



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2023 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3316750

48 Berwyn Road, Richmond TW10 5BS

- 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 NTA Planning LLP against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application ref: 22/3676/HOT, dated 12 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a first-floor side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Sheen Common Drive Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The Sheen Common Drive Conservation Area Statement (CAS) identifies the character of its dwellings as detached two-storey houses built between 1925-1932, possessing a unity in their architectural style and materials. Dwellings along this section of Berwyn Road are exactly that. They are large with hipped tiled roofs. Many have undergone sizeable alterations, a number of which involve two-storey side extensions. Nevertheless, the majority of these have retained a subservience to the host property through a continuation of the original eave's height and incorporation of hipped tiled roofs to reflect the property's originality. The CAS notes that there are remarkably few instances of unsightly roof extensions and poorly designed side extensions within the CA.
5. The appeal property is reflective of the character of the surrounding dwellings, utilising a hipped tiled roof with subservient extensions and alterations preserving its existing traditional form. Its relationship, adjacent to but set back from Berwyn Road, gives the front elevation a prominence within the street scene. These factors mean the existing building contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
6. The Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) (SPD) permits extensions to appear as an obvious

addition, however they must remain subordinate to the main structure. The SPD additionally requires extensions to not dominate the existing dwelling or its neighbourhood.

7. The proposed flat roof two-storey side extension would appear alien to the shape and specifically roof style of the host dwelling and surrounding area when viewed from Berwyn Road. The proposal would create an awkward and jarring interaction between the two-storey flat roof and the roof slope of the appeal property. This would be particularly evident in the protrusion of the eaves above that of the host dwelling, eliminating the existing subordination of extensions observed within the area and creating a dominant feature.
8. The two-storey side extension would continue to the rear, wrapping around the appeal property, obscuring almost the entirety of its rear elevation. The rear building line of the proposed rear extension would reflect that of neighbouring 46 Berwyn Road and 44 Berwyn Road. Whilst it seems the substantial rear extensions to these buildings were constructed prior to the designation of the CA, they nonetheless form part of the character of the surrounding area.
9. Notwithstanding the above, the considerable size of the proposed rear extension combined with the eaves projecting above that of the host dwelling would create a dominant addition, unbalancing its existing original form and traditional character. The bulk and elongation of the proposal would be accentuated through the use of a flat roof.
10. Whilst views of the rear of the appeal site are limited from the public realm, the proposed rear extension would still be visible from the rear garden area of No. 46. In any case, the lack of the scheme's obviousness would not make it acceptable. As positive as such would be, nor would the use of similar materials and fenestrations to the surrounding properties.
11. 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 (the Framework). At paragraph 197, it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage asset and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
12. The proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area for the reasons I have set out. Whilst the harm that would be caused to this designated heritage asset would be less than substantial the Framework makes it clear that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. No substantive evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the works would facilitate the optimum viable use of the building. Furthermore, no additional public benefits have been identified which would be consequently capable of outweighing the great weight that I am required to give to the harm that would be caused to the significance of this designated heritage asset.
14. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policies LP 1 and LP 3 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) and the Local

Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (2015), which collectively require new development to respect and contribute to the character of the host dwelling and wider area, in addition to conserving the significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

15. I note the appellant's concerns regarding a lack of communication from the Council, and that they feel aggrieved that Council Officers did not visit the site prior to making a determination. However, these are procedural matters that are beyond my remit insofar as it relates to a consideration of the planning merits of the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework and worthy of sufficient weight, that would indicate otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR