

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2017

by William Fieldhouse BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3171689

19 The Green, Twickenham TW2 5TU

- 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 Mrs Anne-Marie Morison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application ref 16/4796/HOT, dated 16 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension, partly replacing existing rear and lean-to extensions, and single-storey orangery.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension, partly replacing existing rear and lean-to extensions, and single-storey orangery at 19 The Green, Twickenham TW2 5TU in accordance with the terms of the application, 16/4796/HOT, dated 16 December 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans ref 1207-SV-00 and 1207-PL-01.
 - 3) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the Twickenham Green Conservation Area, and on the living conditions of the occupants of nos. 17 and 21 The Green.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. In accordance with relevant legislation and national policy, in considering this issue I will attach great weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the

character and appearance of the Twickenham Green Conservation Area¹. Whilst not referred to on the decision notice, both the Council's and the appellant's evidence draw my attention to policies DMHD1 (conservation areas) and DMHD3 (buildings of townscape merit) in the Development Management Plan 2011 ("DMP"). As these are relevant to the current proposal, I will pay due regard to them in my consideration of this issue.

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey semi-detached house in a row of similar properties known as Apsley Villas built in the 1840s that are locally listed as buildings of townscape merit within the Twickenham Green conservation area. The uniform stuccoed front elevations and shallow slate roofs of the row of houses are largely unaltered meaning that they make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area by providing an attractive frame to one side of the central triangular Green.
5. At the rear, many of the houses, which have long back gardens with mature vegetation, have been altered and extended. No. 19 has part single-storey and part two-storey extensions to the side and rear which are of somewhat poor quality in terms of form, massing and materials. Nos. 17 and 21 both have larger projecting two-storey rear extensions which I am advised were built well before current national and local planning policies were adopted.
6. The proposal would entail alterations to, and a new roof over part of, the existing ground floor side extension, and a modest rear extension to its first floor element. The most significant component of the proposal would be the increase in size of the first floor rear extension. The new two-storey structure would project over 7 metres from the original rear elevation of the house. It would be set around 2 metres from the side boundary with no. 17 and 3 metres from that of no. 21, and have a pitched roof with a ridge below that of the main roof, and matching slates, slope, and eaves height. Attached to the end of the two-storey rear addition would be a single-storey, largely glazed orangery projecting a further two metres into the garden.
7. Council guidance advises that the overall shape, size and position of rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or neighbours and that this can be achieved through designing the addition to appear subordinate to the main structure so that the original form can still be appreciated². In this case, the proposal, in combination with previous additions, would result in a building that is considerably larger than the original house. However, the proposal would not affect the principal elevation facing The Green, and the two-storey extension would project no further into the garden than those on the properties to either side. Whilst the rear of the building would be quite different to how it was originally, the cohesive design and traditional materials of the additions would better reflect those of the host building than the existing extensions, and they would not appear cramped on the plot or out of character with the properties to either side.
8. The proposal would not, therefore, materially harm the character or appearance of the Twickenham Green conservation area, and would enhance the appearance of the rear of the appeal property compared to its current condition in a manner

¹ Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") paragraph 132.

² House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015 ("SPD").

that would be in character with the rear of other properties along Apsley Villas. It would, therefore, be consistent with national policy³ and in accordance with policy CP7 of the Richmond upon Thames Core Strategy 2009; and DMP policies DMDC1, DMDC5, DMHD1 and DMHD3. Collectively, these policies expect all development to recognise and respect local character, contribute positively to its surroundings, and conserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas; and require alterations and extensions to buildings of townscape merit to be based on an accurate understanding of the significance of the heritage asset.

Living Conditions

9. Due to its length, the enlarged two-storey rear extension would breach a 45 degree line from the centre of the ground and first floor windows in the original rear elevation of no. 21 and the first floor rear window in no. 17, contrary to the Council's SPD. It would therefore lead to some loss of light to, and affect the outlook from, those windows, as well as a secondary window in the elevation of the rear extension to no. 21. However, the fact that the new two-storey structure would be set 2 to 3 metres from the side boundaries, along with the limited height of its roof, mean that the effect would be limited, and a fine outlook over the long back gardens would be essentially retained.
10. I conclude on this issue that the proposal would not lead to unacceptable living conditions for the occupants of nos. 17 and 21 The Green. It would, therefore, be in accordance with national policy⁴ and DMP policy DMDC5 which seek to ensure a good standard of amenity for the occupants of buildings and that development enables sufficient sunlight and daylight to penetrate into and between buildings.

Other Matters

11. The Council's decision notice refers to a number of policies in the emerging local plan. However, as this plan is subject to consultation and examination, the weight I can attach to those policies is limited. That said, they would not alter the policy context to such an extent that it would affect my overall findings.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the timing of development and compliance with the approved plans, it is necessary for samples of all external materials to be approved by the Council in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

William Fieldhouse

INSPECTOR

³ NPPF sections 7 and 12.

⁴ NPPF paragraph 17, 4th bullet point.