This character appraisal and management plan was adopted by the council on 18th September 2009, following public consultation.
Introduction

Rosecroft Gardens Conservation Area was designated in 1988, in recognition of the area’s special architectural and historic interest. It is one of seventy-two conservation areas in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, each of which has a brief Conservation Area Statement to explain the designation and a map showing the area’s boundary.
The Council is working to develop more detailed supporting information for each area by adopting Character Appraisals and Management Plans.

These documents provide a more comprehensive assessment of an area’s character and appearance, and outline specific policies and proposals which we hope will preserve and enhance an area’s special interest in future.

The Character Appraisal, Management Plan and Article 4(2) Guidance are also intended to promote a better understanding of why an area is special, and should help to inform the Council and the public when making decisions which may affect that special interest.

**Character Appraisal**

This Character Appraisal outlines the architectural and historic interest of Rosecroft Gardens Conservation Area, which was designated in 1988. The appraisal also informs the Management Plan and Article 4(2) Guidance for the area, which aim to preserve and enhance the area’s special interest.

Rosecroft Gardens conservation area is a distinctive example of a 1930s model housing estate, of semi-detached and detached bungalows set in gardens to front and rear. The layout of the estate is on a triangular plan and it is accessed only from the Chertsey Road.

**Detailed Map of Rosecroft Gardens Conservation Area**

![Map of Rosecroft Gardens Conservation Area](image)

**Key**

- Conservation Area boundary
- Article 4(2) Direction
1. **Location and Setting**

1.1 The conservation area is situated in Whitton to the south of Chertsey Road, north of the railway line and bounded to the east by the Duke of Northumberland’s river. It covers all the houses within the triangle of the estate, known locally as the Dene Estate.

1.2 The houses are laid out on a tightly contained triangular plan of Gladstone Avenue, with Rosecroft Gardens on the perimeter and Denehurst Gardens at the centre. It is a cul-de-sac, accessed only from the Chertsey Road. Rows of bungalows in garden plots to front and rear are set back from the boundary behind small front gardens, either planted or with hard surfacing. The original treatment of boundary wall was low, stone built, with piers. There are important gaps between buildings, often allowing access to rear garages.

1.3 The bungalows were originally of painted render over brick plinths, with brick surrounds to doorways and a linking band course. They have curved bays below deeply projecting eaves and plain tile roofs. A small number of houses still retain original features such as: distinctive curved glass within metal window frames, glazing bars and three light insets to vertically divided front doors, architectural details so evocative of this period.

1.4 The wider setting of open green spaces, the wide grass verges and trees along Chertsey Road, Crane Valley and Kneller Gardens, contributes to the suburban character of this estate.

39 and 41 Gladstone Avenue, when newly built in 1937. Note the original detailing: low stone boundary wall with gate piers and timber gate; roofscape, roof covering and chimney stacks; metal windows with curved profile. Source: Stephen C. Randall.
2. HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Rosecroft Gardens conservation area was developed as a single residential estate around 1930 on former nursery lands. This was contemporary with the arrival of the Chertsey Road and much of the suburban development to its northwest.

2.2 The social profile is entirely that of a suburban residential development and this has been the case since it was built. The estate has no commercial or retail activity.

3. CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE

3.1 Within the overall triangular shaped site, the layout of streets around which the houses lie, roughly resembles an arrowhead. Access is via Rosebine Avenue only, with Gladstone Avenue and Rosecroft Gardens wrapping around the triangular layout, bisected across its width by a further street, Denehurst Gardens. All the houses have street frontages and are placed symmetrically, set back from the street boundaries. Most of the houses have garages to the rear, so there are lower levels of street parking than occur elsewhere in the borough. The volume of vehicular traffic is also low, as the estate is contained within its boundaries, with no roads crossing through it.

3.2 The single entrance road, Rosebine Avenue, is flanked by two grassed areas that resemble fields, with mature trees. These areas are designated as Metropolitan Open Land: their function is to act as overflow car parking for events at RFU, which may account for wear of the surface. Although these green spaces are not related to the housing development (and are not Council owned), they act as buffer zones between the heavy traffic of Chertsey Road and the adjacent houses. The boundary definition of the rear gardens of the Gladstone Avenue houses is a mixture of brick, render and timber, of varied materials and styles, creating a visually cluttered effect.

3.3 The condition of road surfaces and street furniture in the conservation area is generally poor. The trees and lawn verges are in fair condition.

3.4 The majority of properties are in semi-detached pairs under plain tile roofs, with pitched roofs and deeply projecting eaves covering curved bays, containing the main entrance. The buildings are all single-storey, although many are now extended, with roof lights and large dormers that have altered their roof profiles. The bungalows were originally of painted render over brick plinths, with brick surrounds to doorways and a linking band course, although some have unfortunately now been painted. The bays originally had distinctive curved glass within metal window frames and glazing bars, although some have unsympathetically replaced with uPVC and in inappropriate styles. Doors originally had a distinctive repeated pattern with three light insets within the vertically divided door.

3.5 The gaps between the buildings are functional, serving the rear parking/garages to the rear of the bungalows. They are also important in maintaining the appearance of the individual buildings and providing views of sky and foliage beyond the confines of the roadway.

4. KEY STRENGTHS

4.1 Distinctive character of planned 1930s model residential estate, contained within a defined boundary. The single storey dwellings have pitched roofs and low boundaries.

4.2 The original layout has been retained throughout the estate, with the houses set well back from the boundary and with gardens to the rear.

4.3 Well-designed and distinctive styles of one-storey bungalows, with variety in some plan forms and plot sizes. The estate is carefully planned and well laid out, with broad roads, contributing to an air of spaciousness and openness throughout.

4.4 The pleasant and peaceful suburban residential character of the estate, a key factor in the original design, has been retained. The bungalows’ height limit of one storey has been retained, making the conservation area low density throughout.

4.5 The original plan form of the bungalows has been preserved in most part, with extensions limited to porches to the front and extensions to the rear. The important spaces between the houses preserve the views to the rear and allow pleasant views to the sky and trees behind.

4.6 Most of the houses were built with garages to the rear. This, together with the fact that the estate is contained, with no through roads and traffic largely restricted to residents’ cars means that there is not the severe pressure on parking which occurs in much of the borough. The roads are notably quiet throughout, with low-level volumes of traffic, which considerably enhances the amenity value for residents. Because there is no need to create crossovers, there is minimal forecourt parking, which has helped to preserve the front settings of the houses.

4.7 Many front gardens are planted and some are contained within the original low boundary wall, which adds to the...
pleasant open character of the conservation area and enhances views of the streetscape.

4.8 The skyline of deep-pitched roofs with tall side chimneystacks has largely preserved the lively rhythm of the original design.

5. PROBLEMS AND PRESSURES

5.1 The entrance road off Chertsey Road consists of concrete post and metal rail to the Chertsey Road side and half way down Rosedene Avenue. There are green painted utilitarian gates with metal mesh to the west area of Metropolitan Open Land. Recycling bins are located on the western side of Rosebine Avenue. Cumulatively, these are unsightly and detract from the visual quality of this key entrance road.

5.2 The character of the bungalows and their contribution to the street scene has unfortunately diminished through insensitive alteration. The area has suffered from the loss of architectural features and materials, due to unsympathetic changes.

5.3 The original style of boundary definition was a low, rustic, wall, of brownish stone, with corner posts and a low timber entrance gate. Replacements of walls and gates are varied in style and height, often of poor quality design, materials and colours. This volume of change has resulted in an uncoordinated effect, with loss of the original cohesive boundary treatment that was an important characteristic of the street scene.

5.4 When intact and unchanged, the original, deep, roofscapes of the bungalows, with attractive tiles and chimneys, were a strong unifying characteristic of the area. A large number of the bungalows have had attic extensions, with dominant front dormers and chimneystacks have either been removed or altered. A number of houses have been re-roofed, in different styles and colours of tiles, again reducing the cohesive quality or installed photovoltaic panels on the front roof slope. In some cases, the timber planks under projecting eaves have been heavily over-painted and some covered with panels of artificial material.

5.5 Some front gardens have been paved over, contributing to the lack of cohesion.

5.6 Many of the houses have had porches added: these are of varying styles and materials, some of which are very unsympathetic.

5.7 The original elevational treatment of some of the bungalows has also been altered, with some of the original brick bands plastered or painted over or pebble dashing and stone cladding. While a number of houses retain the original characteristic fenestration, of metal with curved glass to follow the curved edges of the bays, replacements are unsympathetic of uPVC, with straight edges, of varying styles. Some houses retain the original doors and house numbers, with shaped figures and placed at an angle, a minor but important element of the 1930s detailing, but in others this has been lost.

6. CHARACTER DETAILS

6.1 The images below provide a visual reference to the conservation area’s general appearance, its typical forms, materials and colours. It includes examples of inappropriate change, which should be avoided and examples where original details remain, which should be retained or reinstated.

1. **Original details** – fenestration, door with glazed panels, brick bands (although painted over), roof tiles.

2. **Original details** – fenestration, brick bands, roof tiles. **Inappropriate alterations**: front garden paved over.

4. **Original details** – roof tiles. **Inappropriate alterations** – pebble dashing to elevations, brick bands painted over, box roof dormer, front garden paved over, porch, fenestration.

5. **Inappropriate alterations** – brick wall, porch (size and style), front dormer, roof tiles, fenestration, chimney removed, brick bands on façade mostly painted over.

6. **Original details** – low stone boundary wall with piers and roof tiles.
7. *Original detail* – original door

8. *Original detail* – original door

9. *Original detail* – original door

10. *Original detail* – original door
Management Plan

This Management Plan outlines how we intend to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area in future. The Council has a duty to formulate and publish these proposals under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The existing original layout of the estate, and the plan forms of the houses, are important features of the conservation area and are key to defining its overall special character. However, the small size of the bungalows makes them particularly vulnerable to development. Due to their small scale, changes such as details and materials are particularly visible, so it is important that changes are sensitively made. Alterations such as rear dormers and single-storey rear extensions should be of appropriate scale, design, detailing and materials.

Please note that the following proposals include suggested environmental improvements, some of which may fall outside the Council’s control. Limits on the Council’s resources may also mean that proposals for which it is responsible may take longer than is desirable to implement.

I. PROBLEMS AND PRESSURES

1.1 Loss of traditional architectural features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations, especially front dormers, windows/doors and porches.

1.2 Loss of traditional front boundary treatments and front gardens, including for car parking.

1.3 Lack of coordination, clutter and poor quality of street furniture, road and pavement surfaces.

2. OPPORTUNITY FOR ENHANCEMENT

2.1 Preservation, enhancement and reinstatement of special architectural quality and unity. Retain original detailing or ensure that replacements are of sympathetic design and materials.

2.2 Retain and enhance front boundary treatments and discourage increase in the amount of hard surfacing in front gardens. Front gardens should not be paved over, but should be planted.

2.3 Coordination of colour and design, rationalisation and improvement in quality of street furniture, road and footway surfaces. Any repaving on footways should be in traditional artificial stone paving, preferably mixing old and new slabs. Lighting columns should be painted steel. Further tree planting on Rosebine Avenue. The Council has not yet programmed these works, but they remain under consideration.

2.4 Driveways should not be paved or covered with concrete.

3. CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY

3.1 The existing conservation area boundary was defined in June 1988, at the time of the initial designation. Rosecroft Gardens conservation area remains distinct from surrounding development and we therefore believe the character of the estate is accurately reflected in the existing conservation area boundary.

3.2 We propose to leave the existing Conservation Area boundary unaltered.

4. ARTICLE 4(2) DIRECTION

4.1 Conservation Area designation does not, in itself, introduce any greater level of statutory control over minor works to properties, such as the demolition of original features, the replacement of windows and doors with uPVC, the loss of garden walls or pebble-dashing. Such works are normally ‘permitted development’ for homeowners and no application for planning permission is required, despite the impact these works can often have on the appearance of an individual property and its contribution to the wider conservation area.

4.2 In order to control these minor, but cumulatively harmful changes, the Council would normally issue an Article 4(2) Direction, withdrawing some or all of the permitted development rights for a specified group of properties. A range of works, such as the addition of porches and alterations to roof covering materials, would then require a planning application. Local authority officers would be able to provide advice and guidance to residents on appropriate alterations. There is no cost for applications where the property is subject to an Article 4(2) Direction and the Direction is not applied retrospectively.

4.3 We propose to issue an Article 4(2) Direction covering the following properties:

- 1 – 108 Gladstone Avenue
- 1 – 117 Rosecroft Gardens
- 1 – 28 Denehurst Gardens

5. ARTICLE 4(2) GUIDANCE

5.1 Please refer to section 6.0 Character Details above for photos illustrating inappropriate changes to be avoided and original details which should be retained or reinstated. The original stone low boundary wall can be
5.2 Dormers and rooflights – Dormer windows and rooflights should not be installed on front roof slopes. Velux rooflights should be black, of metal, conservation type, with thin framing, with a central vertical thin bar and to be flush with the roofline.

5.3 External paintwork – Repainting of painted window frames, doors, porches, brickwork and render on a like for like basis will not require planning permission. Painting of buildings in colours other than white should not be permitted. Unpainted brick bands should not be covered over.

5.4 Front boundaries – A low rustic stone wall with piers and timber gates is the original treatment and should be retained or reinstated to match original. Iron gates are also acceptable.

5.5 Porches – Various designs of porches have been added. Proposals for their alteration, replacement or creation will be considered on a case by case basis.

5.6 Roofs and chimneys – Concrete tile roofs should be retained or reinstated and repaired on a like for like basis. Clay tiles of a similar appearance are also acceptable. Original chimney stacks and pots should be retained or reinstated.

5.7 Satellite dishes – Satellite dishes should not be installed on the front elevation.

6. ADDITIONAL DESIGN GUIDANCE
(Not related to the Article 4(2) Direction.)

6.1 Front gardens – Front gardens should not be paved over, but be planted.

6.2 Windows and doors – Metal framed casement windows of the original 1930s design, including the curved profile of corner bays and glazing divisions with triple inserts, should be retained or replaced on a like for like basis. Curved glazing should be installed, where replacements are proposed, to replicate the original profile (including in double glazed form that provides high specification thermal insulation properties.) Original front doors should be retained. Where already changed, replacements should be in painted timber, with joinery, mouldings and fittings of the original 1930s design, including inset stained glass detailing, where possible.

UPVC should not be used for window and door frames. This is an unsympathetic material, is environmentally non-sustainable and is not suitable for use in conservation areas. Contact a Council conservation officer for advice on metal window suppliers, including the repair of metal windows.
If you need this document in Braille, large print, audio tape, or another language, please contact us on 0845 122 660 or minicom 020 8831 6001
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