

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3346860
33 Saville Road, Twickenham, TW1 4BQ

- 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 HG Carr against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Council.
 - The application Reference is 23/3340/HOT.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing and erection of a single storey rear extension, alterations to existing roof to form gable and dormer and alterations to external fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing and erection of a single storey rear extension, alterations to existing roof to form gable and alterations to external fenestration at 33 Saville Road, Twickenham, TW1 4BQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/3340/HOT, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
1. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2018-04-002 & 2018-04-003.
3. The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Strategy, received by the Council on 22 January 2024, and retained as such thereafter.
4. The proposed loft window on the southern side elevation of the development hereby approved shall at no time be openable or glazed, otherwise than in obscured glass, below a minimum height of 1.75 metres above the relevant floor level.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.
-

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an extended two storey end of terrace home with a rear box dormer on a substantial rectangular plot on the side but at the end of a cul de sac, just beyond the public highway. The road is of established residential character and the two sides of semi-detached houses and short terraces, the majority displaying bays, results in a pleasing suburban appearance. The proposal is as described above.
4. The Council is concerned that the scheme would represent ungainly and unduly dominant over-development relating poorly to the host property and its appearance.
5. The existing box dormer is one of many found locally, this nature of structure has become a characteristic of the area. The planned increase in dormer size would not take it markedly beyond the norm and the fenestration arrangement is also an approach commonly found in this neighbourhood. The rear extension part is of a size and style seen frequently locally and would be accommodated within a good-sized garden. It is approximately the same projection as the flat roofed structure on the abutting property.
6. Looking closely there is considerable evidence locally of semi-detached properties and terraces not being symmetrical at roof level. However, given the limited gaps, narrow road and street trees, it is the repetitive bays which most draw the eye and where upper-level asymmetry occurs the scene is not jarring. In this case any call for a need for symmetry at roof level would be even less legitimate than generally because the dwelling sits relatively away from view, in a curtilage beyond the public realm of the highway. I would therefore deem it acceptable to change a hipped side to a gable end as proposed. Given all of this I conclude that the appeal scheme would be comfortably accommodated at this property both in the immediate and wider context and, whilst sizeable, it would not represent poor design or harmful over-development on this generous plot.
7. Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) and Policy LP28 of the Publication Version: Local Plan (Regulation 19) are relevant. Amongst other matters they call for good quality design with buildings which relate to context, protect local character and appearance, are of suitable scale and appearance, and are compatible with surrounding development patterns and spacing. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies. The Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations' has parallel objectives and, recognising that it cannot be expected to cover every eventuality in detail, I also conclude that the scheme would accord with the *aims* of that document.

Conditions

8. Along with standard commencement the Council suggests conditions requiring development to be in matching materials and in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I would agree with this in the interests of visual amenity and for the avoidance of doubt. For reasons of safety, I would agree that a condition relating to the Fire Safety Strategy is applied. The Council's suggestion on

restrictive glazing for an upper side loft window is a valid requirement in the interests of neighbours' amenity.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR