

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

**by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 December 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/19/3235242**  
**60A White Hart Lane, Barnes SW13 0PZ**

- 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 Ms Nancy Fletcher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
  - The application Ref 19/1670/FUL, dated 24 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 08 July 2019.
  - The development proposed is rear roof extensions including alterations to the pitch of the front roof slope and raising the ridge of the main roof and installation of new doors to the rear elevation of the outrigger.
- 

## 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 appeal property, a building of townscape merit, and the surrounding area including the Mortlake Conservation Area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is within the Mortlake Conservation Area (CA) which was extended in 2018 to include the western side of White Hart Lane, including the appeal site. The CA has two distinct character areas, the high street is intrinsically linked with the industrial nature of the River Thames and includes larger scale houses related to this, and the infilling of dwellings between St. Mary's Church and the High Street. White Hart Lane West, including the site is a row of Edwardian dwellings which have been converted to commercial use. It has a strong connection with the larger Edwardian buildings prevalent along the High Street.
4. The appeal site is a mixed-use terrace property, with the ground floor used as commercial and the upper floors for residential use. In common with the other properties in the same terrace, the building has a rear projection or 'outrigger' which extends some distance to the rear of the property. Whilst I observed a variety of roof extensions in the vicinity of the site, including dormers to the rear of the appeal terrace, no such extensions have been added to the rear outriggers of the buildings in the appeal terrace. Therefore, those outriggers have retained their original roof form and regular rhythm which contributes to the character and appearance of the terrace and of this part of the CA.

5. The building has been identified as a building of townscape merit, and as such it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Buildings of Townscape Merit Supplementary Planning Document 2015 (SPD) states that buildings with historical associations, architectural style, visual interest as well as their siting within an area, are of significance to the history and character of the environment. As such these buildings should be considered buildings of townscape merit. The significance of the appeal building is therefore considered to be derived from its historic and architectural merit within the CA.
6. The appeal proposal is for a rear dormer extension which would cover the full width of the rear roof. This would necessitate raising the ridge of the main roof of the property. The proposal would also add a roof extension to the rear outrigger. Whilst the additional height of this proposed outrigger extension would be lower than the proposed alterations to the main rear roof, it would add considerable bulk on top of the outrigger. This additional height and mass would appear as a bulky addition to the roof of the host dwelling and would appear as an incongruous feature. Combined with the extension to the main roof and in the apparent absence of any similar roof extensions to other outriggers in the same terrace, this would result in an overly boxy and discordant form. This would dominate the roofscape of the host property. I therefore find harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
7. There are a number of properties on this terrace with rear roof extensions, however a common theme in this locality is the unvaried form of the roof of rear outriggers. The Mortlake Conservation Area Statement states that one of the problems and pressures within the CA is poorly designed and disproportionately-sized roof additions. In this instance, in the context of the otherwise generally unaltered roofscape of the terrace's rear outriggers, the proposed extension would not be in keeping with the surrounding pattern of development and would increase this identified pressure on the CA. The development would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. The site benefits from an extant planning permission<sup>1</sup> for a rear roof extension including alterations to the pitch of the front roof and raising the ridge of the main roof. That consent permission also includes the installation of new doors to the rear elevation of the outrigger. Nonetheless, it is clear from the, albeit limited, evidence before me that the appeal proposal differs from that extent consent permission as it includes an extension over the rear outrigger. I have found that this element of the proposal harms the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Therefore, the appeal proposal would have adverse effect on CA compared with the extant planning permission.
9. As the host building has been identified by the Council as a building of townscape merit, it is considered a non-designated heritage asset. In accordance with paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I am required to balance the scale of any harm to the significance of the host building. That significance arises from its historical and architectural merit. In this case, for the reasons given, the scale and mass of the extension above the outrigger leads me to find harm to the character and appearance of the host building, and its significance as a non-designated heritage asset.

---

<sup>1</sup>Local Planning Authority reference 19/0727/FUL

10. As the appeal site lies within the CA, I also have a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a CA, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
11. For the reasons given above, I have found harm to the character and appearance of the host property, and thus to the significance of a building of townscape merit. Given the buildings significance within the CA, and the fact the proposal would be visible from a number of neighbouring properties, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the CA. Given the proposal is at the rear of the property and the scale of the proposal, the harm identified would be less than substantial. However, having regard to the Framework, I afford considerable weight to the desirability of preserving the CA.
12. The Framework states that where the development proposal will lead to a less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals. The appellant has not identified any public benefits of the proposal, and in the absence of any other substantive evidence I find no benefits which would outweigh the harm I have identified above.
13. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of existing roof extensions within the vicinity of the appeal site. This includes properties on First Avenue and White Hart Lane. However, properties on First Avenue, to the rear of the site are of a different building type to the appeal site, including the form of their rear outriggers. Furthermore, the property referred to at 55 White Hart Lane, and others within the same terrace as No 55 are on the opposite side of the road from the appeal site and are not within the Mortlake CA. The information before me regarding the circumstances in which other roof extensions in the vicinity were constructed is very limited. On the basis of the evidence before me, and my own observations, I am not satisfied that the location, appearance and circumstances of those other properties referred to are directly comparable in all respects to those in the case before me.
14. The appellant has referenced an appeal decision<sup>2</sup> granting permission for a rear roof extension at 68A White Hart Lane. I have not been provided with the full details of that scheme. However, from the limited information before me, it appears that it related only to extensions to the roof of the main building, and not to any works to its outrigger. Furthermore, the appeal decision pre-dates the extension to the CA. From the evidence before, I therefore am not satisfied that the circumstances in that case were directly comparable to those in the current appeal. In any event, notwithstanding those other roof extensions referred to, I have considered the appeal before me on its own planning merits and based on the particular circumstances and policy context applicable to this site.
15. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property, a building of townscape merit, and the surrounding area including the CA. It would therefore conflict with policies LP1,

---

<sup>2</sup> APP/L5810/W/15/3032519

LP3 and LP4 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan 2018. This seeks, amongst other things, that development to be of a high quality design that responds positively to local character and gives great weight to the conservation of heritage assets. The proposal would also conflict with section 16 the Framework which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment. It would also be contrary to the guidance within the SPD which amongst other things, seeks to enhance and protect historical assets.

### **Other matters**

16. I note that the proposal has been designed to reduce the impact on living conditions of neighbouring and future occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and privacy. However, such matters do not alter my conclusions with regard to the harm to character and appearance that I have identified.

### **Conclusions**

17. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

*S Shapland*

INSPECTOR