a visually obtrusive or incongruous feature and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or to the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part.
8. Whilst the proposed extension would extend close to the side boundary of the site, this is not uncommon in the area. Furthermore, the original design of the pair of dwellings with a steep catslide roof to the side already has the effect of reducing the spaciousness around the dwellings to an extent. In addition, the

adjacent pair of dwellings are of a different architectural style and are set back slightly further into their plots than the appeal property. A visual distinction between the pairs of dwellings would therefore be retained. I also note that planning permission has already been granted for a first floor side extension at No 24 which would extend close to the side boundary.

9. Whilst I acknowledge that the guidance within the SPD advises at paragraph 5.2.3 that two storey side extensions should be sited 1m from the side boundary, having regard to all of the above factors, I am of the view that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its proximity to the side boundary and would not have a materially harmful effect on the street scene in this regard.
10. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would not have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, the existing semi-detached pair of houses of which it forms part, and the surrounding area. Thus, it would accord with Policy LP1 of the LP which requires development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality.

Other Matters

11. With regard to third party representations regarding privacy, I am satisfied that with appropriate conditions the privacy of nearby occupiers would not be harmed. Furthermore, having regard to the depth of the proposed single storey rear extension, I am satisfied that it would not result in material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 22 Redway Drive by way of loss of light.
12. With reference to third party comments regarding the submitted drawings, I note that these are scaled and the Council has not highlighted any material discrepancies or inaccuracies. Comments relating to the removal of chimney breasts and other building control matters are beyond the remit of this appeal.
13. With regard to the proposed rooflights on the front elevation, these would be small in size and positioned high on the roof slope and would not materially harm the appearance of the host dwelling or the pair of semi-detached properties which it forms part of.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard 3 year implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for clarity. I have also imposed a condition requiring materials to match those of the existing dwelling to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
15. I have imposed conditions restricting use of the roof areas as balconies/terraces and to require upper floor side windows to be unopenable and obscure glazed below a minimum height of 1.7 metres above floor level to safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings.
16. The Council have also suggested a condition requiring the submission of a Fire Safety Statement. However, I consider that the condition is unnecessary having regard to the small scale of development proposed.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR