



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2019 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by J Whitfield BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3225925

24 Orleans Road, Twickenham TW1 3BL

- 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 & Mrs Chan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 18/4210/HOT, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: *the proposals seek demolition of an existing single storey extension and upvc conservatory and the erection of a two storey rear extension to accommodate two habitable rooms including a bedroom at first floor level and dining room at ground floor level. The existing internal spaces and stair are being reworked to complement the proposed floor plans and a new wc is proposed at ground floor level. In addition the single storey outbuilding located along the rear boundary of the back garden seeks realignment of its garden facing wall and conversion into a habitable space.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 22 and 26 Orleans Road having particular regard to outlook; and,
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and terrace, and whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area.

Reasons for Recommendation

Effect on Living Conditions

4. Given the terraced nature of the appeal property, the proposed two storey extension would sit close to both side boundaries with 22 and 26 Orleans Road.

5. The plans show that the extension would be set away some 0.35m from the boundary with the northern neighbour, No 22. No 22 has a first floor window on the rear elevation which it is said serves a bedroom. This window is set next to the existing first floor projection of No 22.
6. Whilst any first floor rear extension to the appeal property would inevitably lead to some degree of intrusion upon the outlook from No 22, the proposed depth of the extension and its proximity to this neighbouring window would lead to a significant sense of enclosure. Such sense of enclosure would be more harmful than the existing impact of the rear projection of No 22 upon the rear bedroom window of the appeal property, or indeed upon the bedroom window of No 22 itself.
7. As a result, given its siting and scale, the extension would result in dominant, imposing blank wall which would be overbearing on the outlook from the rear bedroom of No 22. The extension, by virtue of its siting and scale, would be likely to make the rear bedroom less pleasant to use as a result. It follows that harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 22 would result.
8. The property to the south, No 26, is set forward of the appeal property. As such, the proposed rear extension would largely sit adjacent to the rear garden area of this neighbour. This close relationship means that the proposed extension would have a significant impact upon the outlook from the rear garden of No 26. This impact is exacerbated by the height of the two storey extension which would present a significant, dominant and imposing blank side elevation towards the garden of No 26.
9. The extension would be likely to make the rear garden less pleasant to use as a result and would therefore cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 26.
10. I conclude therefore that the proposal would adversely affect the outlook from the rear of No 22 and the rear garden of 26, which would be harmful to the living conditions of their occupiers. This would be in conflict with Policy LP8 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018 (LP) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) House Extensions and External Extensions (2015), which collectively seek to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Character and Appearance

11. The appeal site is a terraced dwelling located within the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area (CA). The CA is located by the Thames close to Marble Hill House and was originally designated in recognition of the historic and architectural value of the original village core and river frontage. Orleans Road itself is made up of charming and elegant terraces and cottages, with extensive garages on its western side. The road runs north to south from the busy (A305) Richmond Road towards the Thames and the peaceful, leafy riverside area.
12. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and

enhancing the significance of heritage assets and that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

13. In addition, the 18th Century terrace of properties to which the appeal site comprises the end dwelling (No's 12-24) are designated as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) and as such are considered heritage assets.
14. No particular information is provided with regards to this particular BTM, however it is clear that the frontage of the terrace is uniform and historic, and the terrace forms a distinctive and cohesive group of buildings. The rear elevations however, have clearly been altered over time and include some visible variety. The Council's delegated report recognises this and lists a number of neighbouring dwellings with alterations, including rear conservatory extensions and two storey projections of various depths and widths, including over half the width of the original building. The appellants point to the original pitched roofs characteristic of the CA, however the visible first floor elements all incorporate a flat roof, which appears in keeping with the parapet wall that obscures the pitched roofs of the terrace from view.
15. The SPD House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) states that "*the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours.*" It goes on to state that two storey rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building "*to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the building's original scale and character.*"
16. Whilst this is general guidance which should be assessed on a case by case basis, the proposed rear extension would indeed extend over half the width of the house and include a pitched roof. The appeal property has an existing out of keeping conservatory extension which will be replaced by the proposed extension. However, the combined scale and especially the design of the proposed extension appears out of keeping with the proportions and design of the existing dwelling and wider terrace. It would therefore appear as a dominant and obtrusive form of development. I note there have already been so many alterations to the rear of the terrace that its original character has been eroded to a degree. However, I consider that it is important to the area's character to avoid further alterations that would be disproportionate in scale to, and out of keeping in design with, the original individual houses.
17. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposed extension would, by reason of its scale, siting and design, adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building and terrace. Although this effect would be unlikely to be viewed from Orleans Road, it would be apparent from the rear of residential properties nearby, and would affect perceptions of the character of the CA. It would therefore, fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
18. As a consequence, the development would be contrary to LP Policies LP1, LP3 and LP4, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design, that the scale and form of extensions should respect or complement those of the host dwelling, that the character or appearance of the Conservation Area is preserved or enhanced and that development retain the features of the BTM's which contribute to its architectural integrity and historic interest. The proposal would also be contrary

to the further advice set out in the SPD House Extensions and External Alterations (2015).

19. The Council raise no objection to the proposed alterations to the existing outbuildings and I have no reason to disagree.

Other Matters

20. The appellants comments regarding lack of harm with regards to sunlight and daylight, the use of appropriate materials, the desire to provide a space for modern family living etc are noted. However, these matters, taken either individually or cumulatively and including the responses provided to various neighbour objections, do not outweigh the harm that I have identified and do not lead me to alter the conclusion that I have reached.

Conclusion

21. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

22. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

J Whitfield

INSPECTOR