



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3343298

57 Hazel Close, Twickenham TW2 7NS

- 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 Mr P Pillay against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 23/3306/HOT.
 - The development proposed is first floor side and rear extension, & roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached house, situated on the north side of Hazel Close and on a corner plot which sides onto the side return of Hazel Close and within a predominantly residential area. As a result of its siting on a corner plot the front, side and rear of the property are highly visible in the street scene. Whereas the front elevations of properties in the immediate locality include a mix of both hipped and gable roofs, the rear roofs of properties are predominantly hipped albeit some with the inclusion of dormer extensions within the roof space. A number of the properties, including the appeal property, have Tudor style timber framing with brick infill detailing to the front elevations.
4. The proposal would extend over the side and to the rear above an existing implemented permission for front, side and rear single storey extensions, under the Council's ref: 22/3380/HOT granted in 2023. The first floor side extension would be set back from the front and rear of the property and set in from the side boundary under a hipped roof and set down from the main roof ridge. The rear elevation of the original dwelling would be extended together with a loft conversion and a change from the rear hipped roof to a gable end. There would be accommodation at loft level with a rear facing window in the apex of the gable end.
5. The Council has raised a concern over the width of the first floor rear extension which would be the same width as the original property. The Council's

Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations advises that two storey side and rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original dwelling in order to ensure that the extension would not over-dominate the building's original scale and character. In the particular circumstances of this case, by extending the full width of the original property at the rear, the proposed first floor rear extension would retain the shape, form and symmetry of the main rear elevation. With the wider single storey extension at the rear and wrapping along the side, the proposed first floor extension would not be an over dominant addition and would respect the scale, character and appearance of the original dwelling.

6. The side extension at first floor level would be set back from the front and the rear of the building and the hipped roof would appear subservient to the main roof of the property. This element would also respect the character and appearance of the existing property.
7. However, the introduction of a gable end at the rear would result in a discordant addition to the existing property and would be out of keeping with the predominant pattern of development in the local area, with rear hipped roofs. It would be particularly visible in street scene views given the corner siting of the property with views to the side and to the rear. From the side and the rear the main roof form would appear very bulky and cumbersome in massing that would detract from the more modest character and appearance of the existing house. It would also be visually intrusive in street scene views and over prominent to the detriment of the character and appearance of the local area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal, taken as a whole, would not respect and would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. This would conflict with Policy LP1 of the adopted Local Plan, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations and the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

9. The principle of extending the property is not at issue, and many of the surrounding properties have been extended, but, and for the reasons set out under my main issue, I am not satisfied that the particular proposal before me would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other extensions which have been permitted in the local area. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits but in so far as the information has been made available to me, I have taken them into account. However, none of these appear directly comparable with the proposal before me and do not therefore persuade me to a different conclusion.
11. Reference has been made by the appellant and the Council to the changes made to the proposals following the previous refusal of permission under the Council's Ref: 23/2386/HOT. However, my decision is based on the proposals before me.

Conclusion

12. 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