
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2017

by **R J Maile BSc FRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3162963

205 Amyand Park Road, TWICKENHAM, TW1 3HN.

- 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 A Bastow against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application ref: 16/2433/HOT, dated 17 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor rear extension at 205 Amyand Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 3HN, in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 16/2433/HOT, dated 17 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No development shall take place until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted including fenestration and, if appropriate, hard surfacing materials, 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:

Drawing no. 1493/001: Location Plan – scale 1:500.

Drawing no. 1493/002: Existing Floor Plans – scale 1:100.

Drawing no. 1493/003: Existing Elevations and Section BB – scale 1:100.

Drawing no. 1493/004A: Proposed Floor Plans – scale 1:100.

Drawing no. 1493/005A: Proposed Rear Elevation and Section BB – scale 1:100.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:

- a) The effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, which forms part of the Amyand Park Conservation Area.
- b) The impact of the extension upon the living conditions of nearby residents.

Reasons

a) *Effect upon character and appearance.*

- 3. No. 205 Amyand Park Road comprises a mid to late Victorian terraced house arranged over three floors and a basement. It has a somewhat unusual and constricted configuration having regard to its siting at a point where the street turns sharply to the north. This has resulted in a wedge shaped dwelling with a rear elevation of less than 2.5m in width.
- 4. The interior layout is dominated by a series of staircases, which create rooms of limited dimensions with poor connectivity between them. The scheme before me proposes a small glazed 1.5 storey extension in order to permit a rearrangement of the staircases between the basement and the first floor.
- 5. The Amyand Park Conservation Area was designated in 1988 and extended to include the appeal site in February 2001. I have been provided with a copy of the Conservation Area Study (Area no. 48) and that relating to the designated area as extended.
- 6. Chapter 12 of the Framework¹ sets out national policy for the protection of Conservation Areas, including the consideration of proposals for development within such designated areas.
- 7. The subject property forms an integral part of the designated area, which is an important heritage asset. However, the principal contribution of no. 205 to the Conservation Area is its wide front elevation, which is an important element in the street scene. This elevation would remain wholly unaffected by the scheme before me.
- 8. In assessing the impact of the development upon the heritage asset I have concluded that there would be no harm to the Conservation Area. Moreover, there would be considerable benefit in securing the optimum viable use of the dwelling by means of a significant enhancement to its interior layout (see paragraph 134 of the Framework).
- 9. In reaching my conclusions upon this issue I have been influenced by the fact that the extension would for the most part be screened by the extended built development of no. 207, which extends beyond the proposal and largely encloses it as viewed from the rear. The glazed structure will extend upwards to a point below the cill of the first floor window, such that the majority of the rear elevation visible from the houses to the rear would remain unchanged.

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

10. The Council has raised concerns regarding the use of a glass box format to the extension. However, this would enable natural light to permeate the new stair-cases. It would also appear as a less dominant feature than would be the case if an alternative brick structure were to be erected.
11. Furthermore, the Officer's Report confirms that: "*The Council does not oppose modern glass box extensions of this nature having approved various similar schemes across the borough with similar heritage constraints.*" The report also refers to the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations SPD², which recognises that the particular circumstances of the site must be taken into account when assessing rear extensions.
12. Given the circumstances referred to above I have concluded, having regard to the small scale of the extension and its particular location, that it would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the host dwelling; neither would it be visible from or adversely impact upon the Amyand Park Conservation Area.
13. As such, I have found upon the first main issue that development as proposed will accord with national policy at Chapter 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the Framework, Policies DM HD 1 and DM DC 1 of the DMP³, Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy⁴ and the thrust of the Council's adopted SPD.

b) Impact upon living conditions.

14. The extension would not be seen from no. 207 to the north and will be largely screened in views from the majority of the houses in the terrace by virtue of a single storey extension to no. 203 next door. It would also have little impact upon the houses to the rear having regard to the physical characteristics of the site and the adjacent built development.
15. I accept that the extension would be visible from no. 203. I am nevertheless satisfied, given its limited height and rearward projection along the common boundary, that it would not have any material impact upon the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of that property. The lightweight format of the new structure will also ensure that it would not be overbearing by reason of its transparent nature and the fact that it would be seen against the backdrop of the brick elevations to nos. 205 and 207 Amyand Park Road.
16. I also agree with the comments in the Officer's Report that although the new extension would result in a substantial level of light spillage at certain times of the day, it is not considered that this would result in an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring properties.
17. Accordingly, I have found upon the second main issue that development as proposed would not have a harmful impact upon the living conditions of nearby residents as required by Policy DM DC 5 of the DMP and Section 3 of the Council's adopted SDP.

² London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan: Supplementary Planning Document "House Extensions and External Alterations (adopted May 2015).

³ London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework: Development Management Plan (adopted November 2011).

⁴ London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (adopted April 2009).

Conditions

18. The Council has put forward a total of four conditions should I be minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by the Government's Planning Practice Guidance issued on 6 March 2014 and find the majority to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case.
19. Two separate conditions are suggested in relation to the use of materials, one of which requires the materials to be used in constructing the external surfaces of the development to match those of the existing building. Given the nature of the majority of the works I do not consider this to be particularly appropriate. I do, however, agree with the Council as to the need for details and samples of the proposed materials to be submitted for approval prior to commencement of the development.
20. My reasons for the conditions are:
21. Condition 1 is the standard commencement condition imposed in accordance with section 91(1) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Condition 2 will ensure a satisfactory appearance to the completed development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
22. As to Condition 3, requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, this provides certainty.

Conclusion

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

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR