

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

**by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 2nd September 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3297532**  
**67 Bushy Park Road, Teddington, TW11 9DL**

- 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 Alex O'Neill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
  - The application Ref 22/0383/HOT, dated 7 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2022.
  - The development proposed is a rear dormer roof extension and No.2 roof lights to the front roof slope.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of loft into habitable accommodation with rear dormer at 11 Cresley Drive, London Road, Hook, RG27 9GY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/00683/HOU, dated 24 March 2022, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

## Preliminary matters

2. In the interests of accuracy, I have utilised the Council's description of the proposal used in its decision notice in preference to that used in the original application form.
3. The appeal property is located within the Wick Road Conservation Area (CA).

## Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposals on the host property and whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

## Reasons

5. The appeal property is a terraced dwelling, and the appellant's main proposal involves the erection of a full width dormer extension in the rear roof. The Council acknowledges the presence of other similar structures in this part of

- the CA but contends that most were built using permitted development rights, which no longer apply following the CA's designation<sup>1</sup>.
6. Moreover, the Council says that the *'roofscape of the row of terraced properties of which the host dwelling is part of ...maintains its original character and neat appearance'*, and that the original roofscape of this terrace is still *'readable'* despite the insertion of some other dormers similar to that proposed.
  7. I share the Council's view that, taken individually, dormer structures of the type proposed are not always aesthetically pleasing features, and it is unlikely that any of the many seen on my visit would win design prizes. Nevertheless, from the publicly accessible vantage points near the site<sup>2</sup>, it became plainly apparent to me that rear dormer structures, given their extent and numbers, are wholly characteristic of this part of the CA's roofscape.
  8. Looked at individually, without regard to the wider context, the Council's concerns regarding the effect on the host property have a degree of merit, and the proposal conflicts, in part, with the Council's SPD guidelines<sup>3</sup> on proposals of this type.
  9. But on the other hand I do not consider that the wider spatial context can be simply disregarded or ignored in any reasonable assessment. In what I regard as the applicable wider context, which includes both sides of Bushy Park Road and parts of Wick Road, rear roofs are littered with box-like dormers. In view of this, the proposed dormer would be barely distinguishable or appreciable either in respect of its effect on the host property or the wider CA. The proposal, if built, would have a neutral effect on its surroundings, and consequently the CA's character would be unaffected and preserved.
  10. The Council, seemingly, would not have an objection to the proposed rooflights, provided 'conservation' types were installed. However, I saw that standard rooflights were common in this part of the CA, and to my mind, they did not jar. Another set of small rooflights would thus make no appreciable difference to the street scene.
  11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the character of the CA. Accordingly, I find the proposals accord with those provisions of LP policies LP1 and LP3 in that their design demonstrates a thorough understanding of the site, relates well to its existing context, and preserves the character of a heritage asset.

## Conditions

12. In the interests of visual amenity, I shall impose the Council's suggested condition in respect of external materials, with a slight amendment.
13. It is also necessary, in the interests of certainty that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

---

<sup>1</sup> The appellant notes however that planning permission was granted in April 2021 for a rear dormer at 59 Wick Road, within a stone's throw of his property.

<sup>2</sup> From the public open space referred to in the Council's officer report on the application and from the public footpaths running alongside and over the nearby railway lines.

<sup>3</sup> Supplementary Planning Document on House Extensions and Alterations

14. For the reason already provided, the Council's condition in respect of the proposed rooflights is not imposed.

**Other matters**

15. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representations, but none outweighs those considerations which led me to my conclusions.

*G Powys Jones*

INSPECTOR

**SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS**

- 1). The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2). The development hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the following approved plans: 2021/22/L01, 2021/22/PL01, 2021/22/S01, 2021/22/S02, 2021/22/S03, 2021/22/PL02 REV A & 2021/22/PL03 REV A.
- 3). The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted and in making good shall match those used in the existing building.