



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

**by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 05 December 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3236813**

**34 Cambrian Road, Richmond, TW10 6JQ**

- 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 Sedgwick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
  - The application Ref 19/1278/HOT, dated 17 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2019.
  - The development proposed is second floor recessed side extension and side elevation windows to match existing windows removed and bricked in.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposed development on the host property, a building locally designated as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM);
  - whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Richmond Hill Conservation Area (CA), and
  - the effect of the proposal on the setting of Richmond Park, a Grade I Listed Park LP).

### Reasons

3. The site is located within the Richmond Hill CA, which is a distinctive and well-defined area, surrounded by other CAs, characterised by a variety of building types and a mix of uses that includes residential, commercial, educational and public open space. The site is located close to Richmond Park, a Grade I LP, which contributes to providing a distinct rural setting to the townscape of the area of the CA the site lies within. The site is located on Cambrian Road, within a residential area characterised by traditional properties, the quality of which adds to the significance of the CA. Although many of the properties along the street have been extended in various ways and their roof heights differ, the street retains a rhythmic flow of building frontages and undulating roof lines.
4. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a CA, which is therefore a matter of considerable importance and weight. In addition,

paragraphs 193 and 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) require decision-makers to give great weight to the conservation of a designated heritage asset, and to take account of the effect of development on the significance of non-designated heritage assets. CAs and LPs are designated heritage assets and locally designated buildings, such as BTMs, are non-designated heritage assets.

5. The site comprises a mid-late Victorian, mid-terrace dwelling, originally constructed as one of a pair of matching semi-detached properties, arranged over four floors, ie three-storeys and a basement. The properties have been extended to their respective sides, with two-storey extensions with basements. These side extensions resulted in setting the properties within a terrace, which itself has been created by linking short terraces, semi-detached and detached dwellings together via extensions. The terrace now consists mainly of linked, matching pairs of dwellings that have a variety of architectural styles, heights and frontages. As noted, the building is locally designated as a BTM, as are all the properties along Cambrian Road.
6. The central three-storey section of the 2 adjoining properties has a hipped, dual-pitched roof. The respective two-storey sections are very similar, but not identical. The appeal building has a low level hipped, mono-pitched roof, set behind parapets, with roof pitches matching those of the main roof; whereas the adjoining property has a flat roof over its side extension. I acknowledge therefore that the 2 properties are not symmetrical. However, due to the low level nature of the pitched roof on the appeal property and the presence of parapets, this difference in roof styles is not visible from ground-level or public vantage points. Consequently, they appear symmetrical when viewed from ground level/public vantage points.
7. The proposed extension would be sited above the existing two-storey side extension. It would be positioned broadly over the footprint of the existing, low level pitched roof. However, it would be higher and wider than this roof. The eaves would correspond with the height of the upper eaves on the building. The extension would extend to the side of the third-storey, over the width of the extension below, and link with the neighbouring property's gable end roof. It would therefore fill the existing gap between the third-floor side elevation of the appeal building and the roof of the neighbouring property, which is only two-storey with a basement. The proposed extension would be highly visible from ground-level/public vantage points.
8. I note that, as with many period properties, the properties along the road tend to be designed with the window openings decreasing in size from ground-floor to the upper floors. In contrast, the proposed windows are as large as the windows in the floor level below them and larger than the windows to the side of them in the top floor of the original building. The extension would have a low level crown vaulted roof. However, this is unlikely to be visible from ground level and therefore the proposed extension would appear to have a flat roof behind low parapet walls when viewed from public vantage points.
9. Thus, I consider that the design of the windows is not in keeping with the host property or other properties within the street scene. Additionally, I consider that the design of the proposed roof, given the siting of the extension, would be out of keeping with the existing upper floor roof lines. Furthermore, the proposed extension would substantially block the skyline against which

chimneys on the neighbouring property to the south-east are currently seen. Consequently, it would unbalance the publicly perceived symmetry of the original pair of properties and disrupt the existing roof and eaves lines of immediate neighbouring properties within the terrace.

10. I therefore consider that the character and appearance of the host non-designated heritage asset and immediate neighbouring BTMs would be significantly harmed. As such, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and the CA and consequently would not preserve, or enhance, the character or appearance of the CA. I consider that the proposal would have a neutral effect on the setting of the Grade I LP.
11. With regards to Paragraph 196 of the Framework, I consider that the extent of the harm to the CA identified would be less than substantial. As such, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. The appellant suggests that there would be some limited public benefits resulting from improved energy efficiency due to the use of modern materials. The proposal would also provide improved living conditions for occupants. However, I do not consider these benefits to amount to public benefits that outweigh the harm to the CA I have identified.
12. I appreciate the proposed extension would be set-back from the front and rear elevations of the existing property and, given its size relative to the overall size of the building, would be subordinate in scale. Additionally, the materials would match those of the existing dwelling. The appellant has suggested that the size of the proposed windows is to allow access for cleaning and maintenance purposes. I acknowledge that altering and extending buildings, non-designated heritage assets or otherwise, in CAs is acceptable in principle. However, ultimately, any such alterations and/or extensions need to preserve or enhance the CA. I agree that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties. The appellant has also drawn my attention to planning permission recently granted at 34 Cambrian Road. However, I do not know the full details of this case and in any event each case must be determined on its own merits. I consider that none of these factors individually or collectively outweigh the environmental harm to the BTMs and CA which I have identified.
13. In light of the above, the proposed development would not accord with policies LP 1, LP 3 and LP 4 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018), heritage policies in the Framework or guidance within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) and the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Supplementary Planning Document: Buildings of Townscape Merit (2015). These policies and guidance collectively, and among other things, seek to ensure developments are of high quality design, respect and are compatible with local character and preserve or enhance non-designated and designated heritage assets.

## **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*J Williamson*  
INSPECTOR