

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2021 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3278179

2 Cranmer Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1DW

- 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 Spiros Theodossiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/0287/HOT, dated 29 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the alteration of existing 2 storey side extension to include ground floor front bay and part first part second floor side addition.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Given the limited scale of development, in this instance, neither party is prejudiced by not providing further comments.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No.2 Cranmer Road is an end of terrace dwelling prominently located on the corner of Cranmer Road and Uxbridge Road. The terrace is made up of 4 Victorian three storey villas, which have a unity of style and form, being of yellow stock brick with detailing including cornices, banding, pediments, and canted bay windows to the front elevations. The original buildings have a simple symmetrical form, but the decorative features give them significant visual interest and architectural quality. Consequently, the row of dwellings contributes positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, which is characterised by a mix of terraced and semi-detached Victorian dwellings and later detached dwellings.

6. The appeal property, along with the others in the terrace Nos. 4, 6 and 8, is designated by the Council as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) on its local list. The Buildings of Townscape Merit Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2015) sets out that such buildings are buildings of local interest. Policy LP4 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) (LP) sets out that the Council will seek to preserve, and where possible enhance, the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets (NDHA), including BTMs.
7. I understand that the terrace was originally constructed as two pairs of semi-detached units, however they have since been joined by various infilling side extensions. These are visibly set back and set down from the main roofs above ground floor, albeit the set back is minimal in the case of No. 4. The ground floor elements, some of which are nearly flush with the main front elevation, are simple in appearance. Furthermore, the extensions are in general much plainer in appearance than the main dwellings and as such do not compete with the decorative frontages. These features ensure that they appear subservient to the original properties. The original symmetry and form of the four properties and the terrace unit is therefore still evident.
8. In addition to a single storey rear extension, No. 2 currently also has a two-storey render and tile hung side extension with a sloping roof, which is highly visible from the corner junction. This appears somewhat incongruous against the traditional form of the dwelling, however its simple appearance and lack of detailing means that it does not compete with the decoration and architectural interest of the main dwelling.
9. The proposed extension would replace the existing addition in materials to match the main house and parts would be set back from the front elevation. However, it would be larger and taller than the extension it would replace. Its visual impact would therefore be greater than that of the existing extension despite the use of more sympathetic materials.
10. The use of flat roofs on the proposed side extension would be similar to those of the extensions elsewhere along the terrace and would be clearly set down from the eaves. However, the proposal is for three separate flat roofs of different heights and widths, which would be clearly visible from the side, unlike those of neighbouring extensions. This variation, in combination with the existing single storey side/rear extension, would result in a cluttered appearance that would detract from the simple architectural form of the original property.
11. The two-storey front section of the proposed extension would be set flush with the front elevation of the main dwelling and would feature a smaller version of the adjacent bay window. This siting and the proposed decorative detailing would give a very different appearance to the plainer elevations of other side extensions. It would offer no visual break between this part of the extension and the main front elevation and would start to compete with the architectural detailing of the main dwelling. Consequently, the original form of the dwelling frontage would start to be obscured.
12. The proposed extension would therefore appear as a dominant and incongruous form of development that would harm the character and appearance of the existing property. Given the corner location it would be a prominent and unsympathetic feature highly visible in the street scene. Consequently, it would

also harm the consistent architectural character and appearance, and therefore the significance, of this terrace of NDHAs. It would also therefore diminish the contribution that the host dwelling and terrace makes to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

13. Paragraph 203 of the Framework requires that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of an NDHA. I acknowledge that the extension would provide an improved standard of accommodation for the appellant, however, as a private benefit, this carries limited weight. The removal of the existing contemporary extension would also result in a slight enhancement of the building, to which I afford modest weight. For the reasons set out above the proposal would harm the features which contribute to the special interest of this NDHA and would not preserve or enhance its significance. Having regard to local and national policies which seek to conserve heritage assets, including those that are locally important, I afford this significant weight. The matters advanced in support of the proposal do not outweigh the harm identified.
14. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with LP Policies LP1 and LP4, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that the scale and form of extensions respect or complement those of the host dwelling and that development preserve the significance, character and setting of NDHAs, including BTM's.
15. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (2015), which requires extensions to harmonise with the original appearance of the property and be carefully designed in order to avoid visual confusion. It would also conflict with the design and heritage policies of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area in conflict with the development plan. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework and the benefits of the proposal, which outweigh this harm. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR