



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3277871

126 Fulwell Road, Teddington TW11 0RQ

- 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 D Phelan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/0523/HOT, dated 15 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side and rear extension with loft accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side and rear extension with loft accommodation in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/0523/HOT, dated 15 February 2021, 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 following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block Plan, P538-01, P538-02, P538-03, P538-12C, P538-13D, P538-14D and P538-15D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building unless a schedule of materials is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development is carried out using those approved materials.
 - 4) The first floor side window and second floor side rooflights of the extension hereby approved shall be glazed with obscure glass and shall be non-opening, unless the parts of the window and rooflights which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the glazing is installed, prior to occupation of the extension. The window and rooflights shall be retained in such condition thereafter.

Preliminary matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in July 2021, after the appeal was submitted. I take this revised policy into account, but do not consider that the changes to the Framework significantly affect the consideration of this appeal.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and the local area.

Reasons

4. 126 Fullwell Road is an end of terrace 2 storey, hipped roof house set within a street of mainly similar houses. The middle building of this short terrace is, however, an office building that extends well to the rear of the houses. The Council has granted planning permission for a substantial 2 storey extension to the side and rear of No 126 (Ref 19/3781/HOT). In comparison, the appeal proposal would provide further accommodation at second floor level within an enlarged roofspace. The main section of the side extension would have higher eaves but would be set well back from the street and keep the hipped roof form. The sloping roof would conceal a flat, crown roof which would become more obvious at the back, with a flat roof dormer window and a smaller flat roof section on the rear elevation.
5. Although the overall effect would be of a bulky structure, this would be hidden in views from the front by its set back and hipped roof design. The articulation of the extension into individual elements would help to reduce the visual impact further. As seen from Clonmel Road to the rear, the building would sit between the much larger, blockish office building and a large roof extension at No 124 next door. Many of the houses on the street have sizeable box dormer window extensions at the back. The proposal would therefore not appear to be out of character in its particular setting, despite its scale and the use of flat roofs.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or the appearance of the house or the local area. It therefore accords with the aims of London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan Policy LP1 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *House Extensions and External Alterations*, to ensure that development is of high architectural and urban design quality that is compatible with local character.
7. I have also taken into account the points raised by a third party. I recognise that the proposed extension would block light to office windows that currently look across the rear of No 126. Like the Council I attach somewhat less importance to the amenities of office users than to those of residents and find no objection here. Issues regarding potential joining of the 2 buildings at the back should be dealt with under other legislation.
8. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is needed to protect the character and appearance of the area, with the other options for materials stated on the application form to be used only if given specific approval by the Council. A further condition requiring the use of obscure glazing for upper floor

side glazing is necessary to protect the privacy of neighbours living next door at No 124.

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR