

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2017

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 9th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3161319

44 Waverley Avenue, TWICKENHAM, TW2 6DW.

- 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 Jayanti Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application ref: 16/2487/HOT, dated 21 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the dormer roof extension upon the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. No. 44 Waverley Avenue comprises an inter-war, semi-detached house located in a mixed residential area. It is not within a designated Conservation Area or Area of Special Residential Character.
4. Several of the nearby properties have been the subject of dormer extensions. These were noted during my site visit and are illustrated with photographs in the appellant's grounds of appeal. Nevertheless, I have no detailed knowledge of the planning background to those dormer roof extensions, which may well pre-date national policy in the Framework¹ and the policies of the Council's Development Plan and adopted SPD².
5. In principle I see no objection to the use of the roof space in order to provide enhanced living conditions and space to cater for the multi generation family that occupies the property. I also agree with the Planning Officer who, in her

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

² London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan: Supplementary Planning Document "House Extensions and External Alterations (adopted May 2015).

delegated report, found no objection to the provision of a roof light to the front roof slope.

6. National policy at Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment (paragraph 56). The Council's policies and SPD seek to provide more detailed guidance upon this issue, including Section 8 of the SPD which addresses the topic of roof extensions.
7. The proposed single box dormer would occupy a large proportion of the rear roof slope and appear as an over-dominant feature as viewed from the back gardens of adjoining properties and from the properties to the rear in Powder Mill Lane.
8. The fenestration of the box dormer also fails to meet advice set out in the SPD. However, given the internal layout of the proposed attic accommodation there may be a more appropriate solution to providing daylight to this room whilst taking account of the Council's detailed advice in its SPD.
9. Notwithstanding these comments, the detailed design of the rear dormer roof extension would adversely impact upon the modest credentials of this semi-detached property and represent a dominant and highly visible structure that would be out of proportion with and harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. Accordingly, I find upon the main issue that development as proposed would be contrary to Policy DM DC 1 of the DMP³, Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy⁴ and the Council's adopted SPD. It would also be visually intrusive as viewed from nearby properties, contrary to Policy DM DC 5 of the DMP.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

³ London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework: Development Management Plan (adopted November 2011).

⁴ London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (adopted April 2009).