
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2022

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3292074

5 Staines Road, Twickenham TW2 5BG

- 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 Cairnes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/4064/HOT, dated 26 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor extension over part of existing and original house at ground floor (revision of 21/2279/HOT).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first floor extension over part of existing and original house at ground floor (revision of 21/2279/HOT) at 5 Staines Road, Twickenham TW2 5BG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/4064/HOT, dated 26 November 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Refs (PL)001_Revision 01, (PL)011_Revision 05, (PL)012_Revision 04, (PL)020 Revision 04, (PL)021 Revision 04 and (PL)022 Revision 04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building, the pair to which it belongs and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is an attractive 2-storey semi-detached Victorian villa with a ground floor side and rear projection. Like its attached counterpart, which is 3 Staines Road, and the dwelling on the opposite side of the site, 7 Staines Road, it is a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM). With their traditional style, consistent use of materials, high quality detailing and regular pattern of fenestration, these properties are of visual and architectural merit. Taken

individually and together as a group, these buildings positively contribute to the character and appearance of the local area.

4. The proposal is to extend No 5 by introducing an additional storey to the existing side projection. It follows schemes to enlarge No 5 in a similar way have been refused planning permission on application and at appeal¹. While I have had regard to the planning history of the site including the previous appeal decision, I have assessed this proposal on its own merits.
5. A noticeably taller and larger side projection to No 5 would result if this new development were to proceed. Nevertheless, the new addition would be modest in scale and bulk. It has been carefully designed to reflect the traditional style of the existing house, with matching external materials. The shallow pitched roof would be consistent with the roof form of the host building. These features, coupled with the sympathetic pattern of openings in both the new and existing dwelling, would ensure that the proposal would relate well to the original form of the host building.
6. Whether or not the proposal would exceed more than one half the width of the existing building, its position set well back from the main front wall with a ridgeline set down from the host building would clearly mark its subservience to the parent building. Given this arrangement, the new extension would not dominate the parent building, nor would it draw the eye from the road. In other words, there would be no disharmony because the new extension would clearly be subordinate to, and blend in with, the host building in accordance with the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *House Extensions and External Alterations* (SPD).
7. The introduction of new built form to one side of No 5 would alter its relationship with No 3 as a broadly matching 2-storey pair. Even so, the proposal would visually 'read' as a subordinate side element with the strong symmetry in the 2-storey front elevations of Nos 3 and 5, which is a distinctive feature of these BTMs, still predominant. When seen from Staines Road, the principal elevations of this pair would remain in balance and their broad unity and cohesion would be retained with the new built form in place.
8. The proposed side extension would reduce the gap at first floor level between Nos 5 and 7 by introducing a new extension. When viewed from the highway, a good-sized gap would be retained between the new addition and the side of No 7. Furthermore, the forward position and slight oblique angle of No 7 relative to No 5 would accentuate the visual break between these buildings. This arrangement would ensure that sufficient space would be retained to clearly separate these adjacent properties. As a result, Nos 5 and 7 would continue to be viewed in the street scene as separate, individual entities. That the rearmost section of the new extension would be up to the shared boundary with No 7 would not be readily evident other than in glimpses from the back gardens of Nos 5 and 7. Consequently, the character, quality of these properties and their setting would be maintained if the proposed development were to proceed.
9. The appellants have drawn my attention to an example of a 2-storey side extension at 159 Staines Road that the Council has found to be acceptable. I

¹ Ref APP/L5810/D/21/3273782 dated 15 September 2021

am advised that No 159 is also a BTM. From what I saw, this existing extension contrasts in scale and design to the proposal and in its relationship to both the host building and the adjacent dwelling, No 161, which the appellants say is not a BTM. As this existing extension and its context differs to that of the proposal, few direct parallels can be drawn between them. Therefore, I attach no more than limited weight to this example in support of the appeal.

10. Nevertheless, taking all these matters into account, I consider that the appeal dwelling, once enlarged, would have an acceptable appearance. It would have been significantly changed on 3 sides. However, the finished building would achieve a high standard of design and in keeping with the character and qualities of Nos 3, 5 and 7 as BTMs. As the proposal is compatible in its context, it overcomes the objections raised in relation to the previous appeal.
11. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause significant harm the character and appearance of the host building, the pair to which it belongs or the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policies LP 1 and LP 4 of the Council's Local Plan or the SPD. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that development achieves a high design quality; respects and enhances the local environment and character; and preserves if not enhances non-designated heritage assets such as BTMs. It is also consistent with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, which note, amongst other things, that development should safeguard heritage assets, be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall qualities of the local area.

Other matters

12. As the new extension would be on top of the existing building, no trees would be affected by the proposal. Given the position and orientation of the new built form relative to the existing buildings on each side of the site, there would be no appreciable loss of natural light or warmth derived from sunlight to any other properties close to the site.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building. These conditions reflect those suggested by the Council.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR