



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2024

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3337970

246 Kingston Road, Richmond Upon Thames, Teddington TW11 9JF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by H + P Ellis against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/2520/HOT.
 - The development proposed is amended ground floor extension, new rear extension and dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property including the Wick Road Conservation Area ('CA').

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a late nineteenth century, semi-detached town house located along Kingston Road within the Wick Road CA.
4. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a requirement that special attention should be paid to the desirability that the character or appearance of the conservation area should be preserved or enhanced. Paragraph 201 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') also requires me to assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal.
5. The Wick Road CA incorporates the historic settlement of South Teddington and has architectural evidence of development following on from the establishment of rail infrastructure and the gasworks. The Wick Road CA is mainly residential in character. Houses which form the historic core are predominantly two-storey, modest tight-knit later Victorian terraces, except for a few mid-Victorian houses along School House Lane which appear to be contemporary with the construction of the gasworks. Later Edwardian development can be seen along Bushy Park Road, some larger higher-status dwellings can be found along Kingston Road overlooking the Normansfield Grounds. The submitted Conservation Area Appraisal ('CAA') recognises that: 'Houses along Kingston Road present an elevated status and have basements visible at ground floor level, with steps up to the front doors.'

6. Overall, the significance of the Wick Road CA is derived from the history of the area and the quality and authenticity of its architecture.
7. The appeal property is three storeys, plus attic accommodation. This is in stock brick under a pitched slate roof. To the front is a canted bay window spanning the lower ground and ground floor levels, and steps up to the front door. Other notable features include the scalloped slates to the roof of the bay window, fenestration and red brick detailing above the windows and doors. A small traditional-style dormer sits on the front roof slope, and both the front and rear side chimneystacks have been retained. Despite a modern pitched roof extension, the rear elevation is largely original, this includes the design and arrangement of fenestration and a modest outshut spanning across part of the lower floors.
8. In particular, the appeal property forms a similar pair with the adjoining building. Together, because of their largely original forms and similar appearance, these are good examples of the grander development fronting Kingston Road, which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Wick Road CA.
9. I acknowledge that in some instances rear elevations make less of a contribution to the CA. Nevertheless, and although the proposed rear extension would be largely screened in views from public vantage points, the requirement for development proposals to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA applies whether or not the proposal is in public view or not. Moreover, in this case the CAA includes a Management Plan, which identifies problems and pressures for the CA. This includes the loss of traditional architectural features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations and extensions.
10. The main parties concur that elements of the proposal including the alteration to the roof of the existing ground floor extension and the rear dormer would be acceptable. I have no reason to disagree.
11. Nevertheless, the two storey rear extension would cover the width of the building at both first and second floor level. Thereby, largely obscuring the original rear elevation. This would result in the permanent loss of most of the original fenestration and detailing associated with these and the erosion of the outshut feature. Moreover, along the rear elevation, the proposed extension would both introduce a higher eaves height and in part obscure this.
12. Whilst I note that the design of the splayed corner of the two-storey extension and of the upward extension of the outshut are to minimise the overall massing and scale, these design interventions would create an uncharacteristic and unusual form. This, along with the variations in the design of proposed fenestration and materials would fail to create a cohesive design. Furthermore, and notwithstanding the modest depth of the proposed extensions, the extent of these would dominate the rear elevation of the appeal property. As such, the proposal would not be sympathetic to this and would also significantly undermine any visual continuity with the adjoining property.
13. For the above reasons and because the proposed rear extension would overwhelm the original property, I am not persuaded that this is designed to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure.

14. New windows are proposed along the flank elevation of the appeal property. Although of a simple form, these would be viewed in the context of the fenestration along the front elevation. As such, and even in limited views, the square form and lack of alignment with the original rectangular windows would also bring these in conflict with the original character and design of the appeal property.
15. For the above reasons, I am not persuaded that the proposal reflects the materiality, style and proportions of the appeal property.
16. Therefore, the proposal by reason of its cumulative extent, form and detailing would result in an uncharacteristic and incongruous development. As such, the proposal would undermine the quality and authenticity of the architecture of the appeal property. Accordingly, this would result in less than substantial harm to the Wick Road CA.
17. Having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area¹, despite finding the harm to be less than substantial, I still attach significant weight to this. Such harm can be outweighed by public benefits. In this case no specific public benefits have been identified. Nevertheless, the construction of the development would bring some economic benefits. Even so, given that this would relate to a single property, I attach limited weight to such benefits.
18. Having given limited weight to the public benefits identified, these are not sufficiently forceful to outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have identified.
19. As such, the harm the architectural appearance and character of the appeal property which forms part of the Wick Road CA. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (adopted 2018) ('LP'). This Policy requires all development to be of high architectural quality, maintain and enhance the character and heritage of the borough. That developments are compatible with local character including proportions, form, materials and detailing.
20. I also find conflict with LP Policy LP3, which reflects the aims of the Framework with regard to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Amongst other things, this seeks to conserve and retain original architectural features such as windows, doors, chimney stacks, walls and gates and resists any changes that could harm heritage assets.
21. I have also taken account of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) ('SPD'). In accordance with the appeal decision (Appendix 3 of the appellant's Statement of Case) the weight I attach to the SPD is a matter for me as the decision maker. In this case, LP Policy LP1 refers to SPDs. Amongst other things, the SPD says that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house. Also, that extension should harmonise with the original appearance, which should be taken as the starting point for any future changes and be carefully considered to ensure they are sympathetic and subservient to the main building.

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

22. I also noted the appearance and scale of the modern developments either side of the appeal property and the adjoining semi. However, the existence of these do not alter my findings on the main issue, which largely relates to the specific design of the proposal relative to the appeal property.

Conclusion

23. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR