



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2022

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 JANUARY 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/22/3305475

76 Gladstone Avenue, Richmond Upon Thames, Twickenham TW2 7QA

- 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 Sasindhran Perumal against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/0502/HOT, dated 14 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of infill extension on ground-floor and enlargement of the roof with the addition of three dormers to create space for two bedrooms and one bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rosecroft Gardens Conservation Area; and the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located within the Rosecroft Gardens Conservation Area (the conservation area). The Council's Character Appraisal, Management Plan and Article 4(2) Guidance Conservation Area – Rosecroft Gardens No.46, published September 2009 (the CAMP) sets out the significance of this heritage asset as an isolated distinctive model of a 1930's estate, comprising detached and semi-detached bungalows in a triangular layout. The original bungalows are painted render, over brick plinths with brick surrounds to doorways and a linking band course. They have curved bays below deeply projecting eaves and plain tile roofs. Functional gaps between the buildings serve rear parking/garages to the rear of the bungalows and preserve the views to the rear and allow pleasant views to the sky and trees behind.
4. The appeal site is a detached bungalow in a cohesive row, and retains many of its original features, including its original roofscape, painted rendered finish, banding course and surrounds, and front planted garden. Behind the rear garden of the host property lies the open space along Chertsey Road that forms part of the wider setting of the conservation area. As such, the host property contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5. My attention has been drawn to examples of properties in the conservation area that have been extended with side/rear dormers and rear extensions. The full details of those examples have not been provided, nor do I have any evidence of their planning history, nor the policy context prevailing at their time of construction. However, the examples also demonstrate the presence of unsympathetic alterations (including roof extensions) where the cohesion of the original deep roofscape has been undermined, as identified as a pressure in the CAMP. In any event, on my site visit I found that these were very much in the minority. I therefore do not consider that these weigh in favour of the proposal.
6. While the infill extension depth of less than 4m, and the rear enlargement of the roof to a point below the ridge line of the host property would be in accordance with the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015 (SPD), the height of the infill extension would be above eaves height. The front rooflight would not accord with the CAMP as it would detract from the original roofscape of the dwelling and negatively impact upon the character and appearance of the conservation area. The rear dormer would be of a considerable size due to its height, width and depth. Although it would not be seen directly from the street, it would be seen by occupiers of neighbouring properties and from the open space along Chertsey Road. The flank dormers would be visually obtrusive due to their height, width and depth, and they would be seen from the street and appear to dominate the property.
7. The cumulative impact of the three dormers, together with their height, width, depth and design would dominate the original roof of the host property. The proposal undermines the original deep roofscape of the host property, and the symmetry with its neighbours. The sheer scale of the roof enlargements together with the infill extension and dormers would dominate the original dwelling. The proposed development would be unsympathetic and dominant to the host property and its neighbours.
8. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires when determining proposals in conservation areas that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. In accordance with paragraph 202 of the Framework, the harm I have identified is less than substantial, and therefore the harm must be weighed against any public benefits of the proposed development. The only benefit would be an improvement to residential amenity for the occupiers of the proposed development, which is not a public benefit. As such, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rosecroft Gardens Conservation Area.
10. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018, which seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design which conserves the historic

environment of the borough; and preserves and where possible enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area. In addition, the proposal conflicts with the guidance of the SPD and the CAMP.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Moore

INSPECTOR