
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2019

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3237355

29 Berwyn Road, Richmond, London, TW10 5BP.

- 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 Green against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref. 19/0142/HOT, dated 19 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part single storey part two storey rear extension, two storey side extension and side dormer roof extension; and installation of rooflights to side roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a part single storey part two storey rear extension, two storey side extension and side dormer roof extension; and installation of rooflights to side roof slopes, at 29 Berwyn Road, Richmond, London, TW10 5BP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/0142/HOT, dated 19 December 2018, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents, where applicable: PL02 A, PL01 A, PL04 D, PL03 B, 18-01 EX01, Heritage and Design Statement received 16 Jan 2019. PL5 E, PL6 G, PL7 E received 20 Mar 2019.
 - 3) No new external finishes (including fenestration), including works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the existing, unless otherwise indicated on approved drawings or within the submitted application form.
 - 4) The proposed second floor south elevation windows/rooflights and proposed first and second floor north elevation windows/rooflights as indicated on drawing. no. 18-01 PL/06 Rev. G of the extensions hereby approved shall at no time be openable or glazed, otherwise than in obscured glass, below a minimum height of 1.7 metres (5'7") above the relevant floor level.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations and extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and its setting in the Sheer Common Drive Conservation Area (Area No. 69).

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site contains a two storey detached house which lies in a residential area of similar properties. The elevations of the house are a mixture of facing brick at ground floor with rendered elevations at first floor level and the front elevation has timber panel detailing. The roof is tiled with a hipped form. The local area forms part of the Sheer Common Drive Conservation Area.
4. I note that planning permission was granted by the Council in 2018 under ref. 18/1389/HOT on a similar scheme to that now proposed. The main difference being that in the approved scheme the two storey rear extension had a hipped roof end with a single rooflight in a side and the rear roof planes, while the appeal scheme has a part gable roof end lit by a triangular window and it is proposed to have three rooflights in each side roof slope. This permitted scheme is a material consideration.

Effect on character and appearance

5. In assessing the effect on the significance of the Conservation Area, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of this area and I have placed great weight on the conservation of this heritage asset.
6. The extensions proposed mainly relate to the rear of the property and will not be apparent from the front or be prominent in the street scene. There is a proposed projecting dormer on the north side elevation which gives light to a stairwell, however this is set back from the front elevation and will not harm the overall design and appearance of the property.
7. On the rear elevation the single storey extension is of a contemporary design. I noted at my site visit that the main structure of this extension has been built pursuant to the previous permission. Dealing with the difference to the main roof, the two storey extension would have the same ridge height and width of gable but the end of the roof would be finished with a half hip and the triangular horizontal section would be glazed.
8. The Council suggests that this feature would appear incongruous and would disrupt the balance and appearance of the host dwelling but I do not agree. It struck me that gables were a common traditional architectural feature locally and at my visit I noted that the adjacent properties to the north have prominent gables at second floor level in the rear facing roof. Further, I find that the contemporary design of having a triangular area of glazing in the gable would complement the original form of the building rather than conflict with it or appear unsympathetic. I am satisfied that the original architectural design of the property and its roof scape would still prevail overall and would not be materially unbalanced. The proposal therefore meets the requirements of Policy LP 3.

9. Overall on this issue, I find that the proposal would preserve both the character and appearance of the host property and its setting in the Conservation Area and would not harm the significance of the heritage asset.

Other matters

10. I have taken account of the objections put forward at application stage but these appear to relate to the effect of the scheme already permitted and, in addition to my assessment of the design and appearance considered above, are not directly connected to the changes put forward in the current scheme. In practical terms this limits the weight that can be given to these objections.

Planning balance

11. On the main issue I have found that having regard to the development previously permitted and commenced on this site, the current proposal would not harm the character or the appearance of the host property and its contribution to the significance of the Sheer Common Drive Conservation Area. The proposal would preserve this heritage asset and meet the requirements of the relevant development plan policy. There are no other considerations which outweigh this. This indicates that planning permission should be granted.
12. In terms of conditions the Council recommends four. In addition to the standard condition on the commencement of development (No.1), the plans that are approved should be specified in the interests of clarity and to maintain the appearance of the host building (No.2). For a similar reason, it is also necessary to impose condition No.3 to ensure that the external materials match the existing property unless otherwise specified on the approved plans. Finally, in order to avoid overlooking and a loss of privacy for neighbours, I will impose condition No.4 to ensure that the specified roof lights are non-opening and glazed with obscure glass.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR