
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2019

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3225890
30 May Road Twickenham TW2 6QP

- 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 Little against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 18/3623/HOT, dated 31 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 30 May Road Twickenham TW2 6QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/3623/HOT, dated 31 October 2018, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan number 7351/17 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on both the host property and the surrounding area, with particular regard to its conservation area location.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a terraced property situated within the Twickenham Green Conservation Area (Conservation Area) where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area. In addition, the National Planning Framework (Framework) states that great weight should be attached to the conservation of designated heritage assets, in this case the Conservation Area.
4. The Village Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) describes May Road as being characterised by tightly spaced terraced

houses set behind small front gardens or fronting directly onto the pavement. Views of the rear elevations of the row of terrace properties on May Road are obtained from Knights Place, an access road/car parking area serving a modern housing development. The location of the appeal property towards the far end of the terrace and intervening first floor rear extensions and tree coverage mean that the rear of the appeal property is visible only from the far part of the access road/car park.

5. From my site visit I saw that there have been several alterations to the properties in the rear of the terraces on May Road, most notably in the terrace in which the appeal property is situate, in particular to Nos 18 and 22 May Road where significant two storey rear extensions of differing designs have been added. These alterations give the rear of the terraces a less consistent character and the area as a whole has lost its uniformity and have materially affected the original characters of these properties at first floor level. In addition, the character of the area at the rear of the terraces has been changed significantly by the construction of the Knights Place development.
6. The proposed extension occupies much of the same footprint as the single storey rear extension, other than where it has been chamfered at both sides to overcome previous concerns as to loss of outlook and light for the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Whilst this design would leave elements of the roof visible, I do not consider that the variations at first floor level would appear prominent given the distance and angle of view from vantage points, nor would it make the proposed extension, which would be subordinate to the host dwelling, appear unacceptably out of keeping within the Conservation Area.
7. The "step-in" design of the roof would contrast with the other two storey extensions within the terrace. Nevertheless, alterations to the rear elevation of the properties in these terraces form part of the existing townscape and I do not consider that the proposal would be out of character with the area. Whilst the lantern style roof is not a feature elsewhere on this terrace, it is not prominent within the design of the proposed extension and as such would not be a significant feature within the Conservation Area.
8. The Council has not raised any concerns with regard to the amenity of the neighbours of adjoining properties and I would agree with this assessment.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposal would not be an incongruous form of development to the host property and would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such it would preserve the character and appearance of the Twickenham Green Conservation Area and would not conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Richmond-Upon-Thames Local Plan. These require amongst other things, development to be compatible with local character, including the relationship to existing character and development pattern and that proposals within Conservation Areas should preserve and where possible enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In addition to heritage considerations, the proposal would not conflict with the Council's Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (May 2015) which requires rear extensions to be subordinate to that of the host dwelling.

Conditions

10. Conditions in respect of timescale and specifying the approved plans are necessary as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition relating to matching materials in the interest of the character and appearance of the area. The Council has suggested an additional condition in relation to the installation of windows within either flank wall. The plan submitted does not show any such windows, and in any event Condition 2 requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plan. I do not consider such a condition to be necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given and having taken all other matters into account, I allow the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR