
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3165734

80 Lyndhurst Avenue, Twickenham, 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 Mr S Maclaurin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref DC/DAA/16/3816/HOT, dated 18 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 80 Lyndhurst Avenue, Twickenham, TW2 6BU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/DAA/16/3816/HOT, dated 18 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Block Plan and 1608-1323.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be constructed on the side elevation.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling within a residential street comprising a mixture of house types and designs. The property is currently part of a symmetrical pair but I noted that the mix of houses and bungalows in the street create a varied appearance, spacing and development rhythm so that there is no clearly defined repetition or distinct character arising from the presence of symmetrical buildings. This is particularly so, given that a

great number of the existing semi-detached buildings have been altered and extended in a similar manner to that now proposed.

4. The Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (May 2015) (SPD) encourages subordinate extensions that appear as an obvious addition so that the original form of the building can be appreciated. In this case, the side extension would have a significantly lower roof height than the principal building and would be set back behind the level of the protruding gable on the front of the house. In my view, it would appear as a natural and respectful extension to the existing building and would be clearly subordinate to it. Whilst the proposed flat roof section would not be entirely in keeping with the property and its neighbours, this would not be a prominent or intrusive feature when viewed from street level.
5. The SPD suggests, with regards to side and rear extensions, that it will usually be desirable for subordinate extensions to be set back by at least 1 metre from the existing front elevation. However, this is not an absolute requirement and I am satisfied that the proposed extension achieves an appropriately subordinate appearance in any case, for the reasons set out above. Similarly, I do not consider it necessary for the building to be set in from the side boundary by 1 metre as the extension would be located adjacent to the neighbour's single storey garage, maintaining a good level of separation at first floor level, avoiding any terracing effect in accordance with the SPD.
6. I note that many of the extensions and alterations to other buildings in the street took place some time ago and in a different policy context. Nevertheless, they do now make up the character of the area and the proposal must be considered in the context of this established street scene.
7. Overall, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, I find no conflict with Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy (2009) which seeks to ensure good design that reflects local character and distinctiveness; Policy DM DC 1 of the Development Management Plan (2011) which has similar objectives for good design; or the SPD.
8. The Council has suggested a number of conditions in the event that planning permission is granted. In addition to the standard time period for commencement, it is necessary to specify the approved drawings in the interests of certainty. Matching materials are required to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development. Finally, permitted development rights are removed for the insertion of new windows in the side elevation, to avoid the potential for overlooking.
9. In light of the above, and having considered all other matters, the appeal is allowed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR