



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/24/3346142

55 Avondale Road, Mortlake, Richmond Upon Thames SW14 8PU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Jonathan Lines against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0842/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the extension of existing rear dormer over part of the rear outrigger with 1no. roof light in flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace in which it sits, and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is not designed in a way so as to be subservient to the roofscape of the existing dwelling. Whilst it would be set back from the eaves it would be notably higher than the ridge of the outrigger on which it would sit. Because of those factors in addition to the length of its projection along the outrigger and its flat roof, it would appear as an incongruous and dominant box dormer style addition to the existing roof of the appeal property. In that respect, the proposal would not accord with the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2015 (SPD) where it refers to roof extensions. The fact that part of the chimney would remain visible would not mitigate against its overall impact.
4. My attention has been drawn to other examples of dormers over outriggers in the surrounding area. Of those identified on Avondale Road, they all predate the adoption of the SPD but, in any event, they are not so numerous so to define the character and appearance of the rear roofscapes of the terrace. Furthermore, the nearest example on Avondale Road at No 45, and the one which would have the closest relationship with the appeal property, is of a less imposing design, with a pitched roof and a projection above the ridge of the outrigger which appears for the most part to be screened by the chimney stack.
5. The next closest example at 37 Avondale Road appears to be set lower in relation to the ridge height of the outrigger on which it sits. Therefore, even in the context of the limited examples of dormers over outriggers that have been

constructed along Avondale Road, the appeal proposal would have a notably different and a harmful visual impact in comparison to what already exists, in particular because of the extent of its projection above the ridge of the outrigger on which it would sit. As a result, not only would there be harm to the character and appearance of the host property itself from the appeal proposal, but there would also be harm to the character and appearance of the terrace in which it is located.

6. Directly to the rear and diagonally across from the site are two outrigger dormers at 54 and 62 Ashleigh Road which were granted planning permission in 2020 and 2019 respectively. Neither party has provided drawings to illustrate exactly how similar or different those dormers are to the appeal proposal, but from what visual inspection was possible on my site visit and from the photographs provided, the dormer at No 62 appears also to have a pitched roof and to have its above ridge projection concealed mostly behind the chimney stack. As such, it too is not comparable in its impact to the appeal proposal.
7. The dormer at No 54 is the most similar in design and impact to the appeal proposal, being a flat roofed dormer which projects more obviously above the ridge of the outrigger on which it is built. I have not been provided with any detailed context of the Council's approval in that form other than a reference in the Delegated Report to it being similar to that permitted at No 62, which for the reasons I have set out does not seem to be the case. Irrespective however, this is the only example which has been put forward that is comparable in its impact to that which would arise from the appeal proposal. Whilst it is directly behind the appeal site its presence appears to be an isolated example, on a different terrace row. It does not justify the permitting of the visually harmful dormer that would result from the appeal proposal.
8. There are only three other examples referenced along Avondale Road which are further from the appeal site and in the context of the number of dwellings in the terrace row their presence does not support the proposition that there is a proliferation of outrigger dormers. There is one further relevant example provided on Ashleigh Road at No 68, albeit this is also a pitched roof dormer again with its upwards projection appearing well screened by its chimney stack. Those permitted at 3 and 89 Ashleigh Road are on the opposite side of the road and thus do not back onto the properties on Avondale Road. Therefore, the dormers identified on Ashleigh Road have, with one exception, had a much lesser visual impact on the character and appearance of the area than the appeal proposal would.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace in which it would sit and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policy LP 1 of the Richmond Local Plan 2018 where it refers to the compatibility of development with local character and seeks to protect character and appearance. Policy 28 of the emerging Local Plan contains the same provisions and therefore too would not offer support for the permitting of the proposed development.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the proposed development is intended to provide additional accommodation for the appellant and their family. Whilst I am

sympathetic to the need for this additional space, it does not justify the permitting of a harmful development.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wright

INSPECTOR