



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/20/3245381
2 Springfield Road, Twickenham TW2 6LQ

- 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 S Rowland against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/3047/HOT, dated 9 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and loft conversion, including flat roofed dormer and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension and loft conversion, including flat roof dormer and porch at 2 Springfield Road, Twickenham TW2 6LQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/3047/HOT, dated 9 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the application form and undated drawing numbers 01, 02 and 04.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and area, with particular reference to the roof design.

Reasons

3. The host building is at the end of a symmetrical, hipped roof terrace on the edge of an estate comprising houses of similar mid twentieth century architectural style. Many of these houses have been altered with the addition of porches, loft conversions and rear dormer windows. Occasional hip to gable roof conversions can be observed on end of terrace houses on the estate and in the wider area. Although nominally on Springfield Road, the terrace is situated

at the entrance to the estate and the front elevation angled towards the main road.

4. The property already has an extant permission to build a 'two-storey side extension and loft conversion, including flat roofed dormer and porch'¹. The approved design is to change the main roof from hip to gable, which is the same as the current application. However, the applications propose different roof configurations for the two-storey extension and the box dormer window.
5. There is a greater than theoretical possibility that the approved development will take place because the appellant has submitted supporting information explaining their need for the development on medical grounds and positively engaged in discussions with the Council regarding amendments. I therefore accord the fallback position substantial weight in my decision.
6. The SPD for House Extensions and External Alterations² advises that hip to gable conversions will not be encouraged, especially when there is symmetry in a terrace. However, the site already has approval to change the main roof from a hipped to pitched structure and therefore the disturbance of the symmetry of the terrace has been established in principle. The issues remaining are therefore that of the roof configuration on the two-storey extension and the position of the box dormer.
7. In relation to the design of the extension roof, both sets of proposals are consistent with Policy LP1³, which requires local form and patterns to be respected, but I consider that current proposals are the more sympathetic form of development for the host house. This is because the design would appear better balanced in combination with a gable roof, whereas the extant permission for a combination of hip and pitched structure could look uncharacteristic and contrived. The additional bulk of a gable roof on the extension compared to the fallback position of a predominantly hipped structure would be minimal. The open space between the properties would be preserved by virtue of the host house sitting in a particularly large plot. Consequently, there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host building or terrace in the context of the extant permission.
8. When considering the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, it is pertinent that the side elevation is not visible from the parent estate, comparison with which therefore diminishes in importance. The side elevation is prominent, however, from both directions when approached along the main road. The view on the main road from the Stirling Road estate is dominated by gable ended houses, including the semi-detached house immediately in front of the host house. When approached from the other direction, architecture is more varied, but numerous gable ended structures are present. In this context, the proposed changes to the extension roof would be more in keeping with local forms and patterns than the extant permission. I therefore find the proposals are consistent with local policies and would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. Placing the dormer centrally would be aesthetically preferable, but I can find no justification in policies or in supporting documentation to object to an off-centre

¹ Application number 19/1316/HOT

² London borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Document, House Extensions and External Alterations (May 2015)

³ London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (adopted July 2018)

box dormer. I note that the Council says that the SPD recommends the dormer should be in the centre, but this is not in the information before me. Regardless, as it is at the rear and well screened from the public domain, it would not harm the appearance of the area and is therefore not in conflict with Policy LP1.

Other Matters

10. I note local concerns that the house could be split into two as part of this development, but this is not currently being proposed and regardless, would require separate planning permission.

Conclusions

11. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed. In addition to the standard commencement condition, conditions requiring the use of matching materials and accordance with the approved plans are necessary in the interests of local character and to provide certainty.

B Davies

INSPECTOR