

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3169290

97 Fairfax Road, Teddington TW11 9DA

- 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 L Springhall against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref 16/4259/HOT, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension consisting of two small front dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in two dormer windows to the front of this property. Together, these structures would dominate the roof slope. The larger of the two would include windows that matched the width of those below but the dormer structure would be substantially larger, would extend beyond the form of the gable below and would not have a matching roof pitch. The smaller dormer would similarly have a relatively modest window size but the structure within which it would be set would be of a substantially greater bulk.
 4. The dormers would have a relatively squat appearance, in conflict with the vertical design emphasis provided by the front feature gable. Their bulk, in comparison to the size of the windows, would also be at odds with the general detailing of the property. The proportions of the dormers would result in them being overly dominant and their design would be at odds with the existing detailing of the dwelling. The proposal would represent poor design in this context.
 5. There are a variety of other styles and sizes of dormer windows in the area. I did not find any to be directly comparable to this arrangement but some have similarities. Given the dates provided by the appellant in relation to when the relevant permissions were granted, it would seem that they would have been considered against the current development plan policies. I do not have the full details as to the circumstances that led to their development and although their
-

existence provides some weight in favour of similar proposals, I must also consider this development on its own particular merits and its specific design details.

6. There are a number of semi-detached properties in the vicinity that are no longer symmetrical given works that have taken place. Subject to the works being sympathetic to the design of the house, maintaining symmetry is not an essential requirement. This does not however overcome my design concerns. I have also had regard to the variety of re-development schemes identified but these do not offer support for these particular additions.
7. Overall, I agree with the Council that the dormers would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the host property and would result in poor quality design in this particular context. The proposal would not meet the objectives of achieving high architectural and urban design quality and would therefore be contrary to the design requirements of Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Core Strategy 2009 and Policy DM DC1 of the Development Management Plan 2011.
8. The proposal would also conflict with the specific guidance within the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations 2015 which advises that it is undesirable to add a roof extension (including dormers) to the front of a house, particularly when there is already a gable over a projecting bay, or when these are not a character of the street. It also advises that roof extensions should not dominate the original roof and should be smaller than the windows below.
9. I acknowledge the support offered locally for this proposal and I have had regard to the details of other developments in the area. I note also the appellant's concern with regard to the lack of dialogue with the Council. Overall, I find the proposal to represent poor design that results in conflict with the Council's policies. As the policies generally accord with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight. I do not find that the matters put forward by the appellant or the support offered, outweighs my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR