



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025

by **R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3355218

81 Ellerman Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames TW2 6AB

- 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 Mrs Rebecca Allan against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/2075/HOT.
 - The development proposed is described as part double / part single storey rear extension, following demolition of existing conservatory. Part double / part single storey side extension to replace existing studio and porch. (Please note - ground floor element of this proposal, was previously agreed under 24/1231/HOT).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part double / part single storey rear extension, following demolition of existing conservatory. Part double / part single storey side extension to replace existing studio and porch at 81 Ellerman Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames TW2 6AB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/2075/HOT, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the processing of the appeal the appellant confirmed the plans against which the appeal was lodged, and the Council subsequently submitted the application plans to reflect those listed in the Council's Decision Notice. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. In allowing the appeal I have removed reference to a previously approved application from the description of development as this is superfluous.
4. The information before me indicates that the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19) (PLP) is at an advanced stage of adoption. I therefore attribute weight to the policies in the PLP referred to by the Council.
5. Following submission of the appeal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 and updated on 7 February 2025. The parts of the Framework most relevant to the appeal have not substantively changed from the previous version. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions in respect of these matters, and I am satisfied that no party's interests would be prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal dwelling is one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings within a predominantly residential area. This pair is set back from the road behind a low boundary wall and hardstanding. The appeal dwelling has been extended in the past and has a catslide roof which differs from the adjoining property. As such the pair do not have a strong symmetry in terms of built form and pattern of fenestration. Located at a bend in the road, the appeal property benefits from a wider plot than most within the immediate vicinity of the site, including that of the adjoining semi-detached property.
8. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations 2015 (SPD), sets out that extensions should appear as an obvious addition, remaining subordinate to the main structure. The SPD additionally requires extensions to not dominate the existing dwelling or its neighbourhood.
9. The proposal would replace existing, substantial, single storey extensions. The proposed side extension would be inset from the side boundary with the neighbouring property. Whilst the proposed extension would be substantial in scale, the ridge line of the proposal would be set lower than that of the existing dwelling giving a subordinate appearance. Furthermore, the two-storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the existing dwelling such that it would provide a significant degree of articulation and visual relief to the streetscene. Overall, the proposal would be viewed as an obvious addition to the property.
10. Given the existing asymmetrical nature of the pair of semi-detached properties the proposal would not unacceptably unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
11. Having regard to the eclectic mix of properties within the locality, along with the plot size and design elements of the proposal, I do not concur with the Council that the proposal would be an unsympathetic, dominant or incongruous addition to the streetscene.
12. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy LP 1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018, Policy 28 of the PLP and the overall aims of the SPD. Collectively, amongst other things, these seek to ensure development respects the local environment and character.

Conditions

13. I have considered those suggested by the Council against the tests in the Framework. As well as the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design and protecting the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be carried out in matching materials. A condition requiring compliance with the Fire Strategy is considered necessary to make sure that the development incorporates relevant fire safety measures.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

R Gee

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos:
 - P.M 600- Rev C - Proposed Elevations - 14.08.24
 - P.M 500- Rev C - Proposed Ground Floor Plans - 14.08.24
 - P.M 501- Rev C - Proposed Floor Plans - 14.08.24
 - P.M 502- Rev B - Proposed Floor Plans - 14.08.24
 - P.M 400- Rev C - Proposed Site Plan and 3D Views - 14.08.24
3. No new external finishes (including fenestration), including works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the existing unless otherwise indicated in the approved drawings and application form.
4. The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Statement prepared by Rebecca Allan submitted to the Council on 16.08.24 and retained as such thereafter.

*****End of Schedule*****