



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2024 by M Long BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3332510

27 Cole Park Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames TW1 1HP

- 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 Stuart Pain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 23/1970/HOT.
 - The development proposed is an extension, garage conversion and reconfiguration to the floor layout.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The Government published in December 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.
4. The Council submitted a number of clarifications regarding this case at the appeal stage. These clarifications were sent to the appellant, who was also given the opportunity to provide comments.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cole Park Road Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The CA primarily derives significance from its eclectic mix of late 19th and early 20th century houses which benefit from high-quality decorative design details, including English Arts and Crafts influences. Its significance is also derived from

- the gaps between buildings which contribute to the character of the area and allow glimpses through to greenspace. The site is an attractive house located on a prominent bend in the road. There is a two-storey garage building to its side, which has a subservient height and scale in relation to the main dwelling.
7. The proposal would add considerable mass to the garage building, particularly at the second-floor level. Despite a short set down from the main ridgeline, the combined width and height of the enlarged building would have a dominant scale that would not preserve its existing subservient relationship to the main dwelling. This would conflict with the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015 which sets out that the size of extensions should not dominate the existing house.
 8. From the front, the proposed links to the main house, as well as the double bay window feature, would have an overly prominent appearance that would compete in views of the main dwelling. Consequently, this would interrupt the appreciation of the original design of the appeal dwelling. Due to the noticeable position of the site, the proposal would feature as a harmful addition to the character and appearance of the wider streetscene.
 9. The Cole Park Road CA Appraisal 2021 (CA Appraisal) identifies the loss of visual gaps between properties as a problem within the CA. Although the footprint of the existing garage building would be utilised in the proposed scheme, the additional bulk at the second floor would close the gap between Nos 25 and 27 at this level. The reduction in the sense of space between these neighbouring houses would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the CA.
 10. Guidance within the CA Appraisal sets out that timber framed windows should be retained, restored or replaced on a like-for-like basis. The loss of the timber-framed bay window and French doors at the rear, which the Council has indicated appears to be an original feature, and their replacement with a contemporary design would not preserve the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling.
 11. I observed an extension that has been built at No 29 which has some similarities to the proposed scheme. However, this neighbouring development was consented prior to the designation of the CA and, as such, was subject to different planning considerations. In respect of this appeal, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, which the proposal would not achieve.
 12. During the visit, I noted significant works were underway at No 25. While the full details of this scheme are not before me, it appears that its design is significantly different to the appeal scheme and so is not considered to provide a precedent. In any event, each appeal must be considered on its individual planning merits.
 13. Due to the limited scale of the appeal scheme, the extent of its harm on the CA would be less than substantial. In such circumstances, paragraph 208 of the Framework states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. However, no substantive public benefits have been put forward. While appreciating the appellant's desire to secure amenity benefits and improve the quality of the living accommodation for their family, such

benefits would be largely private. As such, they would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the CA, a matter which I give great weight in line with the Framework.

14. Overall, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It would be contrary to the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan, adopted July 2018, specifically Policy LP3 which requires all proposals in CAs to preserve and, where possible, enhance the character and appearance of the CA. It would also conflict with Policy LP1 which seeks to ensure development proposals respect the local environment and consider, amongst other things, scale, height and massing. There would be further conflict with Policy HC1 of The London Plan, adopted March 2021, which seeks that development proposals affecting heritage assets should conserve their significance. The Council has also mentioned conflict with Policy D4 of The London Plan, however this is primarily related to the design process and scrutiny and so it has not been decisive in the consideration of the modest nature of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan, when considered as a whole. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR