



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2019

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3230666

4 Lenton Rise, Richmond TW9 2TP

- 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 Stephane Croix against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 18/4173/HOT, dated 18 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as: 'Application for planning permission for the construction of a single storey side and rear extension with screened roof terrace, the addition of a side facing doorway from the first floor landing to access the terrace and adjustment to the height of the rear facing door opening at first floor level.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including its effect on the setting of the adjacent Old Deer Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located adjacent to the CA from which views to the side and rear of the site are clear from an adjacent private car park and gymnasium facility. However, due to the open nature of the park, longer views can also be achieved. The site consists of an end of terrace dwelling that is three storeys in height. It forms part of a small development that consists of houses that are of a comparable form, height and appearance. These attributes combine to provide a distinct character and appearance to the cluster of houses.
4. The houses are arranged around a central turning and parking area and the appeal site is located towards the south west corner of the development at a right angle to its neighbouring property, No 5. Due to this layout, whilst the gap between the properties to the rear of the site is large, the gap substantially reduces to the front of the site. As a consequence, whilst views to the side of the appeal site from within the turning area can be achieved, they are limited.
5. The proposed single storey extension would occupy a large footprint, however, it would be set back from the front of the property. In addition, part of the front elevation would be splayed towards the adjacent Old Deer Park. Due to

the proposed set back and splay, as well as its single storey height, this aspect of the proposal would be recessive to the form and appearance of the host dwelling. It would therefore not be overly dominant or visually intrusive when viewed from the front.

6. Despite this, the proposal would also include a balcony at roof level. This would provide a large space that would be enclosed by a combination of trellising to the front of the balcony and glass balustrading to the side and rear. The trellising would be set back from the front of the proposed extension and generously set back from the front of the existing building. However, it would be a tall enclosure located at an elevated level that would increase the visual bulk of the addition.
7. First floor balconies are a common feature in the cluster of houses, but they consist of curved black railings. Due to their prominence and consistency, the curved railings make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed trellising would be a demonstrably different form of enclosure in terms of appearance. It would also be significantly taller than the first floor railings and despite its set back from the front of the property, due to its height and elevated position, the trellising would be appreciable from within the turning area. As a consequence, the proposed trellising would be in stark contrast to the existing railings in a manner that would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area.
8. For the same reasons, the proposed trellising would jar with the prevailing character and appearance of the development when viewed from the CA. However, in addition, the proposal would also include large expanses of glass balustrading to enclose the terrace to the side and rear elevations. The height of the balustrading would be comparable to the existing railings, but the proposed material would be distinctly different to the metal work which is such a defining feature of the appeal site and the neighbouring dwellings. Such expansive use of glass would be significantly at odds with the prevailing metal work. Consequently, the proposed balustrade would harm the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to views from the adjacent CA.
9. In the evidence, it is stated that the railings could be retained. However, it is less clear whether the same would apply to the rest of the balustrading. Consequently, I have to assess the proposal on the basis of the evidence before me, and for the reasons identified above, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore have a harmful effect on the setting of the adjacent CA.
10. Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset from development within its setting should require clear and convincing justification. Due to the scale of the proposal, the level of harm to the setting of the CA would be less than substantial. Accordingly, paragraph 196 of the Framework requires the harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. The proposal would enable the house to be enlarged to accommodate a growing family through the provision of additional living space and an external amenity area. However, such improvement is primarily a private interest and consequently I afford it very limited weight in the assessment of the appeal. The Framework states that great weight should be given to the asset's

conservation and therefore the public benefits would fail to outweigh the harm that I have identified to the setting of the CA.

12. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area including the setting of the adjacent CA. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policy LP 1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018) and the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015). Taken together, these require new development to be carefully designed and to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons identified above, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR