



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3343802

2 Windsor Road, Teddington TW11 0SF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Louise Nunn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 23/3327/HOT.
 - The development proposed is alterations to second floor (loft) accommodation to include the replacement of a roof window in the pitched roof of the front elevation and the replacement of the dormer at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to second floor (loft) accommodation to include the replacement of a roof window in the pitched roof of the front elevation and the replacement of the dormer at the rear at 2 Windsor Road, Teddington TW11 0SF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 23/3327/HOT, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 14 Rev D, 13 Rev D, 1 Rev D, 2 Rev D, 3 Rev D, 4 Rev D, 6 Rev D, 8 Rev D and 10 Rev D.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on character and appearance of the Royal Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached property on the north side of Windsor Road at its eastern end and set within a predominantly residential area, primarily comprising detached villas together with semi-detached properties as

well as short terraces. It lies within the designated heritage asset of the Royal Road Conservation Area.

4. 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 such areas.
5. This is a small Conservation Area extending to a few streets and the significance lies in the well-designed late Victorian houses with the streets arranged in a grid pattern. Many of the houses, and in particular the detached villas, show high quality architectural detailing and as result have been designated as Buildings of Townscape Merit. The appeal property and its semi-detached neighbour do not share this designation.
6. The appeal property has an existing rear dormer extension as well as a roof light in the front roof slope. The proposal would replace the existing roof light and the rear dormer. The rear dormer would be enlarged from the existing position but would be very similar in design and appearance both to the existing rear dormer at the adjacent property at No 4 Windsor Road and as seen on properties in the surrounding streets.
7. I do not agree with the Council's statement that the proposed dormer would be *of a substantial scale in relation to the existing modest dormer*. The increased dimensions would be relatively modest and would still enable the dormer to be set in from the sides of the roof as well as set up from the roof eaves. It would not therefore be an over dominant addition to the roof or in relation to the rest of the property. It would in my view still allow the side gable roof form to be read in street scene views.
8. Given the siting of the appeal property at the eastern end of Windsor Road, part of the existing rear dormer is visible in the street scene and views or glimpses of other rear dormers are also possible in the gaps between buildings. Whilst I understand that some were granted permission or were constructed under permitted development rights, prior to the designation of the Conservation Area, rear dormers are an established part of the street scene as seen from surrounding properties and their rear gardens, as well as in the gaps in the built form along the street. Rear dormers therefore form part of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. They differ in age and scale but dormers of a similar scale and proportions to the one proposed are seen on a number of the properties in the immediate vicinity, and in particular on the adjacent property, which is the other 'half' of the semi-detached pair. The proposal would therefore re-introduce a greater degree of symmetry to the pair of semi-detached properties which would be an improvement on the existing situation and would not look overly dominant in relation to the scale of other dormers in the immediate locality.
9. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would both respect the character and the appearance of the existing property and the significance of the designated heritage asset; it would preserve the character and appearance of the Royal Road Conservation Area. There would be no conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan, the Royal Road Conservation Area Statement / Study, as well as Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which seek a high-quality design which respects the local context, as well as the significance of heritage assets.

10. The Council, in its decision notice has also referred to Policies 28 and 29 of the Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version). However, it would appear from the information provided by the Council that there may be unresolved representations to these draft policies, and this necessarily limits the weight that can be given to them.
11. The proposal would not fully accord with all the detailed guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations. However, in the particular circumstances of this case and for the reasons set out above, I am satisfied that would be justification for an exception to be made to these parts of the SPD.
12. The Council has drawn my attention to a permission for a rear dormer in 1 Royal Road which was granted after the designation of the Conservation Area. No further details have been provided to me. Whilst I have taken this into account in so far as I am able, I am satisfied that in the particular circumstances of the case before me and given the scale and form of the existing dormer, as well as surrounding dormers and in particular the one on the attached property, the proposed dormer would not harm the significance of the designated heritage asset.

Conditions

13. In terms of conditions, the external materials should match the existing to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the Conservation Area, and the approved plans should be listed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR