



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2019

by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Tuesday, 13 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/18/3214580
40 York Road, Teddington TW11 8SN

- 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 & Mrs Madar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 18/2023/HOT, dated 14 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2018.
 - The development proposed is the raising of ridge height to main roof and installation of rear dormer roof extension to rear roof slope and roof to outrigger. 2 no. rooflights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the raising of ridge height to main roof and installation of rear dormer roof extension to rear roof slope and roof to outrigger. 2 no. rooflights to front roof slope at 40 York Road, Teddington TW11 8SN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/2023/HOT, dated 14 June 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: DWG no. 01.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. DWG no. 01.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of the obscure glazing to the window on the east elevation of the rear dormer has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the glazing shall remain for the lifetime of the development.

Procedure Matter

2. The Council altered the description of the development from 'loft conversion' to 'raising of ridge height to main roof and installation of rear dormer roof extension to rear roof slope and roof to outrigger. 2 no. rooflights to front roof slope'. This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposals and I have therefore used this description as set out in my decision.

3. I noted on my site visit that the existing rear elevation did not fully reflect the plans I have before me as the ground floor had been altered and extended to project along the full width of the rear elevation. Planning permission was granted for this and as the appeal proposals relate to alterations to the roof and outrigger at first floor which would not alter the alterations already carried out, I therefore consider that the extension to the ground floor which has taken place is not considered a determining issue in this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a mid-terrace dwelling and is situated within a predominantly residential area. To the rear of the property is an existing two storey outrigger and a single storey addition that has been recently extended to span the full width of the rear elevation. The proposed development involves a roof extension with the addition of a 'L' shaped flat roof dormer sited above both the main part of the property and the outrigger, an increase in height of the ridge of the main roof and 2 rooflights to the front elevation.
6. The site has been the subject of a previously dismissed appeal (APP/L5810/D/18/3197620) for similar roof alterations. In that decision the Inspector, in regard to the increase in ridge height and the erection of 2 rooflights within the front roof slope, concluded that in isolation this would not unduly disrupt the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider area. I have no reason to disagree with the previous Inspector's findings on this matter as the roof height increase would be modest and would not disrupt the roof line of the existing row of terraces, it would also be reflective to the height of the neighbouring property at No 42 York Road. The impact of the rooflights would be negligible on the appearance of the front roof slope.
7. I have taken into account the previous appeal decision in arriving at my conclusion and note that the Inspector found that the rear dormer would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area due to its scale and design. However, in terms of the proposals I have before me, it has been revised from that of the previous dismissed appeal as the dormer has a reduction in size and would be sited away from the eaves of the roof slopes and outrigger. Although the Council consider these to be minor changes to the previous schemes, with the revisions it would reduce the bulkiness and would be similar to roof additions of properties from the surrounding area, and those already on the existing terrace row and including that of No 42 York Road.
8. I therefore find that the proposals would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area and would be in accordance with Policy LP1 Local Character and Design of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan, 2018, that ensures development to be of high architectural, urban design quality and should be compatible with local character and it would broadly comply with the guidance set out in the Councils Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and External Alterations (SPD) where roof extensions should not dominate the original roof and space should be left around the addition.

9. The appellant pointed out that the rear dormer roof extension to main roof slope, roof to outrigger and 2 rooflights to the front roof slope could be erected without the need for planning permission/on the basis that permission was granted on 24 October 2018 for a Lawful Development Certificate (application ref 18/2958/PS192). I am satisfied that if the appeal proposal were not erected, there is every likelihood that such, the rear dormer (fallback), would be built.
10. I judge that the fallback rear dormer would have a greater impact on the character and appearance than the appeal proposal, in particular as the dormer would be slightly larger, limiting space around the eaves and have a cramped appearance with no ridge height increase, as such I regard the likely erection of such roof alterations, the fallback position, as a significant consideration in this case.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition concerning external materials is required to protect the character and appearance of the area. I have imposed a further condition to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in requiring the window on the east elevation of the rear dormer to be obscured glazing.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Karen Taylor

INSPECTOR