

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 December 2016

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

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

**Decision date: 17 January 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3163158**  
**62 Lebanon Park, Twickenham, TW1 3DQ**

- 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 Mr Ian Rennie against the decision Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 16/2644/HOT, dated 3 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2016.
  - The development proposed is a rear dormer and rooflights in rear elevation.
- 

### 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 host property and the locality.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is a very attractively detailed two storey mid terrace dwelling in a neighbourhood of broadly similar homes that come together as an area of established residential character and extremely pleasing aesthetics. In contrast to its immediate neighbours the appeal property has one sizeable, pitched roof, rear dormer and this is visible from the public highway to the rear and a number of dwellings which front this road. The proposal is as described above, i.e. adding a second dormer, and would also embody refurbishing the existing dormer which has deteriorated.
  4. The site lies within the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Policy DM HD1 of the Council's Development Management Plan (DMP) reflects this and adds more detail about further Council actions intended to ensure the safeguarding of these heritage assets. The appeal property is classed as a 'Building of Townscape Merit' (BTM) by the Council and lies alongside others of the same status.
-

5. In the circumstances of heritage assets it is important to respect the scale, proportions, shape and form of roofs within the locality as a whole when considering change. Whilst there is some evidence of architectural detailing and of dormers for the most part the roofs in this Conservation Area play a simple and subsidiary role to the often ornate and bold main elevations of the dwellings. The addition of a large dormer, even alongside an existing similar structure and even to the rear, would unduly detract from this quality and would patently be seen as a non-original and incompatible accoutrement. The effect of the proposal would be for the original roof slope to be substantially lost, for the building to become overly 'top heavy', and for incongruity in design and excessive scale of change to the roof to occur. The development would add further disruption to the original qualities of the terrace and would be visually jarring in the local scene and I could not condone such change within this context.
6. Policy CP7 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies DM DC1 and DM HD3 of the DMP are relevant. Taken together they call for, amongst other matters, protection of local distinctiveness with high quality design sympathetic to the host building and its wider setting and alteration or extension to BTMs only against the backdrop of respecting the architectural character and detailing of the original building. This is reflected in the objectives of the Council's SPD 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) and the 'Buildings of Townscape Merit' SPD (2015) albeit these documents cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the cited development plan policies and purposes of the guidance. It would also run contrary to the aims of S72(1) of the Act and Policy DM HD1 of the DMP because there would not be preservation or enhancement of character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

*Other matters*

7. I sympathise with the Appellant's wish to increase and improve the accommodation of this property. I recognise that the existing dormer size and design has been taken as the cue for the new proposal and in some instances this could be the appropriate solution; it certainly would avoid a 'box-like' slab on the roof as the Appellant puts it. However, my concerns in this case of duplication are as set out above. I appreciate that neighbours' residential amenity has not been raised as an issue and there are no Council objections to the front roof lights. It is commendable that the Appellant has considered energy efficiency and natural light. I note that the Appellant feels somewhat aggrieved over the lack of advice from the Council. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be, such as construction employment, would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore there are no other benefits, including to the Appellant,

which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

*Overall conclusion*

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR