

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3150505

28 Maze Road, Kew, Richmond upon Thames TW9 3DE

- 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 Casey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/0119/HOT, dated 13 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is modifications to existing loft conversion including replacement of two dormers with hip to gable end.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area; and would be of sufficient design quality.

Reasons

3. The property lies within the Kew Green Conservation Area. This is characterised by the development along the Thames; Kew Green itself; and also the residential streets to the east. The Kew Village Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2014 describes that these streets are comprised of good-quality nineteenth and early twentieth-century housing. The different developments all have a distinct character and style. Generally, the houses are well-preserved and the groups retain their historic character.
 4. This proposal would replace an existing small side facing dormer window with a hip to gable extension of the roof. A dormer to the rear would be replaced by a larger box style dormer structure. The gap between this property and its neighbour is limited and obscured in most views by vegetation. This house and its two neighbours have distinctive forward facing gables. The gable would be retained and it would remain a dominant feature as the new side facing gable would be set back from it.
 5. Given that the small side facing dormer would be removed, I consider that the hip to gable extension would represent good quality design in this context. The
-

- proposed works would have very limited public prominence and would have little impact on the wider character or appearance of the front of the property.
6. The alterations to the rear would be partially visible from Forest Road, above the garages and through the existing vegetation. Part of the wider form of the dormer would be obscured from view by the side elevation of the neighbouring house. The alterations would have only a limited visual impact given the distances from the public vantage points and the almost hidden position of some of the new works. The existing dormer is of a modest scale and follows, to some extent, the design detailing of the dwelling. The proposed larger dormer would be at odds with the original character and appearance of the property. It would be more satisfactory than the neighbouring roof structure but I find that its form and scale would represent poor design.
 7. Overall, the development would not significantly alter the character or appearance of the building as experienced from public vantage points. I am satisfied that the works would preserve the existing character and appearance of the Kew Green Conservation Area. However, the size and form of the rear facing dormer would be at odds with the character of the dwelling and would represent poor design. Although it would provide improved internal accommodation and a more efficient use of the dwelling, I am not satisfied that these benefits are sufficient to justify poor design.
 8. As the proposal would have such a limited wider impact, I do not find conflict with the conservation area requirements of Policy DM HD1 of the Development Management Plan 2011. However, Policy DM DC1 and Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy 2009 require high architectural and urban design quality in all new development. The *National Planning Policy Framework* is also clear that permission should be refused for development of poor design. I acknowledge that the Council's Design Guidelines indicate that in order to create sufficient internal headroom, it may be acceptable, as a compromise, to have a small dormer with a flat roof. However, this proposal falls outside this guidance as the dormer would extend across most of the rear roof slope.
 9. I acknowledge that the proposal would not result in harm to the conservation area and the works would have only a limited wider impact. I do not find that the hip to gable extension would have an unacceptable design or would result in harm. Whilst I note that there are other examples of similar rear alterations in the area, including the addition to the neighbouring roof, I must consider this proposal on its own merits. I find that the rear dormer would represent poor design. I am not satisfied that the matters put forward are sufficient to outweigh this concern. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR