
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/20/3246957

2 Haggard Road, Twickenham TW1 3AF

- 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 Phil Rawcliffe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/3171/FUL, dated 17 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is rear L shaped dormer with roof lights on the front slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear L shaped dormer with roof lights on the front slope at 2 Haggard Road, Twickenham TW1 3AF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/3171/FUL, dated 17 October 2019, 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 plans: A01; A02; A03; A04; A05; A06; A07 and A08.
 - 3) The external finishes (including fenestration), including works of making good, shall be carried out in the materials stated on the application form, approved drawings or to match the existing.

Main Issues

2. The main issues of the appeal are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Haggard Road, with particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. There is a lack of consistency to the rear roofscape in the row of properties where the appeal site is located. This includes a number of dormers of differing sizes and design on both the main roofs and outriggers. Regardless of how these were permitted, they nonetheless form part of the existing mixed roofscape character of the area.

4. The proposed outrigger dormer would exceed the ridge line of that part of the roof. Nevertheless, all parts of the proposal would be set below the ridge level of the main roof. Moreover, the external materials would be similar to the existing dwelling and dormers in the area while the windows would match the style of those currently at the property.
5. The proposal would cover the majority of the rear roof. Notwithstanding this, it would be seen with other roof additions in the same row from the rear gardens. It would be partly visible from the road, as are other dormers in the surrounding streets, including at the other end of the terrace. Given there are several dormers nearby the presence of the appeal scheme would not be unexpected. Consequently, the proposed scheme would not be incongruous with the existing roofscape of the area.
6. The size and design of the front rooflights are modest and there are examples of these in the row. Therefore, they would not appear incongruous with the streetscene.
7. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The scheme would accord with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (Local Plan) and the SPD¹. These, in part, seek to ensure that development is compatible with local character and that roof extensions are sensitive to existing character and use matching or complementary materials.

Living Conditions

8. The appeal scheme would be visible from the dormer windows at 4 Haggard Road (No 4). Nonetheless, the existing outrigger and chimney is already a presence in views towards the appeal site. The additional height of the proposed outrigger dormer would not be significantly above the existing large chimney. This would reduce the scale and massing of it as experienced from No 4. Furthermore, the nearest window is set in from the boundary and both dormer windows in the existing dormer serve the same room. This gives a wider outlook from the room. Consequently, the extensions would not have an unacceptable impact on the outlook from No 4.
9. The Council consider the outrigger dormer would breach the 45-degree line from the mid-point of the nearest window in the dormer at No 4. The SPD states that developments should pass this test. However, while there would be some additional height to the built form, in this case there is already an outrigger and chimney in place that would have some impact on light reaching the room.
10. Given the orientation of the properties and the course of the sun and direction of shadowing, the impact on sunlight and shadowing from the appeal scheme would be limited to certain times of the day. Moreover, there is another window, further from the proposed dormer and serving the same room, that would allow light to enter the room. Based on the individual circumstances of this case, the proposal would maintain a reasonable relationship with next door by preventing excessive loss of daylight and sunlight.
11. Therefore, the proposal would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 4 with regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight. It would

¹ Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations May 2015

accord with Policy LP8 of the Local Plan, which in part, seeks to ensure that developments enable good standards of daylight and sunlight to be achieved in existing properties and are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact. Despite a breach of the 45-degree line, the scheme also accords with the aims of the SPD to prevent developments that would lead to a significant loss of daylight and sunlight or the creation of an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed one requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is to provide certainty. A condition is also imposed in relation to external materials in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having taken into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR