



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: 1 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3279981

79 North Worple Way, Mortlake, London, SW14 8PP

- 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 Alan Cathersides against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/1394/HOT, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing rear extension and erection of part one storey part two storey rear extension. Demolition of chimney stack stub and repair of slate roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. The Council, in its decision notice, described the proposed development in the same way as that set out on the appeal form and added a reference to "1 rooflight on rear roof slope."

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Mortlake Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, bay-fronted semi-detached period property with an attractive hipped roof and dates from the 19th Century. It has an attached single storey garage to the side and has been extended at ground floor level to the rear. Like its adjoining neighbour, Number 77 North Worple Way, it has a two storey outrigger to the rear.
 5. The pair of dwellings face towards North Worple Way and as such, are set perpendicular to their neighbours – rows of houses fronting Alder Road and Victoria Road. This and the presence of a footpath alongside the side of the appeal property results in glimpses through to its side and rear from numerous locations.
-

6. The appeal property is located within a residential area and is situated within the Mortlake Conservation Area, which has a historic core at St Marys Church and is characterised by the presence of many fine 18th Century buildings, respected and complemented by later development. Whilst there are contrasts in the scale of buildings, a shared robust utilitarian conformity in the use of brickwork and detailing combines with greenery and views to provide for a cohesive character.
7. Many of the period features of the appeal property and its adjoining neighbour have been retained. Whilst changes over the years have resulted in differences between the two dwellings, the overall roof form, front elevation, rear outriggers and materials provide for an attractive sense of symmetry and together, the dwellings make a positive contribution to their surroundings.
8. The Council's concerns focus on the proposed first floor extension. This would comprise a flat-roofed addition to the side of the outrigger.
9. I find that this would appear as an awkward addition, due to the proposal's introduction of massing adjacent to the outrigger at first floor level in combination with its flat-roofed form. The scale and flat roof of the proposed development would result in it failing to integrate with the established hipped slate roof of the appeal property. It would visually jar with, detract from and unbalance, the symmetry afforded by the rear outriggers of Nos 77 and 79.
10. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the prominent position of the proposed addition – being prominently sited at first floor level – such that it would draw attention to itself as an incongruous feature when seen from various locations with views through to the side and rear of the appeal property.
11. Consequently, the proposal would comprise an unsympathetic addition.
12. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would fail to conserve the character and appearance of the Mortlake Conservation Area. Having regard to paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and to Planning Practice Guidance, I find 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.
13. In this respect, there is no substantial evidence to demonstrate that there are any benefits that would amount to such public benefits that they would outweigh the harm identified.
14. Consequently, I find that the proposal would fail to conserve the character and appearance of the Mortlake 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.

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

Other Matters

15. The appellant, in support of his case, refers to letters of support and the absence of objections to the proposal. Whilst I note this support stands in favour of the proposal, I have found that the proposed development would fail to conserve the character and appearance of the Mortlake Conservation Area and the letters of support do not, in themselves, outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR