

Application reference: 12/0032/COU
FULWELL, HAMPTON HILL WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
06.01.2012	06.01.2012	02.03.2012	02.03.2012

Site:

150 Stanley Road, Teddington, TW11 8UD,

Proposal:

Change of use of existing shop (A1) to (C3) residential

Status: Pending Consideration (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application)

APPLICANT NAME

Corprop
1 Beechway
Twickenham
TW2 5JS

AGENT NAME

Mr S Scaffardi
12 Avenue Road
Staines
TW18 3AW

DC Site Notice: printed on 11.01.2012 and posted on 20.01.2012 and due to expire on 10.02.2012

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

-

History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:

Development Management

Status: REF

Date:12/01/1989

Application:88/2610/FUL

Rear First Floor Extension And Roof Extension To Form Self-contained Flat

Development Management

Status: REF

Date:27/07/1981

Application:81/0366

Change of use of first floor from residential to beautician salon and solarium.

Development Management

Status: RNO

Date:14/10/1987

Application:87/53/32

Installation of ground floor window in flank wall of property.

Development Management

Status: REF

Date:14/02/1989

Application:88/2610

Erection of rear extension to form a self-contained flat.

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application:12/0032/COU

Change of use of existing shop (A1) to (C3) residential

Enforcement
Opened Date:
04.05.2006
Reference:
06/0193/EN/UCU

Enforcement Enquiry

Constraints:

Site, history and proposal:

The property is a shop unit which was previously used as a hairdresser and has been vacant for a year. It is part of a parade of 7 shops on the periphery of the Stanley Road shopping area (150 – 162). In 2000 following representations from the shop owners and noting a number of vacant shop units it was decided that allowing the shops to go to residential use would be accepted. This would allow for consolidation of the parades in the more central part of the shopping area. Between 2000 and 2002 permission was granted for the following shops to convert to residential: 152, 154, 156 and 160. Consequently the frontage has no shopping designation but remains in a mixed use area.

This application seeks permission to convert the shop to a studio flat.

Public and other representations:

None received.

Professional comments:

In normal circumstances a change of use from a shop to residential in a mixed use area would not be encouraged as the function of the mixed use area is to attract visiting members of the public. However, bearing in mind the decision taken in 2000 and subsequent changes of use mentioned above, this is an unusual case and in the circumstances a change of use to residential is not objected to in principle.

Since 2000 a number of other policies and guidelines have changed. The Residential Development Standards give a baseline floorspace figure for a studio flat of 30 sq m. The proposed floorspace exceeds that figure, but only by a small amount. A minimum of 5 sq m of private amenity space is encouraged by the standards, but will not be possible here. Taking into account the circumstances it is not considered that this would amount to a reason for refusal.

No off-street parking exists or is proposed. The parking standard requirement for a one-bed dwelling and a shop is the same – one space – and therefore the proposal should not have a significant impact on on-street parking.

Some of the shopfront conversions were not well handled, however in this case it is not intended to significantly alter it. There will be replacement timber glazing giving a more residential appearance, but other shopfront features will remain.

Policy DM HO 6, requiring a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing, will be relevant to smaller sites such as this only when the draft supplementary planning document is available.

There has been some attempt to address the Sustainable Construction Checklist. However no pre-assessment for Ecohome 'excellent' rating or reason why this cannot be carried out has been given. A condition will be necessary requiring this.

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / ~~NO~~

I therefore recommend the following:

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

Case Officer (Initials): SGS

Dated: 22/2/12

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated:

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Development Control Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Development Control Manager:

Dated:

REASONS:
CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:
UDP POLICIES:
OTHER POLICIES:

The following table will populate as a quick check by running the template once items have been entered into Uniform

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

CONDITIONS:	
INFORMATIVES:	

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:

Professional Comments: