



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/23/3324878

Flats 2A and 2B Court Way, Twickenham TW2 7SN

- 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 Asmai Billo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref: 23/0733/FUL dated 6 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as follows: ground floor flat 2A will gain storage under side elevation stairs. Storage will protrude 35cm from side elevation of existing house. Flat 2B will gain first floor rear extension above existing rear extension of Flat 2A.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission was granted in June 2022 under the Council's Ref: 22/1288/FUL for a single storey front and rear extension. A single storey front and rear extension had both been completed at the time of my site visit. I have noted the amended wording which the Council used in its description of development, but I am clear as to the extent of works undertaken and therefore, the proposed development before me.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised in December 2023. Although some of the paragraph numbering has changed, I do not consider that there are any material changes in the Framework, pertinent to this appeal proposal. It is not therefore necessary to seek the views of the Appellant or the Council on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development, and in particular the first floor rear extension, on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached property comprising two flats (Nos 2A and 2B). It has been extended to the front and to the rear with single storey extensions as set out above. There are mainly semi-detached houses further along Court Way and a group of detached and semi-detached maisonettes on

Whitton Road and turning the corner into Court Way. The appeal building and surrounding roads are part of the Heatham Estate which is Character Area 16 in the Council's Twickenham Village Planning Guidance (Twickenham Village SPD), characterised as low rise residential development.

6. The proposal would seek to extend to the rear at first floor over the recently constructed ground floor rear extension. The roof would be changed from a hipped roof as existing to a gable end with two smaller gables over the extension.
7. Although there have been a variety of ground floor rear extensions along this side of Court Way, as well as the addition of dormers, the proposed extension would materially add to the overall depth of the property and it would appear excessively deep in relation to the rear building line at first floor level further along Court Way.
8. The roof form would also be visually discordant with the more regular forms of hipped roofs which are prevalent in the local area. The SPD refers to the prevalence of hipped roofs within this character area. The effect of both the width of the rear extension and roof form would materially change the appearance of the property and its overall bulk and massing would detract from its existing character and appearance.
9. From my site visit, it was clear that the property as existing and as proposed to be extended is and would be seen in street scene views between surrounding dwellings, and in particular from the corner of Court Way and Whitton Road as well as from Whitton Road. In such views, the additional depth and roof form, both in relation to the existing property and in relation to the local form of development, would appear as incongruous and over dominant features and so detract from the character and appearance of the local area.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not respect but would detract from the character and appearance of the existing building and of the local area. It would conflict with Policies D3 of the London Plan, Policy LP1 of the Council's Local Plan 2018, the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the Twickenham Village SPD, as well as the Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
11. The Council has also referenced Policy 28 from its Regulation 19 version of its new draft Local Plan, in respect of Local Character and Design Quality. Whilst it would appear to follow the objectives of the relevant policies in the Local Plan and London Plan, it is not clear whether this draft Policy has been the subject of representations and this necessarily limits the weight that I can attach to this policy at this stage.

Other Considerations

12. An objection has been raised in respect of the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the surrounding neighbours. I agree with the Council that given the distances between adjoining and surrounding properties and the appeal property I do not consider that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm in terms of loss of light, overlooking and loss of privacy as well as loss of outlook. However, my findings in this respect do not outweigh

the conclusion under my main issue relating to harm to the character and appearance of the existing property and to the local area.

13. I understand the Appellant's objectives to seek to improve the accommodation provided in terms of size and layout, but these considerations would not outweigh the harm I have concluded.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR