
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 06 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3175305
40 Montague Road, Richmond TW10 6QJ

- 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 Thomas and Mrs Carolyn Singer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 17/0890/HOT, dated 1 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of new dormer on south east flank roof slope. Replacement of existing concrete roof tiles with new natural slates. Renewal of lower side roof with new natural slates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant points out that permission for the replacement roof tiles has been granted under a previous application. The roof tiles comprise part of this appeal and so must be considered. However, this does not affect the legitimacy of the previous permission granted.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property, which is a locally listed building; and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding St Matthias Conservation Area

Reasons

4. The property is a locally listed Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) as a substantial four storey square built Victorian villa on Richmond Hill set amongst others of a similar era although with a mixture of styles. It has a side extension which has closed the gap between it and the adjacent properties, and other properties have also had similar side extensions, but they are not terraces. A new dormer is proposed on the main roof.
5. As a locally listed building with the above features, the appeal property is a non designated heritage asset so that the effect of the proposal on its significance must be considered under paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It sits within the St Matthias Conservation Area

(CA) which is a designated heritage asset characterised by a high quality townscape of mid to late Victorian development surrounding St Matthias Church which is a major landmark prominent upon the hill. The grandeur of villas in Montague Road is noted and this building is one such villa and so contributes to its significance. Consequently I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA in determining this appeal in accordance with section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6. The dormer would be a much larger and more prominent addition compared to the small low level rooflights that are already in the roof. By reason of its height and scale, it would erode the building's architectural integrity and detract from its appearance and its significance overall because it would appear overdominant in comparison with the current shallow hipped roof and the roof profiles of adjacent buildings. The appellant asserts that views of it would be restricted by the proximity of tall adjacent buildings and the steep angle of the roof, but overall I find it would be readily visible from within the surrounding area because of its side location and because views are not limited to street level.
7. The proposal would have some benefits by replacing concrete tiles with slate ones that would be more in keeping with the building and the CA. However, I consider that this improvement would not compensate for a harmful unsympathetic addition since the side dormer would be an intrusive feature that would appear incongruous in the streetscene and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA and the BTM.
8. I have had regard to other extensions and alterations within the area and those raised by the appellant. The Council also state that some of these extensions may have been permitted under different policy criteria applying in the past. There are dormers largely front and rear dormers to different styles of property nearby and, because of the mixture of styles along the road, the same type of extension could have a greater effect in one location but not at another, depending on the nature of the building and its effect upon it. Consequently I find that these dormers are not directly comparable to the appeal property. I find that the side dormers at No 5, No 1 and No 34 are to dwellings that have a different roof arrangement than the appeal property, and two of them are largely obscured behind substantial chimney features. In particular, as a BTM this building merits particular consideration.
9. The development would have a negative impact on both the building and the CA that would lead to less than substantial harm. In accordance with paragraph 134 and 135 of the Framework I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. It would improve the home but this is not a public benefit. It would result in an improved appearance by using slate tiles more appropriate to the building and the CA. This modest benefit is however substantially outweighed by the harm that would arise from the remainder of the proposed development.
10. Due to the harm to the character and appearance of both the locally listed appeal property and the surrounding CA the proposed development would be contrary to the Framework and would conflict with Policies HD1 and HD3 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Development Management Plan 2011 which relate to the importance of heritage assets. Together with Policy

DC1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Development Management Plan 2011 (LP) its supplementary planning documents and Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Core Strategy 2009 these seek to ensure that developments respect the character and appearance of existing buildings and areas.

Conclusion

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

S Jones

INSPECTOR