



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2021
by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/21/3266686

First Floor Flat, 2 Erncroft Way, Twickenham TW1 1DA

- 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 Olga Slonchak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 20/1618/FUL, dated 16 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as rear dormer by way of hip to gable conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear dormer by way of hip to gable conversion at First Floor Flat, 2 Erncroft Way, Twickenham TW1 1DA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/1618/FUL dated 16 June 2020, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Dwg. No. A03 dated 10 June 2020; Dwg. No. A04 dated 10 June 2020; Dwg. No. A06 dated 10 June 2020; Dwg. No. A07 dated 10 June 2020; Dwg. No. A08 dated 10 June 2020.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as stated on the application form and approved plans.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling subdivided into flats, located close to the junction between Erncroft Way and Whitton Road. The immediate surrounds are primarily residential with an overarching similarity of style. Nonetheless a

diverse range of roofscapes exists. In particular, the full width dormer at the neighbouring attached dwelling of No. 4 is clearly visible from the rear of the site, and the variety of rear dormers along Whitton Road also define views from both the site and Erncroft Way.

5. The proposal would introduce a rear dormer built up to the ridge and spanning most of the roof with minimal set back, being a prominent addition to the dwelling. While the SPD¹ states roof extensions should not dominate existing structures, this is guidance rather than policy. As a semi-detached property, the host dwelling is experienced as a pair already defined by a large dormer to one side. Although this may have been constructed under permitted development rights that do not apply to the host property, its presence nonetheless forms part of the baseline character against which the proposal should be assessed. Therefore, while a sizeable element would be introduced to the roofscape, in context the proposal would not appear disproportionately large or incongruous and instead would restore a level of symmetry to the pair of dwellings.
6. Similarly, while the prominent location of the proposal would result in views of it from both Erncroft Way and Whitton Road, it would be experienced alongside surrounding roofscapes. Dormer windows of varying scales are highly visible from both the site and surrounding highways including dormers of similar scale and style to the proposal, and pairs of dormers on neighbouring semi-detached properties. In this context the proposal would be compatible with the surrounding character of development.
7. For all of the reasons I find that the development would not have a significantly adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan, adopted July 2018 and the SPD which together seek to ensure a high level of design.

Conditions

8. The standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plan are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the materials are as stated in the application form and approved plans in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. Having had regard to all matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out above.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

¹ London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations May 2015 (SPD)

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions at paragraph 1 of this report.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR