



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2020

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/20/3256445
22 Oldfield Road, Hampton TW12 2AE

- 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 Mrs Charlene Dias against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1393/HOT, dated 22 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dormer extension on the rear roof slope and insertion of a rooflight on the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the significance of the Hampton Village Conservation Area (HVCA).

Reasons

3. The HVCA was first designated in 1969, and has been subsequently expanded twice, in 1982 and in 1991. The appeal property is located within the area included in the 1991 expansion, to the south of the railway station.
4. The HVCA is a designated heritage asset and its significance is derived in part from the traditional design of the buildings it contains, together with the spaces around them, including the streets and gardens.
5. Oldfield Road is a residential street which, in this vicinity, is characterised by traditional 2-storey, garden fronted terraced or semi-detached dwellings of various designs. The terrace containing the appeal building includes a hipped roof at both ends and has brick chimneys. Whilst each of the four dwellings it contains are somewhat different in appearance, there is still some coherence to the front elevation of the terrace.
6. The rear of the terrace has a less uniform appearance than the front elevation. It is also less visible, although there is a fenced footpath between Oldfield Road and Station Road to the north, which passes to the side of No 24.
7. The appeal building is a mid-terrace dwelling which retains many traditional features, including a 2-storey outrigger to the rear. The front and rear roofslopes are largely unaltered and the appeal building currently makes a

- positive contribution to the short terrace within which it is located and to this part of the HVCA.
8. The proposed development would entail the insertion of a rooflight on the front roof slope; and the insertion of a box dormer to the rear. The proposed rooflight would be of a similar design, scale and position to a rooflight on the front roofslope of No 20, next door. The proposed box dormer would be of a similar design, scale and massing, and would be located in a correspondingly similar position on the roof of No 22, as an existing dormer on No 20¹.
 9. From the very limited evidence it is not possible for me to conclude that the existing rooflight or the existing dormer on No 20 are lawful or unlawful. Nevertheless, they are features that have a bearing on the character and appearance of the area and the significance of the HVCA and I have assessed them accordingly.
 10. The scale and position of the existing rooflight on an otherwise largely unaltered front roofscape of the terrace makes it a visually prominent feature that is not in-keeping with the Oldfield Road roofscape.
 11. The design, materials, scale, massing and position on the roof of the existing dormer make it a large and incongruous feature on the roof of No 20 and the otherwise largely unaltered rear roofscape of the terrace. It extends across almost the full width of the property and the top of the box dormer projects above the roof ridgeline and is visible in views from Oldfield Road.
 12. Both the existing rooflight and box dormer detract from the character and appearance of the area and diminish the significance of the HVCA. The design of the windows and the intended materials of the proposed box dormer would be more sympathetic to the host building and the terrace than the existing dormer. However, the proposed design, scale, massing and position on the roof would still be out of keeping with the appeal building and would be a further bulky and inharmonious addition to the rear roofscape of the terrace. As with the existing dormer, the top of the proposed development would also be visible from Oldfield Road.
 13. I note the appellant's comments that the appeal proposal would match the scale and proportions of the existing dormer and so would be compatible with the existing townscape. However, I have found the existing dormer to have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.
 14. Whilst the proposal would provide a visual balance to the roofscape of the terrace, it would also increase the visual prominence of the front rooflights and the rear dormers to the detriment of the significance of the HVCA.
 15. The appellant makes reference to a recent approval for a dormer roof extension at the appeal property (LPA Ref. 19/2755/HOT). There is no drawn information regarding this approved scheme in the evidence before me, although I note that the scheme was revised following comments from the Council. In any event, each proposal should be considered on its individual merits, which is what I have done in the case of the appeal before me.
 16. The proposed rooflight and box dormer would detract from the positive contribution that the appeal building makes to the significance of the HVCA and

¹ The Council has indicated that it has no records for the next door dormer window.

would cause it less than substantial harm. No public benefits of the proposed development have been suggested. Therefore, with reference to paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) this less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset is not outweighed.

17. For these reasons the proposed development would detract from the significance of the HVCA. It would, therefore, conflict with Policies LP1 (local character and design quality) and LP3 (designated heritage asset) of the Richmond Local Plan July 2018 and with the Framework.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR