



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3351971

29 Lonsdale Road, London SW13 9JP

- 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 Mr and Mrs Andrew and Vanessa Dausch against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/0643/HOT.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as *"Rear roof extension in line with the extents of the existing rear extension with one new dormer window to rear. Two new conservation style pitched rooflights to front elevation. Two new conservation style pitched rooflights to side elevations, one per side. One new flat roof light in new portion of flat roof"*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.
3. The information before me indicates that the Richmond Publication (Regulation 19) Local Plan (2023) (PLP) is at an advanced stage of adoption. I therefore attribute weight to the policies in the PLP referred to by the Council.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Castelnau Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a mid-Victorian, 2-storey detached house which is situated in the Castelnau Conservation Area (CA) and has been identified by the Council as a Building of Townscape Merit. It forms part of a group of handsome, double-fronted, detached houses of similar age and original size, massing and appearance, which have been added to at the side in a variety of designs and forms.

6. The substantial Victorian semi-detached and detached villas on Lonsdale Road and in neighbouring streets were developed following the construction of the nearby Hammersmith Bridge and together form a coherent streetscape, which is further enhanced by mature street trees, decorative lamp posts and verdant plots. Yellow stock brick, stucco and slate roof coverings are used widely throughout the CA. The combination of these features creates a pleasant and relatively spacious and verdant residential environment.
7. The appeal property and its immediate neighbours retain their original roof form with hipped roofs above the main part of the house and flat roofs at the rear. The roofs of Nos. 21, 23 and 25 Lonsdale Road have been expanded to the rear with dormers installed into the roof slopes. This has resulted in particularly top heavy and prominent roof forms that detract from the appearance of these properties and the CA. Although these crown roof forms have become a common feature in the CA, they are not a characteristic of the immediate setting of the appeal property.
8. The proposal would comprise the expansion of the hipped roof so that it would extend over the flat-roofed 2-storey rear part of the house at the rear. This would create a crown roof similar to those at Nos. 23 and 25. In addition, a pair of flat-roofed dormers would be installed in the new rear roof slope and rooflights added to the front and side roof slopes. I recognise that the expansion of the roof would be barely perceptible from the street and from properties opposite. As such there would be no material harm to the appearance of the street scene. I also note that the existing roof tiles would be replaced with slate tiles to match neighbouring properties which would be a positive, albeit minor, enhancement.
9. However, the significant increase in the depth of the roof would result in an overly dominant roof form that would, due to its bulk and siting, harm the appearance of the host property and be at odds with the roof forms of the neighbouring houses to either side. As such the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of this part of the CA. The harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply provides extra private space for the occupiers of the appeal property there would be no public benefits arising from it.
10. For the reasons set out above I therefore conclude that the proposal is contrary to Policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Richmond Local Plan (2018) and PLP Policies 28, 29 and 30 which, amongst other matters, require development proposals to conserve the high-quality character and heritage of the borough through an understanding of how it relates to its existing context. The proposal is also contrary to the aims of the Framework and the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015), the latter of which states that the overall shape, size and position of rear extensions should not dominate the existing house.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole **INSPECTOR**