

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2021

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/20/3261516

22 Princes Road, Richmond TW10 6DH

- 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 Kirkbright against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2263/HOT, dated 12 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is for ground floor and 1st floor extensions with associated internal remodelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the host Building of Townscape Merit and the terrace of which it forms part; and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St. Matthias Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a well conserved two and a half storey mid-terrace house with a largely intact original rear elevation at first floor level. It is a good example of Victorian London architecture and the Council have listed it as a Building of Townscape Merit (BoTM), along with the terrace of which it forms part. Consequently, these houses can be considered to be locally listed non-designated heritage assets.
4. The rear gardens of the houses along the eastern side of Princes Road are short and constitute compact former workers housing, consequently any extensions thereto need to be sensitively designed. I note that there are examples of a number of rear extensions either side of the appeal site, from ground level to roof height. However, whilst I note that the Council do not object to the principle of a first floor rear extension to the appeal dwelling, I consider that the double pitched roof construction with resultant rear gable would jar with the mono-pitch accretions to each side.
5. No details have been provided as to how the new roof would marry into these adjacent projections and I find that overall by virtue of its width, height and

depth that the proposed extension would result in a visually intrusive and dominant form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the BoTM and the terrace of which it forms part. However, by virtue of its rear garden location beyond public view, I consider that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole.

6. In coming to my conclusion I have noted the guidance set out within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions and External Alterations (2015). Whilst the ridge of the extension would be set lower than that of the main house, the extension would dominate its rear elevation, jarring with the simple recessive architecture of both houses to either side. I have been given no reason to doubt that the proposed materials employed would be sympathetic and that there would be improvements to the existing single storey rear extension. However, pursuant to paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework, I consider that the aspects of the proposal that fall in its favour do not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider terrace.
7. Therefore, I find the proposal contrary to Policies LP1 and LP4 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan 2018 which together require all development to be of high architectural quality such that the character and heritage of the Borough be maintained and enhanced where opportunities arise and enable compatibility with local character including, scale, height, massing, proportions and form whilst also seeking to preserve, and where possible enhance, the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets, including Buildings of Townscape Merit.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR