

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 August 2021 by Emma Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRPTI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3273225

153 Amyand Park Road, Twickenham, Surrey TW1 3HN

- 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 Walker against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/3240/HOT, dated 11 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, alterations to existing dormer and addition of extension above outrigger.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of the development proposed above has been taken from the appeal form rather than the application form, as it provides a more accurate description of the proposal detailed in the submitted plans.
4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that neither the appellant nor the Council have made any further submissions regarding the revised Framework. However, in light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that any references made to the revised Framework within this decision would not be unreasonable to the parties.

Main Issue

5. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the surrounding area and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area, and

- the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings in relation to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling with a two-storey outrigger to the rear and a rear dormer providing additional accommodation in the roof. The site is located within an urban environment and the surrounding area is residential in nature. It is also located within the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended, requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
7. The significance of the Conservation Area is identified as an attractive area relating to the late Victorian and Edwardian buildings with a strong character and many individual buildings of architectural merit, which I would agree with. The appeal property forms part of the terrace of dwellings on Amyand Park Road which provides a consistent experience of walking through the Conservation Area and makes a positive contribution to its significance. The proposed development would be to the rear of the host dwelling and would therefore not be visible within the streetscene. However, it would be visible from surrounding properties and the railway line to the rear of the site.
8. The proposed extension above the existing outrigger would project from the existing rear dormer, thereby increasing the loft space within the property and resulting in a property which is more akin to a three-storey dwelling when viewed from the rear. The substantial height of this extension, along with its significant size, would be a prominent feature to the rear of the dwelling which would be an overly dominant addition to the existing outrigger.
9. This extension would also disrupt the general uniformity of the roof storey which currently exists along this row of terraces, which also contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and would be out of keeping with neighbouring properties. It is noted that whilst a neighbouring property has a similar extension over the outrigger, it does not extend the full depth of the outrigger and therefore is less prominent than the appeal proposal and in any event does not form part of the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
10. The proposed increase in the width of the existing dormer would cover the entire roof slope to the rear of the dwelling. The increased width would result in an overly dominant addition to the roof slope which would give the property a top heavy appearance. The addition of a Juliet balcony within the dormer would further increase this dominance and would be an uncharacteristic design feature. A number of other dormers on Amyand Park Road have been brought to my attention by the appellant. However, these examples are smaller than the proposed resultant dormer and infrequent in nature. I am therefore satisfied that they do not form a precedent or contribute significantly to the overall character of the area.

11. The cumulative impact of these two roof extensions would result in substantial additions to the existing property, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling, surrounding area and Conservation Area, where the consistent roofline contributes to its strong character.
12. The Council have no objections to the single storey rear extension, which would be located between the side of the existing dwelling and the boundary. As this part of the proposal would be modest in size and only single storey in nature, I find no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions on this aspect of the proposals.
13. However, for the reasons above, I consider that the proposed roof extensions would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, surrounding area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018). These Policies require new development to respect, contribute to and enhance the local environment and character with great weight given to the conservation of the heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of the asset.
14. The proposal would also be contrary to the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area Study (2001) which states that alteration to the roof lines with unsuitable dormer windows change the important scale of buildings, and also alter the roofline, which should be consistent. Along with the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015) which states that the overall shape, size and position of rear extensions should not dominate the existing house.
15. The harm found is relatively small scale due to the location of the proposal to the rear of the property and therefore, having regard to the Framework, the harm to the significance of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area is less than substantial. The Framework requires, where there would be less than substantial harm, for it to be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme.
16. No public benefits have been outlined by the appellant and therefore, do not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the heritage asset previously identified.

Living Conditions

17. Due to the height and size of the proposed extension above the existing outrigger, and its projection from the main rear elevation, it would be viewed as a prominent and towering addition to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings at No.151 and 155 when using their rear gardens. Due to this prominence and the proximity of the appeal property to its adjoining neighbours, with minimal separation, the significant height and depth of the proposed outrigger extension would result in a detrimental sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No.151 and 155 from their gardens.
18. Due to the size of the existing dormer, I am not persuaded that its extension would have a significantly greater impact on the amount of daylight received by the neighbouring properties, both internally and within the garden, than at present.

19. Nevertheless, the proposed extension to the outrigger would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers having regard to outlook and would conflict with Policy LP8 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018). This ensures that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting, including through creating a sense of enclosure. It would also be contrary to the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015) where extensions that create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted.

Other Matters

20. The appellant has indicated that the proposal is intended to optimise the potential of the appeal site and put the land into effective use. Although this is in principle supported by the National Planning Policy Framework, the weight I attach to this benefit would not outweigh the significant harm found to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, surrounding area and the Conservation Area and the harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion and Recommendation

21. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, and I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Emma Grierson

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.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR