

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2017

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3172741
20 Haliburton Road, Twickenham TW1 1PF

- 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 Martin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/4304/HOT, dated 20 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the retention of rear dormer roof extension, including raised roof ridge and eaves height (altering the pitch of the front roof slope), extending above two-storey rear addition and 2no. roof lights on front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for retention of rear dormer roof extension, including raised roof ridge and eaves height (altering the pitch of the front roof slope), extending above two-storey rear addition and 2no. roof lights on front roof slope at 20 Haliburton Road, Twickenham TW1 1PF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/4304/HOT, dated 20 October 2016, and the plans numbered PM1609-01 Revision A, PM1609-02 Revision A, PM1609-03, PM1609-04, PM1609-05, PM1609-06, PM1609-07 and PM1609-08 Revision A, subject to the following condition: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans PM1609-01 Revision A, PM1609-02 Revision A, PM1609-03, PM1609-04, PM1609-05, PM1609-06, PM1609-07 and PM1609-08 Revision A.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the appellant's name from the planning application form, although I note that an initial is provided on the appeal form.
 3. The description of development provided on the planning application form has been replaced in the Council's decision notice by a more detailed description of the proposed development. This revised description has been used within subsequent documents. From the details submitted, I am satisfied that this description is more precise and I have used it here.
 4. Alterations to the existing roof to create accommodation within the roofspace have taken place. I was able to view these at the time of my visit.
-

Main Issue

5. The main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the adjoining semi-detached property.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is one half of a pair of two-storey dwellings. The street is characterised by two-storey semi-detached and terraced properties. Many of the properties have converted their roof spaces to living accommodation. I observed that those conversions host rooflights or dormer roof extensions within the front roof slopes. I also observed there to be a good number of properties that have added rear roof extensions. Although these vary in size, in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site two properties either side of the appeal dwelling host large box-like roof extensions of a similar design and form to this proposal. There is no consistency to the design and form of the dormers in the area. I acknowledge that the appeal property is not listed and there are no special designations in place in this location.
7. Both parties agree that due to the increase in ridge height and the alteration to the front roofslope the development would not fall within householder permitted development. However, most of the rear dormer roof extension could be erected under householder permitted development if not for the small increase in ridge height. Therefore, as a fallback, the applicant could undertake much of the works relating to the rear dormer that have taken place.
8. The Council's Housing Extension and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) recommends that either a smaller well positioned dormer or a mansard style extension would be a preferred roof extension option. However, there are similar roof extensions to that of the proposed scheme within very close proximity to the appeal site. Whilst the Council indicated these neighbouring roof extensions have been constructed under householder permitted development, they do not take regard of the SPD in regard to their design and form. Nonetheless, these roof extensions have substantially altered the roofscapes of these adjoining dwellings. This has significantly altered the character and appearance of these dwellings and the character and appearance of this locality. In this context I see no reason why the rear roof extension of a similar size, design and materials to those close by does not appear acceptable in this location, despite the small increase in ridge height.
9. There are variations in roof heights along the course of the street and parapets separate adjoining roofs. There has been a marginal increase in the height of the ridge of the appeal property. This, along with the change to the plane of the front roof slope, is not appreciably different to that of other properties within this streetscene. The parapet dividing this pair of properties provides a visual break between adjoining roofslopes. This variation enables the small change in height and profile of the roof to take place without creating a significantly unbalancing appearance to this pair of dwellings.
10. I acknowledge the front fascia is deeper than that of the adjoining property and most of the other properties in the area but this change is not particularly

noticeable in the overall streetscene. I observed that a property further along on the opposite side of the road has a similarly sized fascia.

11. Taking all relevant considerations into account, including the guidance set out within the SPD, I conclude that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the adjoining semi-detached property. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not materially conflict with Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Core Strategy and Policy DM DC 1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Development Management Plan which requires development to be of high quality architecture and urban design and to respect local character including the nature of a particular road.

Conditions

12. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council in light of paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. As the development has already taken place a standard time limit condition is not necessary. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. This would also prevent any increase in roof height or changes to it and would prevent the installation of additional windows. I refer to the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance which states that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use will rarely pass the test of necessity and should only be used in exceptional circumstances. I do not consider there to be exceptional circumstances here.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR