



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3322045

68 Lincoln Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6NQ

- 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 Tung Kee Wong against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/0352/HOT, dated 8 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension with single storey rear element to replace existing two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension with single storey rear element to replace existing two storey side extension at 68 Lincoln Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/0352/HOT, dated 8 February 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No new external finishes, including fenestration and works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the finishes of the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2022/12/L01; 2022/12/PAE/01A; 2022/12/PAE02A; 2022/12/PAE03A; 2022/12/PAE04A; 2022/12/PAE05A; 2022/12/PAP01A; 2022/12/PAP02A; 2022/12/PAP03A; 2022/12/PAP04A; and 2022/12/PAP05A.
 - 4) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the submitted Fire Safety Strategy prepared by Simon Merrony Architects unless the LPA gives written approval to any variation.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey, end of terrace dwelling, located within a road comprising mainly of terrace and semi-detached dwellings of varying design and appearance.
4. There is an existing two storey extension to the side of the dwelling which would be demolished. This extension has a large crown roof, and whilst lower in height and subservient to the main dwelling, it does not, in my opinion, reflect the design of the original dwelling or the remainder of the terrace particularly well.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (May 2015) (SPD) whilst non-statutory, provides useful design guidance. It states that side and rear extensions should harmonise with the original appearance of the dwelling and advises that this can be achieved by integrating the extension with the house which can work well with detached houses and sometimes on the end of uniform terraces. An alternative method would be for the extension to appear as an obvious addition so that the original form can still be appreciated. The SPD also advises that two storey side extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building.
6. The ridge height of the proposed extension would be the same as that of the host dwelling. The roof of the extension would mirror the roof design of the original host dwelling, with a small end gable and hipped roof sloping down towards the eaves. The eaves height of the extension would be the same as that of the host dwelling and the use of matching fenestration and materials would ensure that the proposed extension would integrate well with the design and appearance of the existing dwelling.
7. The existing two storey extension is already greater than half the width of the host dwelling and does not comply with the design guidance contained within the SPD. The proposed extension would be approximately 1.2m wider than the extension to be demolished and similarly would not comply with the SPD in this respect. Nonetheless, in my view, the proposed extension would integrate well with the host dwelling and would respect its original character and appearance. Whilst the resultant dwelling would be wider than other properties that make up the terrace, this would not be particularly apparent or harmful given the overall length of the terrace and the various design elements to it.
8. The Council also suggest that the extension should be set back by at least 1 metre from the front elevation in order to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. However, as the dwelling is an end of terrace property, I consider that the integrated approach works equally well as also suggested in the SPD. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would significantly increase roof volume but the design of the extension fully reflects the original design of the host dwelling and the remainder of the terrace which comprises two-storey, pitched roof dwellings.
9. Whilst the dwelling is prominently located on the corner of Lincoln Avenue and Gloucester Road, the extension would be set in from the side boundary by between about 1 – 1.2m. The proposed extension would be well designed and well-integrated with the remainder of the terrace and would not detract from its character and appearance.

10. Thus, I conclude that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Despite some conflict with the SPD, I find that the proposal complies with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which requires all development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality which respects, contributes and enhances the local environmental character.

Other Matters

11. As the proposed two storey side extension would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and is sited some distance away from the boundary of the site with 66 Lincoln Avenue, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 66 in terms of loss of light. Any further alterations or extensions requiring planning permission would be assessed by the Council on their merits.
12. I note the comments made by neighbouring occupiers regarding the possibility of the extension being occupied as a separate dwelling, however, I have no evidence before me to suggest this to be the case. Any subsequent application for the subdivision of the dwelling would be for the Council to decide. In any event I am required to determine the appeal based on the proposal before me. The merits of previously approved extensions to the dwelling are not within the remit of this appeal.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a list of planning conditions in the event that this appeal was to be allowed. I have incorporated most of the suggested conditions, with some adjustments for clarity.
14. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. Whilst the Council suggest a condition requiring the submission of a Fire Safety Strategy, this was provided with the planning application. I shall therefore impose a condition requiring the implementation of the Fire Safety Strategy in the interest of public safety.
15. I have considered the Council's suggestion that a condition should be imposed stating that the extension shall not be used other than as accommodation incidental or ancillary to the existing dwellinghouse. However, as planning permission would be required for the independent use of the extension, I find that such a condition is not reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR