
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/20/3244316

56D Anlaby Road, Teddington TW11 0PA

- 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 Miss Tasneem Ramji against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/2911/FUL, dated 23 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of rear conservatory and erection of new rear extension at lower ground and ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has included an additional plan as part of their appeal¹. While not before the Council at the time of their decision, it provides additional detailing of the existing building. The main elements of the scheme have not altered from that originally submitted and upon which consultation took place. Against this backdrop, no injustice would be caused to any appeal party or third party by my taking this information into account. I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues of the appeal are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the heritage significance of the appeal property; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property comprises a 4 storey Edwardian property that has already been extended and has a staggered rear building line. Although the conservatory is uPVC, as are some of the windows at the property, there is an overall consistency to the walls with them being brick. While not a designated

¹ 19J3.LO.2002 Rev 0 Proposed Section and Elevations

heritage asset itself, or located within such an area, the appeal building is identified as a building of townscape merit.

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that when considering the effect of a proposed development on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, paragraph 197 of the Framework advises that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm, or loss, and the significance of the heritage asset.
6. The significance of the appeal property lies, in part, in the overall consistency of the external materials and proportions of the building. I note that the appellant seeks to avoid a pastiche design, to set the extension apart from the rest of the building and that the lower ground floor walls would be brick. However, the introduction of a mix of materials including zinc and fibre cement cladding would result in the appeal scheme appearing overly busy. It would unfavourably contrast and jar with the current simplicity and consistency of materials at the property.
7. The width and height of the proposed extension would be largely the same as the current conservatory. The proposed fenestration would not follow the pattern of the existing property, however, neither does the existing conservatory. Notwithstanding this, the extensively glazed roof and walls of the existing conservatory allow views through it, making it less noticeable. In contrast, while there is a varied rear building line at the property, the increased depth of the projection, and more substantial construction with solid sections of wall and an uncharacteristic flat roof, would result in the proposed extension being a bulky and prominent feature.
8. Given the size of the remaining areas without built form, the proposal would not result in the site being overdeveloped. There would also be limited views of the proposed extension from the street. Nevertheless, the discordance of the materials and form of the proposal with the existing building would be obvious from nearby properties. Moreover, that a proposal could be screened is not a reason for allowing development that is unacceptable.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to accord with Policies LP1 and LP4 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (Local Plan) and the SPD². These, amongst other things, seek to ensure development is compatible with local character with regard to materials and detailing along with preserving the significance and character of non-designated heritage assets, including Buildings of Townscape Merit.
10. Moreover, it would not accord with the aim of the Framework to conserve heritage assets in a manner that is appropriate to their significance and where it states developments should be sympathetic to local character and the built environment.

Living Conditions

11. At the lower ground floor level of the adjacent flat at 56 Anlaby Road the nearest opening is a door, with the window set further away from the proposed extension. There is a ground floor window closer to the proposed extension. Nonetheless, the lower ground floor and ground floor windows are obscured

² Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations May 2015

glazed, limiting the outlook from them at present. While the extension would be visible from these windows, they are orientated towards the garden rather than directly towards the extension. The proposal would have a greater depth than the existing conservatory and would be a solid structure. Nevertheless, it would not be of a scale that would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure from the rooms these windows serve.

12. The extension would be seen from 58a Anlaby Road (No58a) where the rear elevation is set back from that of the appeal property. Nonetheless, the windows at 58a are again orientated towards their rear garden with the main outlook away from the appeal site. Moreover, the boundary treatments and landscaping between the properties would mostly screen the proposed extension from ground floor windows. There are large first floor windows giving an outlook away from the appeal property and both properties are set in from the boundary. The separation distances and orientation of the windows would prevent the appeal proposal being an overbearing presence from No 58a.
13. The proposal would reduce overlooking towards No 58a with the introduction of a solid side wall where there is currently glazing. This weighs in favour of the scheme, although the angled views and existing boundary screening limits the existing overlooking. Were the appeal to be allowed, conditions could be imposed with regard to obscure glazing the side elevation windows to prevent overlooking. There is no compelling evidence before me that light pollution is currently a concern or to show to what, if any, extent it would be reduced.
14. Therefore, the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent properties with regard to outlook and would have a limited benefit with regard to overlooking. The scheme would accord with Policy LP8 of the Local Plan and the SPD. These, in part, state that developments that create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted.

Other Matters

15. I note the lack of objections from local residents and comments in support of the scheme. However, this in itself is not a ground for granting planning permission unless founded upon valid planning reasons.
16. From the information before me, any benefits associated with a more substantial roof and easier maintenance of the building do not outweigh the harm that would arise from the scheme.

Conclusion

17. I found that the scheme would not result in unacceptable harm to living conditions with regard to outlook and that there would be a limited benefit with regards to overlooking. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.
18. For the reason given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR