



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3278843

55 Amyand Park Road, Twickenham, TW1 3HG

- 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 Maddy Darrall and Simon Reay against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/0690/HOT, dated 25 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with new rear dormer and internal alterations to first floor.
-

Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Maddy Darrall against the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. The Council, in its decision notice, described the proposed development as a "rear dormer roof extension."
4. In its reasons for refusal, the Council refers to the absence of a Fire Safety Statement. The Council suggested that a planning condition requiring the submission of a Fire Safety Statement ahead of above ground works or demolition, could be imposed should the appeal succeed. I note that the approach set out has regard to London Plan (2021) Policy D12 (Fire Safety).

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a three storey bay-fronted semi-detached dwelling and comprises a Building of Townscape Merit located in a residential area within the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area.
-

7. The Amyand Park Road Conservation Area is characterised by the presence of late Victorian and Edwardian terraced and semi-detached dwellings including, like the appeal property, three storey brick dwellings with decorative moulded window and door surrounds.
8. Much of the strong character of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area derives from the presence of buildings of architectural merit, including the appeal property, a Building of Townscape Merit and the meandering nature of Amyand Park Road itself, which reveals a changing series of views, tied together to some considerable degree by the presence of traditional architectural features and materials.
9. During my site visit, I observed the roofscape including and immediately surrounding the appeal property. Whilst there are a number of examples of dormers, these tend to be constructed with hanging roof tiles matching the materials of host properties. I am also mindful of the Council's comments in relation to the presence of dormers pre-dating current policies, dormers being present on dwellings that are not Buildings of Townscape Merit, and Number 53's dormer, adjacent, having no permission record.
10. The proposed dormer would be situated on the rear roofslope of the appeal property. It would not be set down from the main roof ridge and as a result of this, I find that it would appear as an unduly dominant feature when seen from the side and/or rear of the appeal property.
11. The harm arising as a consequence of this would be exacerbated as a result of the choice of materials. Unlike other nearby examples, the proposed dormer's zinc cladding would combine with the siting, scale and form of the proposal to result in it drawing undue attention to itself as an intrusively modern addition out of keeping with its surroundings.
12. Whilst I note that the appeal property has a modern extension to the rear, the proposed dormer would be visually separated from this, appearing separately at the top of the roof, rather than as an adjoining or continued extension. The dormer would jar with the traditional appearance and period qualities of the appeal property's roof and it would appear unsympathetic and fail to respond positively to the identified qualities of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would fail to conserve the character and appearance of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area. Having regard to paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and to Planning Practice Guidance, I consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. This needs to be balanced against any public benefits the development may bring.
14. In this respect, the appellants consider that the proposal would optimise the use of the dwelling, represent significant investment, ensure long term owner occupation and improve family living. However, these do not comprise benefits that would amount to such public benefits that they would outweigh the harm identified.

15. Consequently, I find that the proposal would fail to conserve the character and appearance of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Local Plan¹ Policies LP1, LP3 and LP4; and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): House Extensions and Alterations (2015), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

16. The appellants consider that the significance of the building lies in its front façade and states that the rear of the property "simply doesn't" have historic merit. I note that the various aspects of the roof of the appeal property – not just the front – are widely visible from a range of locations and that the roof's period qualities contribute to the attributes of the Amyand Park Road Conservation Area.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference: Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018).