



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3282144
25 St Georges Road, Twickenham, TW1 1QS

- 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 and Mrs Gilbert against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/2205/HOT, dated 16 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing two storey rear extension and construction of single-storey and first floor rear extensions and new bay window, extension of roof and the raising ridge height of roof, installation of rooflights, replacement windows and demolition and part replacement of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing two storey rear extension and construction of single-storey and first floor rear extensions and new bay window, extension of roof and the raising ridge height of roof, installation of rooflights, replacement windows and demolition and part replacement of existing garage at 25 St Georges Road, Twickenham, TW1 1QS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/2205/HOT dated 16 June 2021 and in accordance with the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 411(PL2)04; 411(PL2)05; 411(PL2)06; 411(PL2)07; 411(PL2)16; 411(PL2)17; 411(PL2)18; 411(PL2)19; 411(PL2)20; 411(PL2)21; 411(PL2)22; 411(PL2)23; 411(PL2)25.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the building (including fenestration) and where applicable, all areas of hard surfacing, shall not be constructed other than in materials/samples of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) no part of the roof of the building hereby approved shall be used as a balcony or terrace nor shall any access be formed thereto.
-

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal property has been the subject of various planning applications. Planning permission has been granted¹ for a similar scheme to that proposed, with the roof form permitted by that previous proposal comprising the most significant difference to the proposal the subject of this appeal.
3. The Council's reason for refusal related only to the proposed raising of the ridge height and the introduction of a rear dormer. The Council has no objections to other elements of the proposed development. Consequently, this decision focuses on the proposed roof form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the St Margaret's Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling situated on a triangular plot along St Georges Road.
6. The appeal property is located within a residential area and is situated within the St Margaret's Estate Conservation Area, a largely Victorian estate, notable for a variety of housing styles, including many detached two storey dwellings with intricate brick and stucco details.
7. The presence of period properties with original features is a significant characteristic of the area. Further, during my site visit, I observed that dwellings tend to be set back from the street behind brick walls and garden areas and driveways and have gardens to the rear. The presence of gardens, trees and hedgerows provides for a pleasant green and spacious character.
8. The appeal property is not Victorian, but dates from the mid 20th Century. It retains attractive period features, including a semi-circular brick opening to its front façade and whilst its rear is partly hidden from view, its front façade ties in well with a brick wall to the front.
9. The property has an unattractive, flat-roofed extension to the rear and this provides for a less attractive side elevation, which can be glimpsed through the greenery around the property.
10. The appeal property sits adjacent to Number 23 St Georges Road, which is a much taller Victorian property and which, to some considerable degree, looms above the appeal property due to its greater height.
11. The proposed development would result in the appeal property's roof ridge being raised. Rather than result in a significant enlargement that would greatly alter the proportions of the dwelling, or a prominent feature, the raised roof would still sit far below the height of No 23 and has clearly been carefully designed to appear in proportion with the rest of the dwelling.

¹ Reference: 19/1228/HOT.

12. Taking this into account, I find that the increase in height would not stand out in any way but would appear as an integrated part of a much-improved building; and the appeal property would still be of modest height relative to surrounding dwellings.
13. Further to the above, I am mindful that evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed roof would be smaller – and would give the impression of less mass – than the previously approved scheme referred to above.
14. A small dormer is proposed to the rear roof slope. This would be largely hidden from general view, but could be glimpsed from a number of locations, including from the rear garden of No 23.
15. The proposed dormer has been sensitively designed. It would be centrally located, set down from the ridge and set well-in from either side of the roof. The absence of windows would avoid scope for overlooking and would preserve residential amenity; and the proposed materials would match the roof.
16. As such, the proposed dormer would, I find, appear as a modest and unassuming addition. Given this and its proposed location, it would not appear incongruous or dominant in any way, and would neither draw attention to itself nor detract from the overall appearance of the building.
17. Considered as a whole, I find that the proposed development would result in an all-round improvement to the appeal property whereby unattractive elements would be replaced. The resultant dwelling would appear as a coherent and attractive whole.
18. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would conserve the character and appearance of the St Margaret's Estate Conservation Area. It would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Local Plan² Policies LP1, LP3 and LP8; to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): House Extensions and Alterations (2015); to the St Margaret's Village Planning Guidance SPD (2016); or to the St Margaret's Estate Conservation Area Statement No. 19, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conditions

19. As part of this appeal, the Council submitted a request for four conditions to be imposed should the appeal be successful and I have considered these against the tests set out in Paragraph 56 of the Framework.
20. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
21. A condition controlling external finishes is necessary in the interests of local character. A condition preventing the use of any part of the roof as a balcony or terrace is necessary in the interests of residential amenity.

² Reference: Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018).

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above, the appeal is successful.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR