



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3278529

1 Chester Close, Queens Ride, Barnes, London, SW13 0JE

- 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 Rhiannon O'Neill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/1467/HOT, dated 26 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2021.
 - The development proposed the construction of a gable-style dormer to the side elevation of the dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the terrace, the locality and the Barnes Common Conservation Area, and consequently whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling on Chester Close, a private road with access from Queens Ride and Lower Common South, within the Barnes Common Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA relates to the common itself, the roads and footpaths through it and the way in surrounding housing relates to the common. That surrounding housing is from a variety of periods and styles which adds a sense of interest and enables the evolution of the area to be appreciated.
 5. The terrace in question is modern but has a degree of symmetry, with a three-storey central section, tapering down at each side to two storeys, with hipped roof profile. There are two other terraces within the complex but outside of the CA boundary which share the same design features, which creates a pleasing uniformity. I recognise that the symmetry has been diminished to a degree as a result of the extension to No.7. However, that two storey addition retained
-

the hipped roof profile and the staggered roof height such that a degree of symmetry remains. Overall, the design relates positively to the CA and makes a positive contribution on account of its scale and form, notwithstanding that it is a modern intervention, falling within an area of modern development as identified in Character Area 7 of the Barnes Village Design Guidance SPD (2015).

6. While the dormer would satisfy the guidance that relates to dormer windows as set out in section 8.1 of the Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (SPD), as a result of its scale it would be a substantial addition to the roof. Given the lack of a side dormer at the other end of the terrace, the dormer would unbalance the appearance of the terrace and fail to have regard to the carefully planned design of the block. As a result, it would appear as an unsympathetic addition that would erode the simple and attractive form of the building. Although trees and vegetation partially screen the appeal property, the roof is prominent from the busy Queens Ride, and any screening would diminish in the winter months.
7. As the two other terraces in the group are not within the Conservation Area, dormers could be erected to those properties under permitted development. However, whether that is likely to occur is hypothetical and the other blocks are far less prominent from within the CA. Accordingly, any harm that would arise would not be comparable to the appeal proposal.
8. The replacement dwelling at No.3 Queens Ride includes modest dormer windows to the side elevations. However, those side dormers retain the overall symmetry of the design, unlike the proposed dormer in this instance which would unbalance the appeal property. Similarly, the character and nature of other detached dwellings in the vicinity differs greatly from the uniform appearance of the terraces in Chester Close. Sherwood Close lies outside of the CA and the dormer extensions and hip to gable alterations that are present would not have been subject to the same policy context or restrictions as the appeal proposal.
9. For the above reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the CA and to the consistency of the group of terraced properties in the immediate locality. Given the localised extent of the impact the harm to the CA would be less than substantial but still carries significant weight, having regard to the statutory duty to preserve or enhance the CA. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development. No public benefits of the scheme have been identified with a desire to extend the property to provide additional space to meet the appellant's needs clearly identifiable as a private benefit which would not outweigh the identified harm.
10. Moreover, the proposal would conflict with policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (July 2018) (LP), which requires development to be compatible with local character including the relationship to existing townscape. The proposal would also fail to comply with policy LP3 of the LP, which requires the development in a Conservation Area to preserve or, if possible, enhance the character or the appearance of the Conservation Area. It would also be contrary to paragraph 134 the Framework, which states that

development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails local design policies.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed because of the conflict with the development plan and there being no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR