



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 August 2021

by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3272681

2 Trinder Mews, Teddington TW11 8HY

- 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 Ms Claire Debney against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/3306/HOT, dated 19 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a front porch and rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch and rear dormer extension at 2 Trinder Mews, Teddington TW11 8HY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/3306/HOT, dated 19 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall in all respects accord strictly with drawing numbers: OS 00, Ground and first floor plans Existing 01, Second floor and roof plan Existing 02, Front and rear elevations Existing 03, Right and left side elevations Existing 04, Sections AA BB Existing 05, 3D Model Existing 06 and Site Analysis 16 received by the Local Planning Authority on 20 November 2020 and drawing numbers: Ground and 1st Proposed 12 Rev C, Front and Rear Proposed 14 Rev C, Right Left cut throughs Proposed 15 Rev C, Right Left Elevations of Block Proposed 17 Rev C and Section AA Proposed 19 Rev C received by the Local Planning Authority on 19 February 2021 and drawing number: Second and Roof Proposed 13 Rev B received by the Local Planning Authority on 4 March 2021.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Teddington Lock Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two storey mid terrace dwelling located within a somewhat secluded position at the edge of the Conservation Area. The site is

situated to the rear of buildings which front onto the High Street and amongst other residential development which exhibits variety in terms of scale, style and design.

4. Planning history for the site confirms that planning permission was granted by the Council for a rear dormer extension at the appeal building¹. The appeal scheme seeks to also introduce a porch to the front elevation of the appeal building. Whilst the Council do not raise concerns regarding the rear dormer extension as part of this appeal proposal, the Council have put it to me that the addition of a front porch would result in harm to the character and appearance of the terrace of dwellings and thereby harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
5. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Moreover, paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The evidence before me indicates that the Conservation Area forms the distinctive historic core of Teddington, with the Conservation Area being formed of two distinct character areas but which are unified by their relationship with the River Thames. The significance of the High Street area derives from the architectural character and layout of the buildings collectively and their historical relationship with the River Thames.
7. The short terrace which the appeal building is a component of is relatively uniform in terms of design and appearance. However, as noted above the immediate surrounding area is characterised by a mixture of building types which exhibit variety in terms of scale and design. In this respect, the contribution made by the appeal building and its associated terrace of dwellings to the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area has been substantially and significantly diminished by the scale of the building which is located to the north of the site fronting onto the High Street, and which dominates views from within Trinder Mews.
8. Furthermore, whilst the front of the appeal building and its neighbours are uniform in terms of their overall design features, views of the front of the appeal building and its neighbours from within Trinder Mews are extremely limited and are dominated by the prominent metal crash barrier positioned separating the site from the adjacent car park which draws the eye away from the frontage of this terrace.
9. The proposed porch is subtle in its design consistent with other examples of projecting porches within the Conservation Area, and would sit comfortably against the front elevation, not appearing as a dominant feature to the existing dwelling or the short terrace of properties. I do not find that the architectural integrity of the terrace or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be unduly harmed by the proposed porch.

¹ Local Planning Authority Reference: 20/2545/HOT

10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace which the appeal building forms a part and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which seek to ensure developments are of a high quality of design, compatible with local character, and which preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
11. There would also be no conflict with the aims and objectives of the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) (the SPD) given that the proposed porch would not be dominant, would sympathetically compliment the existing building and would be sensitive to the existing character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the appeal scheme would accord with those paragraphs of the Framework which concern conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
12. Whilst I acknowledge the Council's concerns regarding further porches to the front of dwellings within this terrace, in my view and given the above observations regarding the surrounding nearby built environment and the existing limited views of the front of the terrace from within Trinder Mews, any such additions which were designed in accordance with the guidelines of the SPD would be unlikely to adversely affect the appearance of the terrace of dwellings nor adversely affect the significance, character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conditions

13. The Council has, within the appeal questionnaire, suggested standard conditions relating to the timescale of implementation, matching materials and the requirement to carry out the development in accordance with the approved plans. These conditions are either statutory in nature or reasonable and necessary in the interests of certainty and I will impose all those suggested with the standard wording.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR