



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 April 2021

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/20/3259366

13 Larkfield Road, Richmond, London TW9 2PG

- 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 & Mrs John & Karla Niblett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 20/1770/HOT dated 26/06/2020, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is ground floor side/rear extension. First Floor rear extension. Alterations/recladding of the existing second floor rear dormer. Replacement window and door on side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor side/rear extension. First Floor rear extension. Alterations/recladding of the existing second floor rear dormer. Replacement window and door on side elevation at 13 Larkfield Road, Richmond, London TW9 2PG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1770/HOT dated 26/06/2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location Plan; and drawing No's P2020/05-111.1; and P2020/05-113.1.
 - 3) For the avoidance of doubt the materials used in the development shall be those stated on the application form, design and access statement and detailed on the approved plans with the exception of the cladding material for the rear dormer. The cladding of the dormer shall not take place until details of materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of development, this is also the description used by the Appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal. The proposal before me does not alter the previous approval which the Appellant references in the description of development on the application form, accordingly I have adopted an amended

description in the heading above rather than the Appellants description of development.

3. I observed during my site visit that works were underway at the site, I understand that there is an existing approval for a similar development at the site. I could not be certain if the works being carried out were in relation to the existing approval or related to the development before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of recladding of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the conservation area.
5. The Council do not raise concern with regard to the other elements of the application, namely the ground floor rear extension, first floor extension and replacement window and door on the side elevation, I see no reason to disagree.

Reasons

6. The site is within a residential area comprising predominantly semi-detached properties. The site is located within the Central Richmond Conservation Area. The properties along Larkfield Road share a number of similar features and materials, although there are minor variations in some finer details.
7. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area. The Conservation Area, in the immediate area of the appeal site is characterised by dwellings which are unified in design and scale with shared external materials and features. The appeal property, along with other traditional dwellings nearby play a role in defining the historic character of the area which is part of the Conservation Area's significance as a heritage asset.
8. The rear dormer would be visible from public vantage points, particularly from the A316, Lower Mortlake Road which is a busy highway. The proposed development includes the recladding of the dormer and the plans and information before me indicate this would be in a copper sheet material.
9. My attention has been drawn to a recent development at 21-21A St John's Road which is clad in a metallic material. I viewed the development during my site visit and whilst the material used is non-traditional and not a common feature in the conservation area, I noted that it was within a different setting.
10. The St John's Road development is located within an area of varying design and style of buildings within a mixed-use area. I therefore do not consider this development to be comparable to the proposal before me. Each development needs to be considered on its individual merits and circumstances against the relevant policies and taking account of other material considerations. I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merits of the appeal proposal.
11. Taking these factors into account, I find that the recladding of the rear dormer in copper cladding would be a discordant feature which would detract from harmonious design of the area which is of significance to the Conservation Area. Paragraph 192 of the Framework indicates that the desirability of

sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets should be taken into account in determining planning applications.

12. Notwithstanding my above findings, the materials used in the proposed development can be controlled by a planning condition. A condition can be imposed to ensure sympathetic materials which do not detract from the conservation area are used in the proposed development.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed recladding of the rear dormer would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Central Richmond Conservation Area. There is no conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which seeks to ensure developments are a high quality of design which conserve the character of the area.
14. There is also no conflict with the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document, House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) (the SPD) states that the side of dormer windows should be covered in materials that match or complement the main roof.

Conclusion and Conditions

15. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
16. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the conservation area I have imposed a condition concerning materials.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR