

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3155691

309 St Margarets Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PN

- 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 Ron Wilson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/2066/HOT, dated 24 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with full width rear facing mansard dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with full width rear facing mansard dormer at 309 St Margarets Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/2066/HOT, dated 24 May 2016, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the mansard dormer hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the mansard dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St Margaret's Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Following an extension to the St Margaret's Estate Conservation Area (CA) in 2011 the appeal site now falls within this. The CA forms part of a Victorian residential estate. 309 St Margaret's Road is a two storey traditional semi-detached property. It has first and second floor bay windows to the front and original plasterwork around the doors and windows. The traditional character of No 309 and its original features contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.
-

4. The proposal includes a rear mansard style dormer with three roof lights to the front. There are other roof lights in the front roof slopes of the row of properties to which the appeal site belongs and they are not unduly prominent given the low pitch of these roofs. The roof lights would therefore not detract from the traditional character of the property and would preserve the appearance of the CA.
5. The rear mansard dormer would not raise the ridge of the main dwelling and the fenestration would be sympathetic to that in the main building. However, it would be large, filling most of the rear roof slope extending, more or less, to both sides and from the ridge down to the eaves. I note that Supplementary Planning Document - House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) (SPD) advises that roof extensions should not dominate the original roof and that a significant area of existing roof should be left beneath a new dormer and on either side.
6. The advice contained in the SPD is good design advice. However, at my site visit I observed a number of large rear dormers on properties in the immediate vicinity to the appeal site. In particular, I looked at the rear of the row of properties to which No 309 belongs from Newry Road and counted approximately five large rear dormers out of a row of nine properties which could be seen from here. I note the Council's comment that these were either constructed under permitted development rights or granted planning permission prior to the extension of the CA. However, the sheer number of rear dormers has changed the character of the rear roof scape of properties along this section of St Margarets Road, to the point that these predominate as opposed to original roof forms.
7. Reference is made to a recent appeal decision at No 309 in 2015 (APP/L5810/D/15/3005643) but this related to a much larger roof extension which extended over the rear outrigger of the property. Extensions of this type are more the exception rather than the norm along this row of properties where the rear outriggers remain largely intact. It is therefore materially different to the appeal before me which concerns a rear dormer confined only to the rear roof slope; a far more common feature of the surrounding area.
8. Based on the above the proposed rear dormer would not appear out of character with the host building or the surrounding area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Given the sheer number of similar dormers in the area a precedent has already been created here therefore the Council's concern in this respect carries limited weight. I therefore find no conflict with Policies DM DC1 and DM HD1 of the Development Management Plan (2011) or Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy (2009) which, amongst other things, require new development to respect local character, including the nature of a particular road, and to protect conservation areas.
9. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and to ensure a satisfactory appearance I have also included a condition requiring the use of matching materials. Subject to these conditions, the appeal is allowed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR