



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024

**by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 30 January 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3327957**  
**293 Richmond Road, Twickenham TW1 2NP**

- 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 George Hewitt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
  - The application Ref:23/0879/HOT dated 3 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2023.
  - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised in December 2023. Although some of the paragraph numbering has changed, I do not consider that there are any material changes in the Framework, pertinent to this appeal proposal. It is not therefore necessary to seek the views of the Appellant or the Council on the revised Framework.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cambridge Park East Twickenham Conservation Area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, end of terrace house on the western side of Richmond Road, approximately opposite St Stephen's Church. It forms part of a Grade II listed row of former artisan cottages built in 1831. The appeal property and adjoining terrace also fall within the Cambridge Park East Twickenham Conservation Area. Both the listed building and the Conservation Area are defined as designated heritage assets under the Framework.
5. The proposal seeks to construct a first floor rear extension, above the existing ground floor rear extension, but set back behind the full extent of the rear outrigger, with a flat roof.

6. In considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any proposal affecting a listed building, Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that that special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
7. Section 72 of the same Act requires, in respect of development within a conservation area, that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that conservation area.
8. In respect of the listed building, its significance stems primarily from its historical and architectural interest as an integral part of a terrace of artisan cottages which largely retain their original proportions, plan layout and appearance, particularly as seen from the street.
9. The immediate neighbouring property at No 291 has a shallow rear extension at first floor level. While I am not familiar with all of the circumstances of that extension, the evidence indicates that it was undertaken prior to the cottages being listed. On that basis, its presence did not act as a barrier to the listing. It does not follow, however, that similar extensions on other parts of the terrace will be acceptable. Each proposal must be judged on its individual merits.
10. With this one exception, the Council states that the majority retain their rear elevations at first floor level. I have been provided with no compelling information to the contrary. Notwithstanding the ground floor rear extension, the rear elevation of the existing building clearly shows the rear outrigger extending further than the main wall of the dwelling. The plan form relating to the former artisan cottage is still clear to read and assists with the legibility of the building's significance as set out above.
11. I have taken into account the small set back from the full extent of the rear outrigger and the proposed use of matching brickwork, but the proposed extension would materially alter the form and the massing as well as the appearance of the existing house at the rear. Given its depth and proportions it would not be seen as a subservient addition to the main dwelling. Furthermore, it would undermine the form and design of the original plan and form of the house with its rear outrigger and set back of the rest of the first floor. This would be harmful to the special architectural and historic form of the listed building.
12. The Cambridge Park East Twickenham Conservation Area comprises an attractive and cohesive area of largely nineteenth century development. The row of cottages of which the appeal property forms part is one of the earliest developments within the Conservation Area, much of the development in the rest of the Conservation Area dates from the 1860s onwards. Accordingly, the significance of the Conservation Area stems in part from the historic pattern of development and from individual buildings of historic and architectural note, including the listed terrace as a surviving early example.
13. In respect of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the proposed rear extension would not be seen from the front, nor from the view of the side elevation that can be seen from Richmond Road. Whilst it would not therefore detract from public views of the Conservation Area, in failing to

respect the special architectural and historic interest of the property, it would harm the integrity of the Conservation Area, it would not preserve its character.

14. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building and would not preserve the character of the Cambridge Park East Twickenham Conservation Area. This would conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Council's Local Plan, the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance including: House Extension and External Alterations; St Margarets and East Twickenham Village Planning Guidance, and Cambridge Park East Twickenham Conservation Area Study, as well as the Framework and in particular Sections 12 and 16 all of which seek a high quality of development which respects the local context and the significance of designated heritage assets. The reason for refusal also refers to two further Supplementary Planning Documents, namely Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings but these have not been provided and cannot therefore be taken into account.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

15. Paragraph 205 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Consistent with that approach, paragraph 206 says that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, including from its alteration, should require clear and convincing justification.
16. I have identified harm to the special interest of the listed building and to the character of the Conservation Area. Given the relatively small scale of the proposal at the rear of the dwelling, the level of harm would in respect of both heritage assets and using the language of the Framework, be 'less than substantial'. Under such circumstances, paragraph 208 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes the securing of optimal viable use of listed buildings.
17. I have sympathy with the family related reasons for seeking the extension to the property to provide additional accommodation, but these are primarily for the private benefit of the appellant rather than for the benefit of the public at large. Therefore, any public benefits that there may be are insufficient to outweigh the harm, which although 'less than substantial' still attracts 'great weight'.
18. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*L J Evans*

INSPECTOR