The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3242643
24 Victoria Road, Mortlake, London SW14 8EX

- 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 Peter Hurry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
- The application Ref 19/2463/HOT, dated 8 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2019.
- The development proposed is a first floor rear extension and internal alterations at first floor.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension and internal alterations at first floor at 24 Victoria Road, Mortlake, London SW14 8EX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2463/HOT, dated 8 August 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule attached to this Decision.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an attractive brick-built mid-terraced house, itself designated as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM), within the Mortlake Conservation Area (the CA). To the front and rear of the appeal site are other terraces, albeit of differing designs. The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Mortlake, Mortlake Green & Queen's Road Conservation Area Study (the CAS) notes the contribution and coherence of these terraces to the CA, and in particular the unusual design of Nos 2 to 42 Victoria Road. The road to the rear, Mullins Path, has a mixture of older terracing and more recent development which allows a view of the rear of the site, albeit somewhat limited and framed against that more recent development.

4. The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations 2015 (the Extensions SPD) aims to provide clear guidelines as to how extensions and alterations should be designed, in order to support the policy principles set out in the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan). The Extensions SPD suggests that rear extensions should not be greater than half of the width of the original building to avoid over dominating the original scale and character of the host building. As the proposal appears to be

greater than half of the width of the host building it would on its face be contrary to the guidance in the Extensions SPD.

5. In my opinion, the rear elevation proposed in this appeal is improved over the previous approval. The remaining original first-floor rear elevation has a more balanced appearance, and the new first-floor rear-facing window better matches the location of the window it mimics. I note also the proposed use of matching materials and detailing, including brick and slate to match and hardwood sash windows.

6. In considering the appeal proposal, I have had regard to the variety of extensions in the area around the appeal site, the fall-back scheme, and the appeal proposal itself. I do not consider that the appeal proposal or the site as a whole would appear unbalanced owing to its width and as a result, unduly dominate the appeal site. To my mind, the appeal proposal would not have a materially different effect on the character and appearance of the area, the site as a BTM, or neighbouring BTMs, to that of the previous approval. I therefore consider that the proposal would be acceptable.

7. As noted, the site lies within the CA, the significance of which, according to the CAS lies in the physical character of the area, the underlying medieval settlement pattern and the definite character of the two-storey brick terraces. The CAS and the Report of the Council note the effect of unsympathetic alterations and the loss of traditional features and materials on the significance of the CA. However, I have found above that the appeal proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, and acknowledge the proposed use of brick, slate and hardwood to match existing materials. The proposal would only alter the rear of the appeal site, and visibility from the public domain would be limited. I therefore consider that the proposal would not cause harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset, and would therefore preserve the character of the CA.

8. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the nature of the proposal and its location, and the great weight which should be given to the conservation of the significance of the CA. For the same reasons, I consider that the proposal would not cause harm to the significance of the appeal site as a non-designated heritage asset, or BTM, as designated by the Council.

9. Taking all of the above together, I consider that the proposal would, as a result of its width and overall appearance have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. It would therefore comply with Polices LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Local Plan. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of a high quality of design, which maintains and enhances the character, appearance and historic special interest of the area, and which properly reflects and respects local character and appearance.

10. The proposal would also comply with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to achieve well-designed places, and to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

11. I note that the proposal would be contrary to the guidance in the Extensions SPD. This sets guidelines to support the Local Plan policies and is a material consideration in the determination of this appeal. That requirement in the Extensions SPD seeks to protect the scale and character of original buildings

from being over-dominated by extensions. As I have found that the proposal complies with the Local Plan policies and the Framework in terms of appropriate scale and good design, it does not cause the harm which the Extensions SPD seeks to protect against. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal accords with the overarching aim of the Extensions SPD to ensure that extensions harmonise with the original building.

Other Matters

12. I note the representations made to the Council regarding the potential for the appeal proposal to give rise to overshadowing, enclosure or loss of light. As the additional width of the proposal is within the site, I do not consider that the appeal proposal would have ay materially different effect to that of the previously approved extension. In any case, as neighbouring properties also have single storey rear extensions, I do not consider that the proposal would cause any unacceptable harm to the living conditions of occupiers of surrounding properties.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a number of conditions to be attached, should planning permission be granted. Having had regard to the requirements of, and tests within, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance I have imposed conditions concerning commencement (1), requiring the use of matching materials (2) and compliance with the submitted plans (3). I have removed reference to the existing survey plans from Condition 3 for clarity. These conditions are necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development and to preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

S Dean

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2. That 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, unless otherwise indicated on the approved drawings or within the submitted Application Form.

3. That the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: Design and Access Statement, Heritage Statement, 1103-1000-B, 1103-9001-C, 1103-9002-C, 1103-9003-C, 1103-9004 C, 1103-9005 C, 1103-9006-A.

End of Schedule of Conditions