

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3168130

16 Ham Street, Ham, TW10 7HT

- 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 Martin Bennett (Clinton Properties Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/3861/HOT dated 1 October 2016 was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a rear roof dormer extension.
-

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 whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ham House Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modestly sized mid-terrace house, which is identified as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) and is situated within the Ham House Conservation Area (Conservation Area). Part of the terrace contains modest two storey properties where the symmetry and pattern of windows and doors, the presence of chimneys and the consistent use of a white painted exterior, contributes to the distinctiveness of this group of buildings and to the character of the Conservation Area.
 4. The proposal is for a dormer on the rear elevation which would occupy a large portion of the rear roof slope. At the time of my visit, I was able to see that the two-storey properties on the terrace retained a largely original roof form, comprising of traditional pitched roofs which are generally unobstructed other than being punctuated at regular intervals by chimneys. The scale of the proposal, despite it not exceeding the ridge height of the property and the intended use of materials to match those of the existing dwelling, would significantly alter the character and appearance of the existing roofscape. It would have a box like form that would not be in keeping with the predominant historic form of the terrace, which comprises of traditional pitched roofs.
-

5. Although I note the appellant's reference to the rear of the site being well screened and the proposal not being seen as an obvious addition from public vantage points, the dormer would however be visible from the rear of other properties within the Conservation Area. Whilst there is a contrasting ridge height in the terrace, the proposal would nevertheless interrupt the clear roofscape that exists amongst the two storey properties and appear as a large bulky addition to this part of the terrace.
6. Reference has been made to an approval at No. 30 Ham Street for a rear dormer loft extension. Whilst this nearby site may also be designated a BTM and is within the Conservation Area, it is a three-storey property and from the information before me, the overall size of the dormer, and in particular its height is smaller than the appeal proposal. I have also taken note of the referenced appeal decision¹. Although some information on this has been provided, I am not aware of the full circumstances of the case. From the decision itself however, it would appear that the site is not located within a conservation area.
7. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, which is a BTM and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Policy CP7 of the Council's Core Strategy, Policies DM DC 1 and DM HD 1 of the Council's Development Management Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document's '*House Extensions and External Alterations*' and '*Buildings of Townscape Merit*'. It would also be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seeks to conserve or enhance the historic environment. Given the harm that I have identified in respect of the main issue, I do not consider the proposed development would be the form of sustainable development, that the Framework intends there to be a presumption in favour of.
8. In relation to designated heritage assets, paragraph 134 of the Framework indicates that where there would be harm that is less than substantial, as in this case, it must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals. I note the height of the dormer is required to provide adequate head room. This would provide benefit to the occupiers and future occupiers of the appeal dwelling but would provide little public benefit. This would not in any case outweigh the harm to the heritage asset that I have identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/L5810/W/15/3014390