

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/21/3276661

8 Palewell Park, London SW14 8JG

- 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 Timothy Payne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/1082/FUL, dated 20 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is removal of opening rooflight and installation of lead clad dormer window to east elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. In light of the appellant's submitted Planning Fire Safety Strategy, the Council has withdrawn its Fire Safety reason for refusal. The remaining main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of properties of which it forms a part, and the wider area.

Reasons

3. While the residential buildings in Palewell Park predominantly comprise terraces and semi-detached houses of a fairly consistent two storey height, Nos 6, 8, 10 and 12 Palewell Park form two markedly taller semi-detached pairs. Although the front elevations of the two pairs are similar, their built forms vary at roof level. Most noticeably, Nos 6 and 8 have half hipped roofs with two front rooflights in the upper part of the roof at No 8, and three smaller rooflights at No 6. In the lower part of the roof, both properties have an outer front dormer window. In contrast, Nos 10 and 12 have gable roofs and they lack high level front rooflights. Furthermore, they have outer front wall dormers which break the eaves line.
4. Notwithstanding these differences, across the four properties front dormer windows are consistently confined to the lower part of the roofs and other than the subdividing chimney stacks and parapet walls in each pair, the upper part of the front roof planes are distinctly devoid of substantive projecting elements. Consequently, this pattern to the roofscape is an important aspect of the character and appearance of the properties and the respective part of the street scene.

5. In the appeal scheme, the outer front rooflight at No 8, close to the hip, would be replaced by a dormer window that would replicate the design of the existing dormer window beneath. However, due to its high level position and visible additional bulk, it would prominently unbalance Nos 6 and 8 as a pair, and disrupt the important roofscape pattern across the two sets of semi-detached properties.
6. In light of the above, the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of properties of which it forms a part, and the wider area. As such, it would conflict with Policy LP 1 of the Council's 2018 adopted Local Plan. Amongst other things, this policy seeks to ensure development respects, contributes to and enhances local character. It would also conflict with the Council's 2015 House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, insofar as its guiding principles promote development which sympathetically complements the existing house and is in character with the locality.

Other Matters

7. Any benefits to the living conditions of the occupiers of the host property that would be derived from the proposed development would not outweigh the harm.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Ford

INSPECTOR