
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2017

by W Fabian BA Hons Dip Arch RIBA IHBC

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

Decision date: 31 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/16/3163407

First Floor Flat, 8 Stanley Gardens Road, Teddington TW11 8SZ

- 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 Kanwar G Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/3489/FUL, dated 31 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is an L-shaped dormer roof alteration and chimneys removal.
-

Decision: The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

1. Planning permission (Ref 16/2794/HOT) for a single storey rear infill and extension has previously been granted at the ground floor flat within the appeal property. This aspect of the developments now on site and shown on the proposal drawings is not under consideration in this appeal.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to work already substantially underway at No 8, a modest two storey traditional brick mid-terraced property. It has previously been converted to two separate flats during the 1990s. This attractive terrace of five adjoining similar properties, mainly two storey houses, remains mostly as originally built. At the rear there are paired two storey 'offshoot' projections extending a little over half the length of the back gardens.
4. The application drawings show the property prior to construction of the authorised rear ground floor extensions. The drawings indicate the substantial retention of the original rear offshoot, but the removal of the existing side rear chimney stack on it at the party boundary and the installation of a large flat-roofed slate/tile clad dormer set back from the rear wall of the offshoot, on top of the existing flat roof.
5. This dormer is shown linking to a further wide flat roofed slate/tile-clad dormer occupying almost the full width of the main rear roof pitch. Both dormer

- elements incorporate full height pairs of glazed doors with Juliette balconies at the original eaves level.
6. Although the proposal drawings show the main dormer roof adjoining the main existing ridge, from my site visit and the submitted photographs it has clearly been installed at a slightly higher level overall than the ridges of the main roofs at adjacent properties; it seems from this that the main roof has been replaced at a higher level than the neighbouring ones. The new ridge line is almost level with the party boundary parapet walls on each side, which project well above the adjacent ridgelines. The chimney stack abutting the party boundary has also been removed and a pair of front rooflights installed on the front pitch of the roof.
 7. At the rear the dormers as proposed and installed are large and box-like. They appear top-heavy in this location and loom above the neighbouring modest two storey terraced properties on each side, which remain largely as originally built.
 8. Overall, the rear and front alterations that have been carried out disrupt the previously coherent form of this particular original terrace. From the front, the removal of half the bulk of the original chimney stack and the raising of the main roof ridge creates an uneven stepped roofscape that is harmful to the appearance of the terrace. While the rooflights do not contribute to this harm, they are inextricably linked to the whole proposal.
 9. This is contrary to policy C7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework Core Strategy, 2009, and policy DM DC1 of the Development Management Plan, 2011, which seeks to maintain and improve the local environment and ensure a high architectural and urban design quality. These policies accord with the aims of the Government's Planning Policy Framework which sets out that contributing to and enhancing our built environment is one dimension of sustainable development and that planning should always seek to secure high quality design. The dormers also fail to follow the Council's design guidance set out in its Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alteration, 2015. This specifically resists roof extensions that project above the ridgeline and dormers that dominate the original roof.
 10. I have seen the glazed doors onto a balcony at No 1, but these are lower and less prominent than the dormers in this appeal. Other rear L-shaped dormers further along this road and in nearby streets have also been drawn to my attention. I have seen that some are similar in appearance to the appeal ones, but without their individual full planning circumstances I am unable to draw direct comparisons. In any case, as set out above, at this particular location there are no other similar dormers at the rear of this particular terrace where the original form and design remain mostly intact and so the site specific circumstances in this appeal are different to these examples.
 11. To sum up, the proposed rear dormers and the alterations as carried out to the roof have harmed the overall character and appearance of the terraced property and its surroundings. They are contrary to the development plan as a whole and to national policy, as set out above. The appeal should be dismissed.

Wenda Fabian Inspector