



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3345044

67 Fulwell Park Avenue, Twickenham, TW2 5HF

- 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 Mrs & Mr Kiran and Nick Johnson against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Council.
 - The application Reference is 23/2535/HOT.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The work has been completed; this does not alter the way in which I assess the scheme.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and b) living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey house within a terrace of four. Front elevations are mirrored in attractive style with the appeal property and its outer neighbour sitting on higher ground which gives a stepped ridge height at the halfway point in the terrace. This terrace, with its mix of front facing gables and forward-facing roof slopes, is reflective of many found locally. The locality is of established residential character and the thoughtful arrangement and designs of the terraced homes creates an area of pleasing appearance.
 5. The proposal is a flat-roofed rear dormer which has been constructed removing most of the rear roof slope and projecting above the appeal property's main ridge line creating a vertical upstand when seen from the front.
 6. Whilst a step along a terraced ridge line is not uncharacteristic in this locality given its topography, I could only see steps which were logical and well-constructed with a 'normal' ridge and a slope away to front and back. The scheme before me is completely alien. I would describe the vertical upstand, as seen from the front, as bizarre. It is simply not appropriate in this
-

streetscene. Turning to the rear of the property the large box-like structure displays no elegance, consumes the vast majority of the roof slope and projects above its own and the neighbouring ridges. There is little hint of subservience from this over-large top-heavy structure. The situation is compounded by ill-positioned and excessive glazing which takes nothing in cues from what lies below. Furthermore, from front and back, the structure as a whole aligns awkwardly with the chimney stack. Overall there is little or no account of the immediate or surrounding architecture with incongruity and obtrusive form prevailing.

7. Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) (LP) is relevant. Amongst other matters this calls for good quality design with built form which relates to context, protects local character and appearance, is of suitable height and proportions and would be compatible with surrounding development patterns. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to this policy. I further conclude that there would also be conflict with pertinent design-quality aims of the Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (SPD) albeit I acknowledge that this cannot cover every eventuality.

8. My concerns over this main issue carry substantial weight.

Living conditions

9. By any measure this is an extensive ungainly box type structure at upper level of an otherwise well-proportioned rear elevation on a terraced home. From the gardens of the adjoining properties, it would be seen as an unsubtle towering sizeable edifice with a large expanse of glass disproportionate to anything below. The overbearing aspect would be unsettling. Accepting that a degree of overlooking is the reality on an estate layout such as this, the increased intrusion on privacy would be palpable in both reality and perception and lead to a newly uncomfortable situation for immediate neighbours.
10. LP Policy LP8 aims to safeguard residential amenity; I conclude that the scheme before me would run contrary to this. It would also conflict with parallel objectives in the SPD.

11. My concerns over this main issue also carry substantial weight.

Other matters

12. I sympathise that expenditure has been incurred and is forthcoming; I understand that the Appellants did not realise until the scaffolding was removed that the dormer had not been constructed in accordance with approved plans. However, to be fair to all I have to determine matters as I would with a proposal which was not in situ and I would not endorse this example of poor design.
13. The scheme which received the Certificate of Lawfulness (Ref 21/3921/PS192) is a fall-back and in my opinion has little to commend it in terms of design quality or protection of living conditions for neighbours. However, I am faced with a planning proposal which goes further and requires permission and should be assessed according to development plan policies and well-rehearsed

development management criteria and to my mind it simply does not pass sound planning tests.

14. I appreciate that matching materials have been used and I understand that headroom is greater than the approved scheme and Building Regulations may have been passed. I have carefully considered other examples of roof works drawn to my attention, both locally and further afield, but for reasons of design, scale or context find none to be directly comparable. In any event I must assess this case on its own merits. I recognise that the host property is not the most prominent in the streetscene but nevertheless it is open to view and now appears visually alien, from front and rear, in an otherwise well-designed arrangement of terraced homes. Whether or not neighbours object I have to protect amenity for the long term.
15. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellants but these matters, either individually or collectively, do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issues identified above.
16. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality as well as on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR