



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 August 2021

by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3269641

57 King Edwards Grove, Teddington, TW11 9LZ

- 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 Mrs Liz Cockett against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2495/HOT, dated 7 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft extension with new rear and side gables and roof extension on RHS. 2no. front facing rooflights, new access staircase and re-roofing of existing pitches. Minor internal alterations at FF.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. However, as the paragraph contents which are relevant to this appeal are unaltered, it has not been necessary to seek the views of the parties on this matter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the King Edwards Grove Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a two storey detached dwelling located within the Conservation Area. King Edwards Grove comprises a mixture of two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. As I observed on my site visit, there is some variety in terms of style and scale of houses with some variety in terms of roof design of dwellings located within the Conservation Area, with examples of dwellings located close to the appeal building which have been extended including roof additions.
5. The Conservation Area appraisal indicates that the significance of the designated heritage asset is derived from the architectural quality of houses with high quality detailing such as decorative timber work to balconies and veranda, with roofs exhibiting high quality architectural elements such as large chimneys, decorative ridge tiles and finials. The appraisal further indicates that problems and pressures for the Conservation Area include poor quality and disproportionate roof additions.

6. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Paragraph 199 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
7. Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018) (the Local Plan) requires new development to be of high architectural and urban design quality. This includes ensuring that development respects, contributes to, and enhances the local environmental and character. Policy LP3 of the Local Plan concerns Designated Heritage Assets, including Conservation Areas, expecting development to protect the significance and settings of these designated heritage assets.
8. The appeal building is set back from the highway behind a modestly sized front garden. The dwelling is two storey, exhibiting a timber detailed gabled front. The appeal building appears to have been previously extended and altered at roof level. However, whilst the frontage of the building at roof level is not symmetrical as a result of those extensions, the additions are subservient in scale and appearance to the host dwelling and do not dominate, or detract from, the positive contribution that the prominent front gable provides to the host building and to the Conservation Area.
9. The appeal proposal is for roof extensions to the sides and rear with additional rooflights to be inserted in the front roof slope. It is acknowledged that the proposed extensions and alterations would be set back from the front of the house, would not increase the overall height of the building and would result in the characteristic front gable form being retained. However, the proposed extensions would be substantial in terms of their mass and bulk and, in my view, would significantly unbalance the host dwelling at roof level and would result in the appeal property having an awkward top heavy and lopsided appearance. The use of matching materials would be insufficient to alleviate the imposing and disproportionate nature of the extensions.
10. The cumbersome, bulky and disproportionate roof extensions would unbalance the host building, being visually discordant and thereby harmful to the character and appearance of the area and to the significance of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the proposed extensions at roof level would be dominant, drawing the eye from the characteristic front gable which, as above, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the host building and to the Conservation Area. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, for the above reasons the scheme as a whole would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
11. In terms of the advice in the Framework, the harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be 'less than substantial', affecting only its immediate surroundings. As such the Framework sets out the need to address 'less than substantial harm' in a balanced manner against benefits associated with such schemes.
12. The Appellant has put it to me that the appeal proposal would provide for improved light and space within the host dwelling. However, in this instance, the public benefits of the proposal would appear to be limited to employment

opportunities during the proposed works. The limited benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the identified harm that would be caused to the Conservation Area to which I attach significant weight in accordance with paragraph 199 of the Framework.

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. There is conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan which, together and amongst other things, seek to ensure that developments are a high quality of design which conserve the character of the area. There is also conflict with the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document, House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) which seeks to ensure visual continuity is retained.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR