



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3342106

113 Hazel Close, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 7NP

- 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 and Mrs Bird against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/3320/HOT, dated 12 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Single storey side and rear extension with a flat roof to create an enlarged kitchen and dining area. A larger extension was approved under Prior Approval reference 22/2880/PDE which will be constructed as part of this proposal'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Single storey side and rear extension with a flat roof to create an enlarged kitchen and dining area. A larger extension was approved under Prior Approval reference 22/2880/PDE which will be constructed as part of this proposal at 113 Hazel Close, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 7NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/3320/HOT, dated 12 December 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BSS/282/23-01 (Location Plan and Existing Plan); BSS/282/23-01 (Location Plan, Block Plan and Existing Plan); BSS/282/23-02; BSS/282/23-03; BSS/282/23-04 (Rev A).
 - 3) No new external finishes, including fenestration and works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the finishes of the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) no part of the roof of the building hereby approved shall be used as a balcony or terrace nor shall any access be formed thereto.

- 5) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Strategy Document prepared by B S Seera received 14/12/2023, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a semi-detached dwelling. It has been extended at roof level incorporating a gable end with a large dormer across its rear elevation. The proposal is for a single storey side and rear extension to the dwelling.
4. The proposed extension would extend to the rear of the main wall of the dwelling by 4.5m. It would also wrap around part of the side elevation of the dwelling although it would be well set back from the frontage.
5. Of relevance is a 'larger home extension' approved under prior approval reference 22/2880/PDE. This extension had a depth of 4.5m, a width of about 7m, an eaves height of 2.63m and a height of 2.93m overall.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) (SPD) advises that in respect of semi-detached houses, the effect of a single storey extension is usually acceptable if the projection is no further than 3.5m. It also acknowledges that the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances of the site.
7. The Council accept that the proposed extension would not have a significant effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers and having regard to the siting of the adjacent dwellings, I have no reason to disagree with this view. Furthermore, the overall depth of the proposed extension would not exceed that which was approved under the prior approval application referred to above. Therefore, despite some minor conflict with the guidance contained within the SPD, I find the depth of the extension to be acceptable in these circumstances.
8. The Council has raised particular concern regarding the eaves height of the proposed extension, which would be approximately 200mm higher than that of the host dwelling. However, the side extension would be set well back from the frontage of the dwelling and the minimal difference in eaves height would not be appreciable when viewed from Hazel Close. Moreover, the rear elevation would display a uniform eaves height and would not appear incongruous or out of character with the existing dwelling. Views of the flank elevation of the proposed extension would also be limited to those from adjoining dwellings where the small difference in eaves height would not be harmful to the scale and appearance of the extension.
9. The proposed extension would be larger than the extension approved under ref. 22/2880/PDE as it would also wrap around part of the side elevation of the dwelling. However, the proposed extension would be of a flat roof design and would be significantly lower than the host dwelling, even taking into account the raised eaves height. The proposed extension would be of an overall size

and scale such that it would be subservient to and would not visually overwhelm the host dwelling. It would also sit comfortably within the constraints of the site and would be sited in from the external boundaries. These considerations lead me to conclude that despite some conflict with the SPD, the proposed extension would be of an appropriate size, scale, bulk and form and that its overall design would not have a harmful effect on the host dwelling or the surrounding area.

10. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which requires all development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality which respects, contributes to and enhances the local environmental character.

Conditions

11. I have had regard to the Council's suggested a list of planning conditions in the event that this appeal was to be allowed.
12. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. A condition restricting the use of the roof is necessary to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. I shall also impose a condition requiring the implementation of the Fire Safety.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR