



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3353138

13 Mayfair Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames TW2 7JG

- 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 Viridi against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/1286/HOT.
 - The development proposed is described as 'first-floor extension of 1.2m deep and ground-floor rear door and elevation amendment of previously approved application'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first-floor extension of 1.2m deep and ground floor rear door and elevation amendment of previously approved application at 13 Mayfair Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames TW2 7JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/1286/HOT, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The fenestration detailing of the first-floor extension hereby approved shall match the detailing of the first-floor window in the rear elevation.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, 100_05 (proposed roof plan), 100_06A, 100_07, 100_08A, 100_09 and 100_10.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 13) is one half of a semi-detached pair standing in a row of similar properties. No 13 has a dormer and hip-to-gable extension which extends across the full rear roof plane and a half-width, flat roofed single-storey rear extension. Planning permission has already been granted for the replacement of the single-storey extension. As the amended single-storey extension proposed in this appeal would be similar to the approved

development, the Council raises no objections to this element of the proposal. There are no reasons to disagree.

4. However, in contention in this appeal is the proposed addition of a first-floor pitched roof extension above part of the ground floor extension. It would be 1.2m deep, 2.7m wide and the height of the eaves would match the eaves of the main dwelling. The proposed rear first-floor window would align horizontally with the existing first-floor fenestration and would respect its scale. The window design should be refined to match the existing first-floor window and this could be required by condition to ensure design conformity.
5. The proposed shallow pitched roof would sit comfortably in front of the dormer and below the window. The existing dormer and hip-to-gable extension is in my judgement the dominant form of development at the appeal site. Within this context I am not convinced by the Council's evidence that the proposed first floor extension would damage the appearance or architectural integrity of the house or that its pitched roof would be visually harmful. In reaching my conclusion I have also had regard to the Council's previous design objections to a flat roofed first-floor extension. In the specific circumstances of the appeal site, including the existing and approved extensions to the property, the first-floor extension would not appear dominant.
6. In terms of the wider visual impact of the proposal, there would be limited views of the first-floor extension within the streetscape due to the limited space between the houses. The original design coherence of the rear of the row of houses has already been altered by development at the appeal site and elsewhere, including large dormer windows on the adjacent pair of semi-detached houses. Moreover, within the surrounding area, including on Mayfair Avenue, are other properties with part single, part two storey rear extensions and large rear dormers. Whilst they do not set a precedent for further, similar development, they are a feature of the existing built environment. Overall, the proposed scheme would not detract from the appearance of the area around the appeal site, nor would the character of the locality be harmed in views from neighbouring rear gardens or from Oaklands Drive.
7. I conclude that the first-floor extension would be proportionate and its design would sufficiently harmonise with the appearance of the existing house as it is proposed to be extended. The appeal proposal would not be out-of-keeping within the locality. For these reasons, the proposed first-floor extension would comply with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Local Plan, Policy 28 of the Publication Local Plan and Policy D4 of the London Plan. Furthermore, there would be no conflict with the objectives of the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations or the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. For the foregoing reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

9. External materials to match the existing house are required by condition to safeguard visual amenities. As indicated above, the fenestration detailing of the first-floor extension should match the existing window to safeguard the appearance of the appeal property. Accordingly, an appropriate condition is

attached. I have included a condition identifying the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR