



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2021

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3276033

244 St Margarets Road, Twickenham TW1 1NL

- 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 Luke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref: 21/0230/HOT dated 25 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion consisting of a rear dormer and one rooflight to the side. Loft space to include a bedroom and en-suite bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion consisting of a rear dormer and one rooflight to the side. Loft space to include a bedroom and en-suite bathroom at 244 St Margarets Road, Twickenham TW1 1NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/0230/HOT dated 25 January 2021 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: 1579.01.03.Exg.001; 1579.01.03.Exg.002; 1579.01.03.Exg.022; 1579.01.03.Exg.023; 1579.01.03.Exg.024; 1579.01.03.Exg.060; 1579.01.03.Exg.061; 1579.01.03.Exg.062; 1579.01.03.Exg.063; 1579.03.03.Pln.023A; 1579.03.03.Pln.024B; 1579.03.03.Pln.060B; 1579.03.03.Pln.061B; 1579.03.03.Pln.062B; 1579.03.03.Pln.063;
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was amended during the application process to omit the front rooflights and to replace the side dormer with a projecting rooflight. The description of development used above and in the decision reflects this amendment, to accord with the scheme upon which the Council determined the application and as set out on the Council's decision notice.

3. Since the application was determined, the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been revised in July 2021. However, I do not consider that the changes directly affect the appeal proposal before me, but all references in the decision letter are to the July 2021 version.

Main Issue

4. The Council has confirmed that it raises no objection to the rear dormer roof extension. From my site visit and the information presented, I am also satisfied that the rear dormer is well designed and would be of an appropriate scale and siting to respect the character and appearance of the existing property, and preserve the character and appearance of the St Margaret's Conservation Area. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed side rooflight on the character and appearance of the property and the St Margaret's Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is one half of a semi-detached pair of dwellings on the east side of St Margarets Road and within a group of similar semi-detached pairs, dating from the early twentieth century, turning the corner into St Margarets Drive, and within a predominantly residential area. The appeal dwelling and surrounding buildings are also within the designated heritage asset of St Margaret's Conservation Area, an attractive largely residential area with a variety of dwellings, although the core of the Conservation Area, and its distinctive character, is focused on the mid-Victorian development of spacious villas set around open spaces. Nonetheless the predominant pattern of development within the Conservation Area and contributing to its significance is the verdant and spacious layout of a variety of house types.
6. The proposal would comprise a rear dormer roof extension together with a projecting rooflight on the side hip roof. The proposed size and siting of the rooflight would result in it being set comfortably away from the roof margins, including being set down from the apex of the hip and set in from the eaves. Although the side rooflight would project above the surface of the roof, I consider that its dimensions and siting would mean that it would sit comfortably within the roof slope and would not be a dominant or visually intrusive element in relation to the scale and proportions of the existing house.
7. The rooflight would be seen in some street scene views but given its size and its siting on the side roof slope, it would not be a prominent feature in such views. Furthermore, because of its siting it would not be readily viewed in relation to the semi-detached pair, in terms of affecting the symmetry between them.
8. A variety of rooflights and dormers are evident in the local and wider street scene, including in the group of properties within which the appeal property is situated. The proposed rooflight would not affect the sense of spaciousness around the property and its relationship with the neighbouring property. Given its siting and proportions, it would not be visually intrusive in street scene views and would not materially harm the predominant spacious pattern of development within the local area which contributes to the significance of the Conservation Area.

9. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed side projecting rooflight, individually and together with the proposed rear dormer, would respect the character and appearance of the existing property, the semi-detached pair and would preserve the character and appearance of the St Margaret's Conservation Area. There would be no conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Council's Local Plan (2018) and the Framework, and in particular Section 16, all of which seek for high quality design which seeks to respect the local context and conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. In terms of conditions, I agree with the Council that the materials should match those used on the existing building in order to protect the character and appearance of the existing building and of the Conservation Area. A condition should be imposed to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR