



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2024

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3344633

64 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 A Vara against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Council.
 - The application Reference is 23/3438/HOT.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, relocation of entrance door and associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, relocation of entrance door and associated internal alterations at 64 Lyndhurst Avenue Twickenham TW2 6BU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/3438/HOT, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
1. 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.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1403-P-001, 1403-P-002, 1403-P-003, 1403-P-004, 1403-P-005 and 1403-P-006.
3. The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Strategy, received by the Council on 11 January 2024, and retained as such thereafter.
4. The new first floor side window as shown on drawing 1403-P-006 'Proposed elevations' shall be obscured glazed and fixed shut to 1.7m above ground level.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an extended two storey semi-detached home on a corner plot. The small front garden faces Lyndhurst Avenue and the side flank and length of rear garden run alongside Chiltern Avenue. There are a range of two storey and bungalow homes in this area of established residential character and pleasing mid density suburban appearance. The proposal is as described above.
4. The Council values the space to the side of the house and is concerned that the scale and siting of planned development here would be incongruous and visually detrimental.
5. The existing dwelling does not share full symmetry with its adjoining house and this host property presently has an ungainly arrangement of roof and window forms including a large, non-characteristic side dormer. This is planned for removal. I noted a number of corner-sited properties locally do have flanks which are close or abut footway and this includes the dwelling immediately across Lyndhurst Avenue. The strip of land alongside the existing home is not visually precious in my opinion. The proposed extension work, while sizable, would show subservience in terms of set-back and lower ridge and would be of a sympathetic hipped roof form. The rear extension part is of a size and style seen frequently locally and would be accommodated within a good-sized garden. Given all of this I conclude that the appeal scheme would not lead to an alien scene; it would sit comfortably in its immediate and wider surrounds.
6. Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) and London Plan Policy D4 are relevant. Amongst other matters they call for good quality design with buildings which relate to context, protect local character and appearance, and are compatible with surrounding development patterns and spacing. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies. The Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations' has parallel objectives and, recognising that it cannot be expected to cover every eventuality in detail, I also conclude that the scheme would accord with the aims of that document.

Conditions

7. Along with standard commencement the Council suggests conditions requiring development to be in matching materials and in accordance with listed, approved, plans. I would agree with this in the interests of visual amenity and for the avoidance of doubt. For reasons of safety, I would agree that a condition relating to the Fire Safety Strategy is applied. The Council's suggestion on restrictive glazing for an upper side window is a valid requirement in the interests of neighbours' amenity.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR