
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by Caroline Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3154982

76 Lyndhurst Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond upon Thames TW2 6BU

- 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 Gurdeep Dhillon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/0875/HOT, dated 4 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice and appeal form. Despite the application form and wording on the plans referring to a loft conversion, this is not shown on the submitted plans nor was it a matter considered by the Council in their determination of the application. I noted at my site visit that a rear dormer and hip to gable extension has been built at the property however this is not a matter for me to consider in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Lyndhurst Avenue is a suburban residential street consisting of semi-detached houses and bungalows of a similar age with small variations in design. The appeal site at 76 Lyndhurst Avenue is a semi-detached two storey dwelling adjoined to No 78. No 74 have converted their garage to living accommodation which adjoins the garage of No 74, a semi-detached property with a first floor flat roof extension above the garage.
 5. The proposal encompasses the erection of a single storey rear extension across the full width of the property and a flat roof extension above the converted garage. The Council has no objections to the erection of the single storey rear extension and I have no reason to come to a different view on this matter.
-

6. The Councils 'House Extensions and External Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) states that in order to achieve subordination and to avoid terracing, side extensions should be set back one metre behind the front elevation and sited one metre from the side boundary.
7. The proposed first floor extension would be contrary to the guidance within the SPD as it would not be stepped back and set in by only approximately 500mm. The flat roof design and unalignment with the adjacent first floor extension would result in an unsympathetic and ungainly addition to the host property, out of keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling. When read cumulatively with the adjacent first floor extension, the design, gap and unalignment would result in a fussy and unbalanced appearance. Whilst I appreciate that the step in from the side boundary would reduce the terracing effect to a degree, this would not outweigh my findings above.
8. At my site visit, I noted the numerous properties the appellant had drawn my attention to. Whilst I agree that there are several pairs of unsymmetrical extensions and examples with no set back or set in, I have been provided with limited details regarding the circumstances that led to these extensions being built. The Council have said that the majority of the extensions were built prior to the adoption of the SPD and current policies. In my view, the fact there have been a number of inappropriate extensions does not justify more of them, especially as they are now in conflict with the Council's adopted policies and guidance and I have therefore given them little weight.
9. Whilst I appreciate that the proposed extension may improve the quality of the accommodation and the lifestyle of the appellant, such personal circumstances seldom outweigh general planning considerations.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would materially harm the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area and find conflict with Policies DM DC1 of the Council's Development Management Plan (2011), Policy CP7 of the Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) and guidance within the SPD. These seek, amongst other things high quality design which respects and reinforces local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Jones

INSPECTOR