



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3344812

13 Maze Road, Kew, Richmond TW9 3DA

- 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 and Mrs D Kennerley against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 24/0734/HOT.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer, conservation rooflights and PV panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the Kew Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is part of the streets of Victorian/Edwardian houses which together with The Green comprise the Kew Green Conservation Area (KGCA). Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990, requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The significance of the KGCA is derived in part from the historic open space and the architectural quality of the surrounding properties.
4. No.13 Maze Road is an end of terrace property with its side boundary along Haverfield Gardens. The rear elevation is in its original form sharing a two-storey outrigger with the neighbouring property. The other properties in the terraced row have additions to the roof, and from the appellant's aerial images, it is evident that many of the neighbouring properties in Haverfield Gardens also have dormer windows and alterations to the roof. Due to their rear position and the limited gaps between the properties, these are not a visually prominent feature. Whereas, the strong character of the area is created by the replicated architectural features, ornamental details and materials, and the street trees.
5. The Kew Green Conservation Area 2 Statement identifies the loss of architectural features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations as a particular problem. The proposal would add a large flat roof dormer and while it would be offset from the side elevation it would encompass the majority of the

- roof. The dormer would adjoin and extend to both sides of the existing chimney adding significant bulk and altering the composition of the roof. The form of the roof addition is contrary to the advice within the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations- Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) which, amongst other things, advises keeping roof extensions in scale with the existing structure and it promotes maintaining the existing style of roof, indicating that it is especially important at road junctions or in corner locations.
6. As a corner property No.13 has a different relationship to the rest of the terrace and physically has a greater visual presence in the street scene. As such, alterations to the roof have more influence on the appearance of the property and contribute to the wider character of the area. There are examples of corner properties within the vicinity with alterations to the roof. However, the success of the harmonisation of those features varies, and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits.
 7. I recognise that the headroom necessary to accommodate stairs will influence the position and form of a roof addition and that some of the other corner properties with smaller pitch roofed dormers have greater height. Additionally, the proposed design incorporates elements which seek to respond to the sensitive location. Nonetheless, the scale of the roof addition is large accommodating 2 bedrooms and a bathroom, and the combined extent and form of the proposal would be an unsympathetic addition to the host property.
 8. The existing street trees along Haverfield Gardens do filter some views of the side and rear of the property, particularly in the summer months when I visited. Even so, due to the elevated position on the roof, and despite the offset, the proposed dormer would be a dominant feature. Due to its design and massing it would diminish the architectural integrity of the property and the alterations to its composition would be to the detriment of the prevailing character.
 9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The visual impact would be localised, but the development would fail to preserve the significance of the KGCA as a whole. The harm to the significance of the KGCA would be less than substantial and as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) it should be balanced against the public benefits. The alterations to the property are primarily for the benefit of the occupiers, and whilst there would be some social and economic benefits of the enhanced accommodation these are limited. As directed by paragraph 205 of the Framework 'great weight' is to be given to the conservation of heritage assets and there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm I have identified.
 10. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies LP1 and LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan, 2018, and the SPD. Together these seek high-quality design which respects the local character and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces and heritage assets.
 11. There would also be conflict with section 16 the Framework, the KGCA Statement and the Kew Village Planning Guidance which seek to protect the historic environment and preserve features which contribute to the conservation area's significance.

Other Matters

12. The Council has referred in its decision to policies 28 and 29 of the emerging Publication Local Plan. Whilst at an advanced stage and a material consideration it does not carry full weight and I have based my decision on the adopted development plan.
13. The appellant has noted some inaccuracies with the Council's description of the appeal property which I acknowledge. It is also suggested that the Council did not visit the site. I do not know if that is the case, but the side and rear of the property can be seen from the public domain and the officer's report refers to various features and properties in the vicinity. Notwithstanding this, I have assessed the proposal afresh based on all the information before me and my observations of the site and surrounding area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR