



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 May 2022

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/21/3285195

7-9, Fitzgerald Road, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HA

- 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 Jacqueline Crane against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/2001/FUL, 9 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a rear outrigger dormer, internal alteration, floorplan redesign and all associated works at 7 Fitzgerald Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Mortlake Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The proposed extension would be atop a first-floor rear outrigger, obscuring part of the existing rear roof dormer and above and existing ground floor rear extension, both of which are full width of the property. Nearby properties have various rear extensions which give the area a mixed character, and there is a large rear projection at 13 Fitzgerald Road that may have obscured original features. Nonetheless, the general pattern of outriggers remains visible along the rear elevation of the terrace.
4. I could clearly see the first floor and roof areas of the appeal building from Church Path, a right-of-way running diagonally along the rear of the site, together with the close approaches along this route. Glimpses of the building are also possible from Mullins Path Open Space and Mullins Path itself, together with views from surrounding properties. The visibility of the rear of the building from both public and private areas means that it contributes to the visual qualities of the Conservation Area.
5. The significance of the Conservation Area away from the riverside is drawn from the historic character of its residential properties together with the tight urban views that exist, as identified within the Council's *Mortlake, Mortlake Green & Queen's Road Conservation Areas Study*. Its *Conservation Area Plan* recognises that poorly designed and disproportionately sized roof additions together with the loss of traditional architectural features due to unsympathetic alterations are problems within the area.

6. The proposed extension would create a bulky addition which would, in conjunction with the existing rear elevation additions, appear incongruous in the context of its surroundings. Although the outrigger would still be identifiable, the obtrusive nature of the addition would result in a blocky appearance to the rear of the house. This would conflict with the aims of the Conservation Area Plan and Study.
7. Although the harm would be less than substantial as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm. I acknowledge that the proposal would address the household's changing needs, but this does not outweigh the harm. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Mortlake Conservation Area, and that furthermore it would harm these qualities of the area. It would also conflict with the Council's *Local Plan* (2019) Policies LP 1 and LP 3, which seek development of high architectural quality that conserves the historic environment, amongst other considerations.
8. The appellant has directed my attention to Local Plan Policy LP 8, and *The London Plan* Policy H2, but I do not consider these policies to be directly relevant to the main issue. I have had regard to the Council's adopted *House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (2015) within my decision.

Conclusion

9. There are no material considerations that require me to determine the appeal other than in accordance with the development plan for the area. Accordingly, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR