
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2020

Appeal A: APP/L5810/W/19/3240685

108 Castelnau, Barnes, London SW13 9EU

- 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 Ken Mcfarlane against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/2063/HOT, dated 2 July 2019, was refused by the Council by notice dated 28 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the existing rear dormer and rooflight are to be removed and replaced with a larger rear dormer. A new slate roof covering is proposed to match the existing.
-

Appeal B: APP/L5810/Y/19/3238846

108 Castelnau, Barnes, London SW13 9EU

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Ken Mcfarlane against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/2064/LBC, dated 2 July 2019, was refused by the Council by notice dated 28 August 2019.
 - The works proposed are the existing rear dormer and rooflight are to be removed and replaced with a larger rear dormer. A new slate roof covering is proposed to match the existing.
-

Decision Appeal A

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the existing rear dormer and rooflight to be removed and replaced with a larger rear dormer and a new slate roof covering to match the existing at 108 Castelnau, Barnes, London SW13 9EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2063/HOT, dated 2 July 2019, subject to the following conditions 1) to 5) on the attached schedule.

Decision Appeal B

2. I allow the appeal and grant listed building consent for the existing rear dormer and rooflight to be removed and replaced with a larger rear dormer and a new slate roof covering to match the existing at 108 Castelnau, Barnes, London SW13 9EU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/2064/LBC, dated 2 July 2019 and the plans submitted with it and subject to conditions 1) to 4) on the attached schedule.

Main Issue

3. The building is listed Grade II and is within the Castelnau Conservation Area; the main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposal on designated heritage assets.

Reasons

4. The proposal would see the replacement of a smaller rear dormer and a modern rooflight with a single larger dormer said to be a match to that already in place at number 110, the other half of the semi-detached pair.
5. Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Richmond Local Plan set out requirements respectively on local character and design quality, and on designated heritage assets. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72(1) of the same Act requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
6. Paragraph 193 of the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
7. The listing description refers to pairs of houses, 84 to 122 on this side of the road, and on the other side, 91 to 125, dating from about 1842 and includes the fact that many have later attics and dormers. The ensemble, as well as the individual houses, retains a high degree of architectural and historic significance as seen from Castelnau, with limited later interventions at roof level and over, or in place of, the one-time coach house to the side. At the date of listing in 1983, the description refers to these features.
8. To the rear there is more variety at roof level with a full width dormer in one nearby case. It is accepted that at least one dormer similar to that proposed here, at number 106 was approved in 1984, after the listing (Ref 84/0477). Also more evident to the rear is the variety and effect of the side additions, some being prominent and poorly connected to the host building, but in the case of number 108, the addition has been skilfully arranged with a recessed glazed 'flash-gap' to visually divorce new from old, and the architectural quality of that addition is evident also in the internal spaces, the staircase in particular.
9. The conclusion from observations along the front and rear of the even numbered properties is that the significance is less to the rear where there is variety and some jarring elements at roof level. However, the use of a dormer similar to that now proposed at the appeal property does not appear out of place or jarring where they exist at present.
10. The Council differentiate between the historic and architectural value of pre-1939 dormers, such as the present appeal installation, and those placed more recently, it being accepted that dormers have been added throughout the Twentieth Century. The pre-existing dormer is narrow and reflects the largely vertical emphasis of the fenestration below but does not align with those historic sash windows and casement doors, and the bow-top does not impart such an architectural interest as to require its preservation.

11. There is merit in architectural terms in matching that already in place on the paired number 110, and although the Council argue that the presence of dormers on both, albeit of differing sizes, does not result in an unbalanced form, the view taken at the appeal site inspection is contrary to that.
12. Provided that the new dormer is a reasonable match in size and form to that next door, the removal of the present dormer and rooflight and replacement would not cause harm to the architectural or historic significance of the listed building and would preserve the character and appearance of the Castelnau Conservation Area. The proposal would satisfy the statutory tests in the 1990 Act, the requirements of Local Plan Policies LP1 and LP3, as well as the provisions for the preservation of designated heritage assets set out in the Framework.

Conditions

13. In addition to the commencement conditions in each case, the planning permission should list the 'as proposed' drawings for the avoidance of doubt. Whilst drawings P31.0 and P34.0 specify materials and drawing P36.0 indicates the joinery proposals and profile of the fascia, and that is sufficient to judge the planning and listed building merits, there is a need for greater detail to ensure the quality of the work and the reasonable match with number 110.

Conclusions

14. The proposal would not cause harm to the significance of the listed building or the conservation area, and hence would accord with statute, local and Central Government policy on the care of designated heritage assets. Conditions can ensure the success of the project and the quality of the work. For the reasons given above it is concluded that both appeals should be allowed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS – APPEAL A PLANNING PERMISSION

- 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: P31.0, P32.0, P33.0, P34.0, P35.0 and P36.0.
- 3) No windows shall be manufactured or put in place until full joinery details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include all profiles, method of hanging and balancing the sashes, method of glazing and glass thickness and cavity gap. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

- 4) No covering to the cheeks, tops and fascia of the dormer hereby approved shall be carried out until full details of the leadwork and any rolls and steps have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Notwithstanding the reference on drawings P31.0 and P34.0 to 'new slate to match existing', no slating work is to be carried out until samples have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved samples.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS – APPEAL B LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) No windows shall be manufactured or put in place until full joinery details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include all profiles, method of hanging and balancing the sashes, method of glazing and glass thickness and cavity gap. The works shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) No covering to the cheeks, tops and fascia of the dormer hereby approved shall be carried out until full details of the leadwork and any rolls and steps have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) Notwithstanding the reference on drawings P31.0 and P34.0 to 'new slate to match existing', no slating work is to be carried out until samples have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved samples.