



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2024

Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3342965

70 Poulett Gardens, Twickenham, Richmond upon Thames TW1 4QR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Kelly Hill against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref. is 23/2793/HOT.
 - The development proposed is for a loft conversion with raising of gable wall over existing external wall, additional habitable space within loft void and additional dormer to existing main roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with raising of gable wall over existing external wall, additional habitable space within loft void and additional dormer to existing main roof at 70 Poulett Gardens, Twickenham, Richmond upon Thames TW1 4QR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/2793/HOT, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 01 Rev A, 02, 03, 04 Rev A, 05 Rev C, 06 Rev B, 07 Rev C and 08.
 3. No new external finishes (including for fenestration), including works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the existing building.
 4. The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the submitted Fire Safety Strategy.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey extended semi-detached house forming one half of a pair with 72 Poulett Gardens. Many houses within the road have

been altered and enlarged over time with some having had hip-to-gable roof extensions whilst their adjoining neighbour has not. Consequently, I consider that a lack of symmetry between pairs of semi-detached dwellings is a quite common architectural theme within the street.

4. I note that the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) highlights that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. However in many cases neighbouring properties have been extended including with quite substantial rear box dormers. The SPD also recommends a number of guidelines with regard to side and rear extensions, but it is but one material consideration in the determination of the proposal.
5. There would remain a degree of articulation to the front elevation of no70, with a step-down in the ridge line over the two storey side extension. Whilst it would extend beyond the hip of the existing roof, and no longer retain the original roof profile, nonetheless I consider that it would not appear unduly dominant, notwithstanding that it would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings to a degree.
6. As I have found above, it is not unusual to see unbalanced pairs of semi-detached dwellings within Poulett Gardens; and whilst it may be that some of these were granted planning permission under a previous planning policy context, nonetheless they do form significant part of the prevailing character of the locality.
7. Therefore, I consider that the design of the proposed dormer and roof extensions would not result in excessive bulk and scale; being characteristic of the pattern of development within the street scene and consequently I consider that no demonstrable harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. This is in compliance with Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan July 2018 which together require all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality, with proposals having to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council suggest a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions to match those of the existing building, and that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I consider these conditions necessary in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the Council suggest a condition requiring that the proposal be carried out in accordance with the submitted Fire Statement which I consider necessary in order to ensure that the development be safe in terms of fire safety, in accordance with London Plan Policy D12.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR