The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2020

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/20/3249080
18 Godfrey Avenue, Twickenham TW2 7PF

- 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 Miss Liz Swan against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
- The application Ref 19/3451/HOT, dated 12 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2020.
- The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension with dormer windows to front, rear and side roof slopes.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling located within a predominantly residential area comprising mainly semi-detached dwellings which have hipped roof forms. By reason of its siting on the outside of a bend, the property is noticeable within the streetscene from 2 directions. However, and although a detached dwelling, the property's general design and roof form reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding dwellings. The Council's *House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) seeks to maintain existing styles and roof profiles and ensure alterations are sensitive to the existing character.

4. As identified by the appellant, some of the surrounding dwellings have been altered, including hip to gable roof extensions and the erection of dormer windows predominantly within the rear roof slopes. Where the roofs have been altered, they have maintained a similar pitch of front roofslope when compared to what originally existed.

5. The proposed development includes a roof extension to the property which would result in a mansard roof form with dormer windows within the front, rear and one of the side slopes. This proposed extension would replace the existing hipped roof of the property but would not increase the overall height of the ridge.

6. Although some of the roofs have been altered, it was not identified during the site visit that other dwellings within the surrounding area, in particular those fronting Godfrey Avenue, possess a mansard roof form. By reason of bulk, design and steep roof pitch, the proposed mansard roof form would be incompatible with the prevailing roofscape of the dwellings within the surrounding area. The resulting property would, as claimed by the Council, have a top heavy appearance and would be a visually intrusive form of development when viewed from the road.

7. Further, the design and form of the proposed dormers with their vertical emphasis would not reflect the fenestration of either other dormers within the surrounding area or the property itself. By reason of form and design, The appeal scheme would be an unsympathetic, bulky and incongruous addition which would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the property, the streetscene and surrounding area. The use of traditional materials in the erection of the proposed development would not mitigate the unacceptable harm which has been identified.

8. Reference has been made by the appellant to the appeal scheme enabling the provision of additional living accommodation and also resulting in an efficient use of the property of the type referred to in the National planning policy Framework (the Framework). However, the Framework also refers to permission being refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. For the reasons already given, this would be the case with the appeal scheme.

9. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan, the SPD and the Framework. Amongst other matters Policy LP1 requires development to be of high architectural quality and compatible with local character. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR