
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2021

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 August 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3270649

51 Gordon Avenue, Twickenham TW1 1NH

- 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 John Griffiths against the decision of Council of London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/0120/HOT, dated 13 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft extension with dormer over outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No.51 Gordon Avenue (No.51) is a two-storey terraced dwelling located on the southern side of Gordon Avenue. To the rear there is an existing dormer extension with Juliette balcony across the full width of the main part of the roof. The proposed dormer would adjoin and slightly over sail the existing, projecting over the original two-storey rear outrigger of No.51.
4. The proposed dormer would extend to a depth of around 3.7m from the main rear elevation of No.51, set back from the edge of the rear elevation of the outrigger by only around 1.3m. It would be sited very close to the eaves of the outrigger, above the existing ridgeline and extend up to the party parapet wall with its adjoined neighbour. The guidance in the *House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015)* (SPD) is that roof extensions should not dominate the original roof and should be set well in from either side. The proposed dormer necessarily adjoins the main rear elevation, but despite the set-back from the edge of the rear of the outrigger, the siting so close to the eaves and above the ridge means that the dormer would all but consume the roof of the outrigger. Its proportions would appear oversized, and it would dominate the original roof, contrary to the SPD guidance.
5. Further, in combination with the existing full width dormer to the main elevation of No.51, little of the original roof form would remain visible or legible and the profile of the roof would be entirely altered. Although there are only

semi-public views of the rear of No.51 from the gardens of neighbouring dwellings (including those on Ailsa Avenue) and the rear ginnel, because of this the proposal would appear a discordant addition to both the host dwelling and the rear of the terrace.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples of extensions, including roof extensions, to the rear of dwellings on Gordon Avenue. I have not been provided with full details of these extensions or know the circumstances of whether they were built pursuant to householder permitted development rights, or not. However, I saw on my site visit that existing dormer extensions close to No.51 appeared to leave a reasonable amount of roof space and, in the case of extensions to the outrigger, had a greater setback from the eaves and edge of the roof than the proposal before me. In contrast to the proposed dormer at No.51, they appeared subordinate to the existing roof and do not therefore lend any particular support to the appeal proposal.
7. I recognise that the proposed dormer would provide valuable additional accommodation within the roofspace for family living, exercise, and home working, which has been particularly important during Covid-19. However, whilst a benefit of the proposal, in this case I find it does not outweigh the harm that I have identified to character and appearance above.
8. In conclusion on the main issue, the proposed rear dormer would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. Therefore, in addition to the conflict with the SPD guidance I identify above, the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan (2018) Policy LP1 which requires development to be compatible with local character including proportions, scale and form.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR