



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3302005

45 Blandford Road, Teddington, TW11 0LG

- 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 Ms Carolyn Rogers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/1114/HOT, dated 4 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear ground and first floor extensions. Alterations to windows/doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
3. Blandford Road is a residential street with a suburban character. The appeal site, No45 is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling with a long rear garden (a feature common to its neighbours).
4. The property benefits from a rear single and two storey extension under council reference 21/4318/HOT. The boundaries of this scheme are helpfully shown on the submitted ground and first floor proposed layout drawings. The appeal proposals would result in a further 0.5m in depth to the ground floor extension to a depth of 4m, as well as a larger first floor flat roofed extension with a further 1.7m in depth to 3.10m.
5. The neighbouring, adjoining dwelling, No43 Blandford Road has not been subject to an extension. At the site visit, I could see what appeared to be a loft conversion at No43 was underway. The two properties are separated by a close-boarded fence of approx. 1.8m high.
6. Policy LP8 (Amenity and Living Conditions) of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) (LP) requires that all new development protects the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties.
7. House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) provides guidance for extensions, advising that proposals which

would result in an '*unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted*'.

8. The SPD also provides guidance on parameters for rear extensions in order to minimise harm to neighbouring amenity. For semi-detached dwellings, it sets out that extensions should not exceed 3.5m in depth, albeit this is subject to the individual circumstances of the site and its surroundings.
9. Considered alone, an additional 0.5m on the permitted ground floor extension would not result in excessive harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No43. However, the first floor extension would in my view, add a significant additional area of built form that would, cumulatively, appear overbearing from the perspective of the occupiers at No43.
10. Whilst the proposals would not result in a loss of daylight/sunlight to No43, nor impede the 45 degree line when taken from the nearest first floor window of No43, the outlook from the ground floor windows of No43 would still be harmed by the additional blank bulk of the extension.
11. I therefore consider this would result in offence to policy LP8 as well as the relevant parts of the SPD.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR