



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3327162

58 May Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6RL

- 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 Adam Nell and Anneka Long against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/1010/HOT, dated 16 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is Hip to gable and zinc rear dormer loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached 2 storey house on the corner of May Road and Cravel Road. The house has a ground floor rear brick extension that extends more than the full width of the house such that it projects slightly beyond the side wall where it meets the pavement, and a first floor flat roofed extension clad in dark zinc. The hipped roof remains unaltered. The adjoining house has a hip to gable extension and flat roofed rear dormer which has, to some extent, upset the symmetry shared by the houses. It is a similar size and colour to the proposed development but is finished with hanging tiles rather than zinc sheets. Because of its highly visible corner location, the rear of the appeal property contributes as much to the street scene as its front elevation.
4. The Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) advises that a roof extension should leave a significant part of the existing roof below and to the sides of it, so as not to dominate the roof. It also discourages hip to gable roof extensions. The proposed dormer would fill most of the roof plane. The hip to gable extension would transform the roof shape and, in combination with the first and ground floor extensions, it would alter the rear elevation of the house such that little of its original character and appearance would remain.
5. I note that there are rear dormers on many other houses along May Road that are visible from the street, some of which are on the main roof and others project out over rear outriggers. However, in most cases, the original roof form

is visible beneath them so that their original character is discernible, which would not be the case with the proposed development. Also, they are not as prominent and therefore have less of an impact on the street scene than would be the case with the proposed development. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would dominate the appeal property causing harm to both its character and appearance and that of the wider area and thus conflict with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) which require development to be of high architectural quality that enhances the local character.

Other Matters

6. The appellant has referred to their permitted development rights as a potential fall-back position. I have no details of an alternative scheme demonstrating that it would be similar to, or more harmful than, the current proposal, or evidence that it would be developed in the event of this appeal being dismissed. As such, it is a matter of negligible weight.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR