
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2021

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3277418
Westward, Park Lane, Teddington TW11 0HY

- 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 Mrs Christina Rogers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/1042/HOT, dated 22 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2-storey side extension following demolition of detached double garage and replace front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 2-storey side extension following demolition of detached double garage and replace front porch at Westward, Park Lane, Teddington TW11 0HY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/1042/HOT, dated 23 March 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end terrace dwelling of traditional style within a predominantly residential area wherein buildings vary in scale, design, age and type. Consequently, there is some variety to the appearance of the existing built form within the local area of which Westward forms part.
4. The Council appears to raise no objection to the replacement of the existing front porch with a slightly wider and taller structure, as proposed. I, too, find this element of the appeal scheme acceptable because its size and design would be in keeping with the visual character of the host building. Consequently, I shall concern myself with the proposed side extension.
5. This element of the appeal scheme would be a sizeable addition with only a modest set back from the main front wall. Even so, it would be proportionate to the host building with a ridgeline that would continue at a slightly lower level from the existing dwelling terminating with a hipped end. The significance of the front bay and the projecting gable, which are distinctive features of the existing house, would be retained with the new built form in place. The external materials would match those of the existing dwelling and the pattern of fenestration would be consistent with the rest of the appeal property. To my

mind, the proposal would relate well to the scale, proportions and style of the host building. It would be a sympathetic addition and harmonise with the appearance of the existing dwelling.

6. The submitted design would set the finished dwelling apart from other properties in the same terrace. However, creating a definitive end stop to the terrace in this way would not look out of place particularly as the detached double garage is to be demolished and removed to make way for the new extension. With its modern design, relatively wide frontage and large light coloured door, this garage, unlike the proposal, relates uneasily with the traditional style of nearby buildings and is a conspicuous feature in the local street scene. Moreover, the terrace to which Westward belongs, while having a coherent character, is varied in its detailed design and appearance such that it is capable of successfully accommodating further diversity in its built form without undermining its intrinsic charm. Consequently, I am unable to share the Council's concerns that the proposal would be overly large, bulky, obtrusive or that it would unduly dominate the host building or its neighbours.
7. The proposed side extension would be more than one half the width of the existing dwelling and it would not be set back from the principal elevation by at least 1-metre. As such, the appeal scheme conflicts with some of the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *House Extensions and Alterations* (SPD). However, for the reasons given, no visual disharmony would result. Having carefully viewed the site and the surrounding area, I have little doubt that the appeal scheme would not be uncharacteristic form of development particularly among the varied built form within it. Taking all of these factors into account, I find that a conflict with some aspects of the SPD is insufficient reason in itself to withhold planning permission on this occasion.
8. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policy LP 1 of the Council's Local Plan. This policy states that new development should achieve a high standard of architectural and design quality and that it should respect, contribute to and enhance the local environment and character.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. These drawings include the fire safety strategy, which the Council has suggested as a separate condition. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building. To safeguard the 2 higher quality trees within and just beyond the site, a condition is required to ensure that the protective measures outlined in the appellant's Arboricultural Method Statement, Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan are fully implemented.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3277418
Westward, Park Lane, Teddington TW11 0HY

Schedule of 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 following approved plans: Refs 307/AE/01, 307/OS/01, 307/PL/30, 307/PL/31 and 307/PL/32.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted and any works of making good shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement, Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan prepared by SouthOaks Arboricultural Consultancy.