



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2020

by R. Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/20/3259792

49 Holly Bush Lane, Hampton TW12 2QY

- 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 and Mrs Evans against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 20/1804/HOT, dated 30 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion involving the erection of a rear dormer, and installation of front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion involving the erection of a rear dormer, and installation of front rooflights at 49 Holly Bush Lane, Hampton TW12 2QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1804/HOT, dated 30 June 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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: LR_20_49HOLLYBUSHLANE_00; LR_20_49HOLLYBUSHLANE_01 to 05 REV B.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No.49 Holly Bush Lane (No.49) is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling that has an existing two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and conservatory. The existing roof of No.49 is hipped and a dormer extension is proposed to the rear which would result in a slight extension to the hipped roof visible within the front elevation. This would alter the appearance of the front of the host dwelling but given its modest scale of around 0.7m x 0.5m, the hip extension would not appear visually intrusive or incongruous. Although forming

a semi-detached pair, the adjoining house at No.47 Holly Bush Lane has not been extended to the side and consequently there is no real symmetry in appearance. The extension to the hipped roof would not therefore be unsympathetic to its neighbour or compromise the architectural composition of the pair of dwellings.

4. The *Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (2015)* (SPD) guidance is that roof extensions should not dominate the existing roof and normally a significant area should be left beneath and either side of a new dormer. In this case, the proposed dormer would be around 4.9m in width and although set off the party wall with its adjoining neighbour it would fill much of the width of the existing roofslope. It would however be set around 0.5m from the eaves of the roofslope and would not project above the ridgeline. Although a 'significant' area of roof would not be left either side of the dormer, and therefore there would be a degree of conflict with the SPD guidance, overall, the scale would respect the proportions of the host dwelling and not appear overly dominant.
5. Because of its size and location, part of the dormer cheek, as well as the hip extension, would be visible within the streetscene particularly given the low height of the adjacent bungalow at No.51 Holly Bush Lane. I saw on my site visit, however, that the style of dwellings in Holly Bush Lane is very mixed, with a variety of roof forms. There are also examples of dwellings where rear roof extensions are visible, notably including No.58 Holly Bush Lane which forms part of the streetscene with No.49. These contribute to the mixed character and appearance of Holly Bush Lane, which I found to have no particular uniformity and is therefore less sensitive to change. Given this context, the appeal proposal would assimilate well within the streetscene.
6. Rooflights within the front elevation are also a characteristic of dwellings in Holly Bush Lane, including set within hipped roofs similar to No.49. The Council have raised no issue with the three proposed rooflights to the front roofslope and I find no reason to disagree.
7. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of No.49, or the wider streetscene. Consequently, there would be no conflict with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018) or paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework because it would be compatible with local character including the existing townscape, scale, and proportions.

Conditions and conclusion

8. In addition to the standard time condition for implementation, I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and to provide certainty. A condition relating to matching materials is also necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the reasons given, above I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones,

INSPECTOR