



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2024

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/23/3328943

40 Arundel Terrace, Barnes, Richmond upon Thames, London SW13 8DS

- 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 Ann Stow against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/KEM/23/1635/FUL.
 - The development proposed is roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof extension at 40 Arundel Terrace, Barnes, Richmond upon Thames, London SW13 8DS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/KEM/23/1635/FUL and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this planning permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the following approved drawings: 01, 02, 03 Rev B, 04 Rev B, and 05 Rev A.
 - 3) The external finishes (including fenestration) for the development hereby approved, shall be as specified on approved drawing 04 Rev B.
 - 4) Before the development hereby approved is brought into use, the proposed side window in the dormer roof extension shall be fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of this window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Thereafter, such a window shall be retained for the life of the development.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has submitted amended drawings (03 Rev B and 04 Rev B). These resolve discrepancies identified in the drawings originally submitted with the application. Therefore, and because the amended drawings do not change the nature of the original proposal, I have accepted these in determining this appeal and do not consider that the interests of any party have been prejudiced by my having done so.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on a Building of Townscape Merit and the character and appearance of the area including the Castelnau Conservation Area 25.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a purpose-built flat along the southern side of Arundel Terrace, within the Castelnau Conservation Area 25. The significance of this conservation area is derived from its history and the quality of its architecture.
5. Most notably, the appeal property forms part of a group of four flats originally designed to appear as a pair of semi-detached houses. These are two storeys, in red brick and cream roughcast render under a pitched slate roof. To the front is a two-storey canted bay window surmounted by a gable. The sash windows have a distinctive glazing pattern. The entrance doors are grouped together under an open porch with a slate roof and timber spindles.
6. The rear elevations of these properties incorporate relatively deep, two-storey outriggers and are less detailed and have undergone some alterations.
7. Therefore, and primarily because of their frontages, the appeal property and adjoining building are identified by the Council as Buildings of Townscape Merit. Together, these are non-designated heritage assets, which contribute to the varied and characterful streetscape of Arundel Terrace, and the character and appearance and significance of the Castelnau Conservation Area 25.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') requires me to assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset).
9. The Council's House extensions and alterations – Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') advises that: 'roof extensions should not dominate the original roof. Normally a significant area of the existing roof should be left beneath a new dormer and on either side of the dormer, thus setting the extension well in from either side of the roof.'
10. Dormer extensions are a common feature of properties on the south side of Arundel Terrace and nearby. This includes extensions over outriggers. Most notably, at 34 and 36 Arundel Terrace. Whilst this pair of properties are of a different design to the appeal property and these extensions pre-date the current adopted local plan as well as the Council's SPD, these and other alterations to nearby outriggers still inform the character and appearance of the area.
11. The proposed dormer extension would extend over the rear of the main roof of the appeal property and this reflects other similar extensions nearby. The remainder of the extension would extend over part of the outrigger and its rear and side elevations would slope back from the eaves of the roof. Thereby, limiting its massing and retaining a sizeable part of the original roof of the outrigger.
12. Although part of the proposed extension would extend slightly above the ridge of the outrigger, this would remain subordinate to the main roof. The extent of fenestration within the dormer extension would be limited and the remainder of

this would be clad in slate tiles to match the existing roof. Overall, and in the context of nearby roof alterations, the proposal would be a sympathetic and proportionate addition to the appeal property.

13. Moreover, the proposed dormer extension would largely be apparent from the rear of the appeal property. In such views, this would form part of an altered and varied roofscape. This includes, nearby domestic and commercial properties incorporating flat, pitched and hipped roofs in a range of heights and scales, and outriggers in a variety of designs.
14. Roof lights are proposed along the front roof slope. These reflect similar arrangements within the street scene and would not detract from the principal elevation of the appeal property.
15. Therefore, and despite some deviation from the guidance in the SPD, because of its design, size and materiality, the proposed dormer extension would assimilate with the appeal property and wider roofscape and not appear unduly dominant.
16. For the above reasons, the proposal would not harm the significance of the appeal property as a Building of Townscape Merit and would also preserve the character and appearance of the Castelnau Conservation Area 25. Accordingly, I find no conflict with policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Richmond Local Plan (2018). Together, these policies require all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality, and that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets. Consequently, I also find no conflict with similar aims of the Framework for securing high quality design and safeguarding heritage assets.

Conditions

17. In considering the suggested conditions, I have had regard to the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard timescale condition for the implementation of the permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. To ensure that the development safeguards the character and appearance of the conservation area, a condition requiring that the materials for the proposed dormer extension match the existing property is necessary. To safeguard the living conditions of neighbours, it is necessary to impose a condition in respect of the specification for the proposed flank window.
18. Given the modest scale of the proposal, a condition requiring any non-road mobile machinery associated with its construction to use ultra-low sulphur diesel is not necessary or reasonable.

Conclusion

19. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR