



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2022

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3290136

10 Ryecroft Avenue, Twickenham TW2 6HQ

- 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 Lindsay Bell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/3353/HOT, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear single storey extension and double storey side extension, replacing existing garage and utility room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear single storey extension and double storey side extension, replacing existing garage and utility room at 10 Ryecroft Avenue, Twickenham TW2 6HQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/3353/HOT, dated 27 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 PL001, PL002, PL003, PL004, PL005, PL006, PL007 and PL008.
 - 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Statement, dated 4 October 2021, and permanently retained as such thereafter.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development firstly, on the character and appearance of the local area; and secondly, on the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Ryecroft Avenue with particular regard to visual impact, sense of enclosure and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house within a mainly residential area, wherein buildings largely date from the inter-war period and are similar in type and style although vary in scale and general appearance. Consequently, there

is some variety to the existing built form in the street scene and the local area to which the site belongs.

4. The proposal is primarily to enlarge No 10 with a 2-storey extension at the side and a single storey addition at the rear. A significantly larger building would result with extended 2-storey front and rear elevations across almost the full width of the plot. The new side addition would step forward of the main front wall with a hipped roof that would carry over from the main dwelling at the same height. The absence of a set back from the existing front elevation and a set down from the main ridgeline would draw the proposed side extension into conflict with some of the advice within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *House Extensions and External Alterations* (SPD).
5. Nevertheless, the proposal has been designed to complement the form, scale, and design of the existing house. It would be a proportionate addition to the host building with a hipped roof reflecting the style of the existing house and matching external materials that would unify the overall design. The new side extension would be on the same footprint as the existing garage, which establishes a substantial built form forward of the main front wall and is to be demolished and removed. No significant disharmony would result from the proposed arrangement. I saw that several other properties along Ryecroft Avenue include first floor side extensions with no set back from their main front wall, including the attached property, which is 8 Ryecroft Avenue. As such, the proposed 2-storey side extension would not be an uncharacteristic feature of properties within the same street scene as the site or the local area.
6. The size of the new ground floor window with full length glazing would be a prominent feature of the new front façade. The modern style of this window would differ to the windows that typically characterise interwar housing. While unusual, it would be simple in design and sufficiently separated from other windows in the principal elevation to avoid any particular disruption to the pattern of fenestration. The Council raises no objection to the new front door and the glazed side panels or to the new first floor side window. From the submitted plans, I, too, find these elements of the appeal scheme acceptable.
7. Overall, the proposal would respect the intrinsic character of the host building. The house, once enlarged, would have been significantly changed on 3 sides. As the appeal scheme would blend into the existing front and rear facades, it would not visually dominate the host building nor appear incongruous. Furthermore, the introduction of additional built form to one side of No 10 would also restore a greater sense of balance between the appeal dwelling and its attached counterpart, No 8. At present, that balance is disrupted by the first-floor side projection above the garage at No 8 and its forward projecting front porch, both of which are absent at the appeal property.
8. By harmonising with the character, scale, and design of the host building, restoring a sense of balance with the front of No 8 and respecting the character and qualities of the local area, the proposal would adhere to the key principles of the SPD. Therefore, I find that a conflict with some of the design guidelines within the SPD is insufficient reason to refuse planning permission.
9. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it does not conflict with Policy LP 1 of the Council's Local Plan or the Council's SPD. This policy and guidance seek to ensure that development achieves a

high design quality and respects, contributes to, and enhances the local environment and character. It also complies with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, which aim to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and adds to the overall quality of the area.

Living conditions

10. The new addition would project outwards from the main rear wall further than the maximum length for this type of property that is advised in paragraph 3.1.2 of the Council's SPD. Even so, the following paragraph of the SPD explains that the final test of acceptability will depend on local circumstances, which could justify a greater rear projection.
11. The new flank wall would be close to and parallel with the shared rear boundary with No 8 with the upper section visible above the fence that marks the perimeter of these attached properties. As a result, the external space nearest to the rear of No 8 would be partly enclosed and the new development would be evident from both here and its rear windows. At ground floor level, No 8 has a window in the side return wall that faces the site and a full-length window in the main rear elevation close to the common boundary with No 10.
12. Even so, the new building would be modest in height with a flat roof. As a result, it would keep a low profile when seen from the rear of No 8. While there would be some additional loss of natural light to the rear of No 8 due to the position of the proposed extension just to the south that would be modest in extent given the height and position of the existing boundary fence.
13. The proposed rear extension would be close to the rear of No 8. However, the presence of the new built form would not be so great as overbear, dominate outlook, heighten a sense of enclosure nor result in an appreciable loss of natural light as experienced by the occupiers of No 8. Given that the proposal would not materially reduce their living conditions, there is no conflict with LP Policy LP 8 or the SPD insofar as they aim to safeguard residential amenity.
14. In reaching this conclusion I note that a sizeable rear extension could come forward in any event through the exercise of permitted development rights for which the appellant has prior approval.

Conditions

15. 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. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building. A condition is required to ensure that the provisions of the submitted Fire Safety Statement are carried out for the health and safety of future occupiers.

Conclusion

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

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR