



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3340953

49 Blandford Road, Teddington, Richmond Upon Thames, TW11 0LG

- 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 Vince Harte against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/2889/HOT, dated 25 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is side dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side roof extension at 49 Blandford Road, Teddington, Richmond Upon Thames, TW11 0LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/2889/HOT, dated 25 October 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Fire Safety Strategy, prepared by Raw Architects Ltd, dated 02/2023, received 25th October 2023, and retained as such thereafter.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2051 P101; 2051 P102; 2051 P103; and 2051 P110.

Preliminary Matters

2. On my site visit I observed that the development has been completed, along with a hip to gable extension and a rear dormer. According to the information before me, the Council issued a Lawful Development Certificate in April 2023 under ref. 23/0246/PS192 for a hip to gable extension and rear dormer at the property. The appeal is therefore in relation to obtaining retrospective permission for the side dormer roof extension.
3. The Council has referred to discrepancies in the drawings. Any discrepancies in relation to other parts of the dwelling such as the number of roof lights in the single storey side extension are not material to the appeal proposal. I can also see no significant discrepancies between the drawings in relation to the proposed side dormer roof extension. I shall therefore determine the appeal on the basis of the drawings submitted to and determined by the Council.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the side dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal concerns a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling which is paired with 47 Blandford Road. It is located in a row of semi-detached dwellings of a similar original design although several have been subsequently altered and extended.
6. The appeal is for a side dormer roof extension. It is positioned on the side elevation of a hipped roof forward projection which is a defining feature of the appeal property and the other dwellings in the same row.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) whilst non-statutory, provides useful guidance. It states that roof extensions should be 'in-scale' with the existing structure and should not project above the ridgeline. Roof extensions should not dominate the original roof and should keep existing profiles.
8. The side dormer that has been constructed at No 49 is set slightly down from the both the main ridge of the dwelling and the ridge of the hipped roof forward projection on which it sits. It is also set in from the side elevation of the newly constructed gable roof and has been constructed in matching materials. The dormer extension is set back from the front elevation of the dwelling which enables the original roof profile to be appreciated. In my opinion, the dormer is not an unduly prominent feature of the roof of the dwelling and is 'in-scale' with the existing structure. As such I find that it does not detract significantly from the original character and appearance of the dwelling and is a form of development that complies with most of the aims and objectives of the SPD guidance.
9. The hip to gable extension which has been constructed at the appeal property would on its own, cause an imbalance between the pair of semi-detached properties. Whilst the dormer adds to the unbalanced appearance, it is not a highly prominent feature and, in my view, does not result in any significant adverse effects on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair, or the surrounding area. Furthermore, the appellant refers to a planning application for a side dormer in respect of the adjoining semi, 47 Blandford Road, and although I do not have confirmation of the outcome of this application, there is a reasonable likelihood that in the future a similar form of development may be sought at that property.
10. I also note the dormer extensions on the adjacent pair of semi-detached houses, Nos 43 and 45 Blandford Road. I acknowledge the Council's comments that the roof extensions at Nos 43 and 45 were the subject of Lawful Development Certificates rather than applications for planning permission granted by the Council. The Council also state that the decision in respect of the side dormer extension at No 45 appears to have been issued in error and that the extensions at Nos 43 and 45 have not been carried out in accordance with the drawings submitted with the relevant applications and are subject to enforcement investigations.

11. Notwithstanding the Council's comments and having regard to the information provided by the appellant, it seems that at both 43 and 45 Blandford Road a form of dormer extension on the front/side roof slope has been confirmed as being lawful by the Council. There are also other examples of dormer roof extensions near to the appeal site which are also visible from Blandford Road and according to my observations, such extensions form part of the established character of the area whether or not they benefit from planning permission or have been constructed under permitted development rights. I therefore conclude that the side dormer extension has not resulted in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
12. My overall conclusion is that the side dormer extension does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair or the surrounding area. Thus, I find that it complies with Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which together require development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality which respects, contributes to and enhances the local environmental character.

Conditions

13. As the proposed development is retrospective, it is not necessary to impose the standard implementation or matching materials conditions. I have however imposed the approved plans condition for clarity and a fire strategy condition in the interests of the safety of the occupiers of the dwelling. I am not convinced of the need for a condition requiring a Flood Risk Assessment or Drainage Strategy given evidence before me and the small-scale nature of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR