



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2023

**by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 17 November 2023.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3325276**

**27 Elmfield Avenue, Teddington, Richmond Upon Thames, TW11 8BU**

- 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 & Mrs Smyth & Pierson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
  - The application Ref 23/0397/HOT, dated 14 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2023.
  - The development proposed is Demolition of existing roof, gable ends, garage and attached garage outbuilding. Construction of a double storey side extension with a new hipped roof over, two front facing gables above the bay windows and change of windows and roof tiles all round.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Demolition of existing roof, gable ends, garage and attached garage outbuilding. Construction of a double storey side extension with a new hipped roof over, two front facing gables above the bay windows and change of windows and roof tiles all round at 27 Elmfield Avenue, Teddington, Richmond Upon Thames, TW11 8BU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/0397/HOT, dated 14 February 2023, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) No development above existing ground level shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 5922/1; 5922/2; 5922/3; 5922/4; and 5922/5.
  - 4) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Reasonable Exceptions Statement prepared by Nathan Turner received 15 February 2023 unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 5) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Environment Agency Flood Risk Assessment received on 20 February 2023 and retained as such thereafter.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located in a road comprising of semi-detached and detached dwellings many of which are of an Arts & Crafts Style, including the appeal property. The dwelling sits within a plot that is wider than most along this section of Elmfield Avenue.
4. Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Local Plan (2018) (LP) seeks (amongst other matters) to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (May 2015) (SPD) states (amongst other things) that side and rear extensions should harmonise with the original appearance of the dwelling either by integrating with the house or being made to appear as an obvious addition. The SPD also advises that two storey side extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the building's original scale and character.
6. The width of the proposed two storey side extension would exceed half the width of the original dwelling and as such would not accord with the SPD. However, whilst the SPD provides useful design guidance it should not be applied rigidly or exclusively where there are other material considerations.
7. The proposed extension would represent a large addition to the dwelling. However, the host property would be remodelled and re-elevated so that the extension would appear fully integrated into the design of the dwelling. This would be achieved by two matching front gables above the bay windows, a new hipped roof over the entire dwelling, new fenestration and doors, and a decorative balcony across original and new elements.
8. The design approach is to replicate the appearance of the Arts and Crafts style of the adjacent semi-detached houses, 29-31 Elmfield Avenue which are typical of the surrounding area. I acknowledge that the change of design to the roof of the dwelling would result in the loss of the side gables and chimneys of the original property, however, these elements of the dwelling are not of any particular merit and the extended dwelling would continue to display design features that are typical of this style of housing.
9. Therefore, whilst the design and appearance of the appeal property would be altered, in my view the proposed extension would be of a high quality architectural and urban design that would contribute to the character of the area, as required by Policy LP1 of the LP.

10. Thus, I conclude on this main issue that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Despite some conflict with the SPD, I find that the proposal complies with the design objectives of Policy LP1 of the LP and the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Conditions**

11. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. A condition requiring the implementation of the Fire Safety Strategy is necessary in the interest of public safety. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment in the interests of public safety.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*J Davis*

INSPECTOR