



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/21/3283531

44A Church Road, Teddington TW11 8PB

- 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 Kashif Salman of Conway Investments Properties Ltd against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/2035/FUL, dated 4 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion involving dormer to main roof & to outrigger roof. 2 x front roof windows. Re-location of first floor rear window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion involving dormer to main roof & to outrigger roof. 2 x front roof windows. Re-location of first floor rear window at 44A Church Road, Teddington TW11 8PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/2035/FUL, dated 4 June 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2021/44/CRI/104/A, 2021/44/CRI/105 and 2021/44/CRI/106.
 - 3) No development shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including windows and roof lights, of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.
 - 4) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Statement dated 18/06/2021 and retained as such thereafter.

Preliminary Matters

2. An amended drawing has been put forward as part of the appeal. This drawing shows minor interior changes. The changes depicted in the drawings are considered minor and do not change the detail of what is being proposed. Having regard to the Wheatcroft principles, I consider, in this case, that the amended drawing can be accepted, and no party would be prejudiced by doing so.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Church Road Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The significance of the Church Road CA, which the site is in, includes, a mixture of Edwardian and Victorian, mainly 2-storey commercial and residential properties with larger buildings interspersed in the streetscene. The groups of terraces are of a modest character, fine proportions, and traditional materials. These terraces are set back from the highway with small front gardens and low boundary walls. This contributes a distinctive rhythm and sense of uniformity to the streetscene. However, the rear elevations and roofs are more diverse as a result of extensions and dormers to a number of the buildings. The overall impression of consistency is consequently less pronounced to the rear of buildings on this side of the street.
5. With the exception of the buildings on the ends of the row, the frontages of terraces generally match that of the host building, excluding the ground floor window, with respect to materials, ridge and building lines, and relationship with the street scene. While not listed or locally listed, these attributes and the property make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA on Church Road.
6. Section. 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect, national policy on heritage assets, which includes conservation areas, is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (Framework).
7. The Council has no objection to the proposed front roof lights replacing the existing single rooflight. These do not align with the existing windows on the front elevation. Whilst visibly offset when viewed from directly in front of the building from wider angles it would not be distinguishable given the alignment offset distance is minimal. Additionally, they would better assimilate with others in the roofscape compared to the existing large roof light.
8. Additionally, the adjoining property is also served by similar roof lights offset from the below windows. However, whilst the introduction of the roof light would be an improvement it would still be a requirement that these are conservation type rooflights, flush fitting. I am satisfied that, subject to details being agreed, the roof lights would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host building, streetscene and the wider CA.
9. The Council's Conservation Area Statement recognises there has been a loss of traditional architectural features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations, extensions and use of non-original materials. Indeed, there are a number of properties in the locality which have been altered or extended in some way that is not characteristic of the original building.
10. The proposed rear dormer would be set back slightly from the eaves of the roof but would occupy nearly the full height and width of the main rear roof slope of the host building. The dormer to the outrigger would occupy most of the hip of the roof matching the adjacent dormer. This would be contrary to guidance

within the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations (SPD) that dormers should not dominate the roof.

11. However, the dormer would also be of broadly comparable scale to other roof extensions on this section of the terrace. I accept that these dormers may have been built prior to the designation of the CA. Nevertheless, the development would be seen together with these examples, and while not all buildings have dormers, I find that dormers of the scale proposed would not therefore be incongruous or out of keeping with the established character of the CA as a whole.
12. For this reason, the existing dormers and roof alteration along the rear of the row would help to limit perceptions of its overall scale and bulk relative to the host roof, and while it would undoubtedly be large, the development would not in my judgement appear excessively so nor unacceptably dominant against the host building or the rear of the row.
13. In addition, the plans indicate that the development would be finished in tile hanging to match the adjacent dormers. This would help the proposal assimilate visually with others on the row at both outrigger and roof level. I am satisfied that subject to external materials matching the adjoining extension the proposed development would sit comfortably in its surroundings and the wider CA.
14. Furthermore, the dormer would be largely screened to views from the street by the existing dormer to No 49 and the roofs of the host and neighbouring buildings. There would be some views from surrounding properties and gardens, but these would not be widespread given the height and depth of the rear projections to the host building and the buildings on the end of the terrace row which would serve to obstruct, at least partially, views of the dormer from many points.
15. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the CA, thereby preserving its character and appearance. The proposal would, therefore, comply with Policies LP1, LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018). These, amongst other aims, seek to ensure that development proposals which affect the CA should preserve or enhance its character or appearance and make a positive contribution to the local environment. It would also accord with the Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Planning Guidance SPD (2017), the CA85 Church Road Conservation Area Statement and the Framework. Together these aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Other Matters

16. Any noise and disturbance associated with development would be for a temporary period only. No substantive evidence has been submitted to detail any longer-term nuisance would occur as a result of the proposal. Matters of untidy land would be dealt with by Council through other regulatory powers and do not alter my findings on the main issue.

Conditions

17. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty.

18. In order to preserve the character and appearance of the CA a condition is necessary for external materials to be agreed with the Council. As this will affect the construction of the development, it is necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition which has been agreed by the appellant.
19. A condition on fire safety has also been included to ensure the proposal incorporates the necessary fire safety measures.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR

