
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3305251
68 North Place, Teddington TW11 0HN

- 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 P Hyde against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/1250/HOT, dated 14 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of this property and the terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this terraced house which is located within a terrace of similarly designed properties. The houses have 3 floors of accommodation, the top floor of which is within the roof/dormer. The entire terrace has its front ground floor elevation set back from the upper floors, supported on brick columns. The front doors are all set back and so are the garage doors, and some with windows where the garage has been converted.
4. Within this terrace, the consistent repetition of this feature is obvious and striking. It is enhanced by the use of a lintel feature over the void. In my judgement, this is a positive design feature which unites the individual properties within this terrace into an attractive and cohesive single building.
5. The proposal would provide a porch by enclosing both sides and the front of this part of the void. It would have a small set-back of 250mm. Whilst it would not project forward of the existing building, I consider that it would appear as an obvious addition to the building. It would interrupt the consistent pattern and rhythm of the solid-to-void appearance of the front elevation and I consider that it would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the terrace. I appreciate that other alterations have been undertaken to some houses within this terrace involving the conversion of the garages but these have not affected the appearance and consistency of the recesses.

6. There are other terraces in the area which the appellant has drawn my attention to and that I observed at my site visit. The terrace at Nos 38 to 52 North Place is of the same design as the appeal property. The terrace formed by Nos 2 to 36 North Place is of a different design and the main front elevation is not recessed but the original front door entrance was recessed. I note that some houses within this terrace have been provided with a porch which encloses the recessed area. However, these are of a different design than the appeal property and the effects of these alterations are very limited in my judgement. I have also had regard to the pair of semi-detached houses at Nos 72 and 74 which sit adjacent to this terrace. These have different dormers and different ground floor arrangement than the terrace which accommodates the appeal property. Whilst the semi-detached houses do not have any recessed features, they are obviously separate from the terrace and the absence of these features is neither harmful to the area nor is it an indication that the recesses are not valuable features on the terrace.
7. The appellant also points out that neighbouring Victorian and Edwardian terraces contain houses with a variety of porches which enclose an original recessed front entrance. The appellant indicates that the appeal property and its neighbours have had permitted development rights removed and so planning permission is required for some alterations, she indicates that the Victorian/Edwardian terraces are not subject to that restriction and so have been able to provide porches without needing planning permission. The design of these houses and the planning circumstances are quite dissimilar to the appeal property and so I do not find any comparisons helpful in determining the appeal.
8. I have taken account of all other matters raised by the appellant including the insulating effects of the proposed porch and the benefits of the additional space that it will provide for her. In my judgement, there are no matters which are sufficient to outweigh the harmful effects that the proposal would have on this terrace and, as a result, the area as a whole. As a consequence, the proposal is contrary to Policy LP1 of the Council's Local Plan of 2018 and there are no matters which outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR