



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2022

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/22/3294673

50 Halford Road, Richmond, TW10 6AP

- 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 A Borrelli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/0050/FUL, dated 10 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "*single storey rear and first floor rear extensions (resubmission)*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It has been brought to my attention that the appellant's name is misspelt on the application form. I have therefore corrected this in the header, above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are, firstly, whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Richmond Hill Conservation Area and, secondly, the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 48 Halford Road with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Conservation area

4. The appeal site is within the Richmond Hill Conservation Area, which encompasses areas of attractive historic townscape and open land on either side of the River Thames. Whilst it contains a variety of building types and uses, the conservation area is unified by its relationship to Richmond Hill. Its significance stems from the large number of well-preserved buildings and spaces that reflect the historic development of the area, particularly during the 18th and 19th centuries.
5. The appeal site is located on Richmond Hill within an area of historic townscape. The Conservation Area Statement identifies Halford Road and the surrounding streets as dating to the early Victorian period, being developed following the arrival of the railways in Richmond in 1846. The appeal property itself comprises an attractive Victorian terrace that is constructed in buff stock

brick. The street is characterised by such terraces, and it has a relatively consistent and uniform character. Whilst the appeal property is not locally listed as a 'building of townscape merit', and has been extensively altered, it still makes a positive contribution to this character.

6. The proposed extension would be positioned at the rear of the property and would be 2 stories in height. The upper storey of the extension would infill a small gap between the rear elevation of the property and the outrigger. This would be at a point where the style of outriggers changes between those to Nos 50-54, and the properties to the north, which have broader, lower, outriggers with a dual pitched roof shape.
7. The upper part of the extension would be partly visible from some points along Vineyard Passage and Grosvenor Avenue. However, such views would be glimpsed in nature and the extension would otherwise be obscured by existing trees, walls, and buildings. It would also have a traditional appearance in terms of its materials and proportions that would be sympathetic to the character of No 50. At this point, between differing styles of rear outriggers, I do not consider that it would unduly disrupt the rhythm at the rear of these properties. In any case, given its limited visibility, it would not be readily perceptible from public views in the surrounding area.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Richmond Hill Conservation Area. It would therefore be in accordance with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Richmond Local Plan (2018), and guidance in the Framework relating to designated heritage assets.

Living conditions

9. The development would be positioned in close proximity to the shared boundary with No 48 Halford Road. Whilst the lower ground floor part of the extension would be largely screened from view, the upper storey would project significantly above the boundary fence. This would be positioned less than a metre from the boundary and would be in close proximity to French doors and a patio area at the rear of No 48.
10. From the garden of No 48, the upper part of the extension would be seen as a tall expanse of brickwork in close proximity to the boundary. This would create an imposing presence that would significantly enclose the patio area along one side. This would have a harmful overbearing effect that would be visually oppressive to users of the garden area. Moreover, given the relatively small size of the garden to No 48, the proposed extension would impact upon a significant proportion of it.
11. The appellant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight Report¹ which concludes that the extension would meet the relevant BRE guidelines in relation to daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. However, this assessment is limited to the effect on neighbouring windows only. It therefore does not address my concerns regarding an enclosing effect on the rear garden area of No 48.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 48 Halford Road with regard to outlook. It would therefore be contrary to Policy LP8 of the Richmond Local

¹ Ref 1846/JN (Daylight and Sunlight (UK) Limited, 7 January 2022)

Plan (2018) which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that new development protects the amenity and living conditions of adjoining and neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to outlook. Whilst it would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would generate some modest economic benefits during the construction phase, that does not alter my view that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR