

**Application reference: 13/2243/FUL**  
**WEST TWICKENHAM WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
24.06.2013	24.06.2013	19.08.2013	<del>19.08.2013</del>

**Site:**

The Prince Blucher, 124 The Green, Twickenham, TW2 5AG

**Proposal:**

*Single* ~~Two~~ storey side extension with glazed lean to roof. Erection of a new timber pergola and re-positioning of 3 No. existing parasols. New section of glazed roof to existing pergola.

*1.0/13*  
*17*

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Griffin Brewery  
Chiswick Lane South  
London  
W4 2QB  
United Kingdom

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Jeff Thwaites  
51-55 Fowler Road  
Hainault  
Essex  
IG6 3XE  
United Kingdom

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 03.07.2013 and posted on 12.07.2012 and due to expire on 02.08.2012

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

14D Urban D

**Expiry Date**

24.07.2013

**Neighbours:**

2A Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5AH - 03.07.2013  
114 The Green, Twickenham, TW2 5AG, - 03.07.2013  
2 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5AH, - 03.07.2013  
Flat 1,4 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5AH, - 03.07.2013  
3 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5BG, - 03.07.2013  
Flat, The Prince Blucher, 124 The Green, Twickenham, TW2 5AG, - 03.07.2013  
112 The Green, Twickenham, TW2 5AG, - 03.07.2013  
2 Briar Road, Twickenham, TW2 6RB, - 03.07.2013  
33 First Cross Road, Twickenham, TW2 5QA, - 03.07.2013  
32 First Cross Road, Twickenham, TW2 5QA, - 03.07.2013  
6 Briar Road, Twickenham, TW2 6RB, - 03.07.2013  
4 Briar Road, Twickenham, TW2 6RB, - 03.07.2013  
2 Briar Road, Twickenham, TW2 6RB, - 03.07.2013

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

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application: 13/2243/FUL

Two storey side extension with glazed lean to roof. Erection of a new timber pergola and re-positioning of 3 No. existing parasols. New section of glazed roof to existing pergola.

Professional Comments:

**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): CSH

Dated: 11/10/13

**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: .....

<b>REASONS:</b>
<b>CONDITIONS:</b>
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b>
<b>UDP POLICIES:</b>
<b>OTHER POLICIES:</b>

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**

<b>CONDITIONS:</b>	
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b>	

**ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:**

13/2243/FUL  
THE PRINCE BLUCHER, 124 THE GREEN,  
TWICKENHAM  
TW2 5AG

WEST TWICKENHAM WARD

**Proposal:**

Single storey side extension with lean-to roof; erection of a new timber pergola and re-positioning of 3 No. existing parasols; new section of glazed roof to existing pergola.

**Site description and planning history:**

The site is located to the western end of The Green at the junction of The Green, Staines Road and Briar Road.

The property is located within the Twickenham Green Conservation Area, has been designated a Building of Townscape Merit, a mixed use area and an archaeological priority area.

**Amendments:**

The original description of development was as follows -

*'Two storey side extension with glazed lean to roof. Erection of a new timber pergola and re-positioning of 3 No. existing parasols. New section of glazed roof to existing pergola.'*

Following <sup>officer</sup> representations regarding the impact of the two-storey element of the proposal, the plans were amended. As such, the description of development was amended to be that set out above.

As the proposal was a reduction in scale of the proposed works, it was not considered necessary to re-consult.

**Public and other representations:**

No representations have been received.

**Professional comment**

Land Use

Policy DM TC 5 states that uses which support the evening economy such as...pubs...will be supported if -

- a) they are compatible with other town centre policies.
- b) add diversity to the evening economy of those areas identified as requiring diversification (Richmond and Twickenham);
- c) there is not an adverse effect on the amenity of nearby uses and surrounding residential areas, including a cumulative adverse effect.

Given that the application relates to a long established public house it is considered that 'a' and 'b' will not be affected by the proposal. Given that the proposal is considered not to unduly affect the amenities of local residents (see below), it is considered that the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of this policy and no land use concerns arise.

Design

As noted above, the premises are located within a Conservation Area and the application site and a number of surrounding buildings have been designated as

Buildings of Townscape Merit. Accordingly, regard is given to the relevant policies in the DM DPD and Core Strategy.

During the course of the application, amended plans were sought and received amending the design of the proposal by removing the first floor element of the proposal which had been considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the BTM itself as well as the wider Conservation Area.

Given these changes, the extension would not now be visually intrusive when viewed from the street scene and is more modest scale is appropriate for the building itself. Other aspects of the proposal include an extension to the existing timber pergola such that it would now project towards the main road as well as the installation of a glazed roof to the existing timber pergola. These alterations and works are similarly considered to be relatively modest additions and would preserve the character of the area and the building itself.

It is considered that the overall appearance would be acceptable and would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the building itself or the wider Conservation Area. This is a view that the Principal Conservation Officer concurs with.

#### Residential amenity

When assessing the scheme it is necessary to consider the requirements of Policy DM DC 5 (Neighbourliness, Sunlighting and Daylighting). This Policy states that in considering proposals for development the Council will seek to protect adjoining properties from unreasonable loss of privacy, pollution, visual intrusion, noise and disturbance.

The physical development itself would not unduly harm the amenities of the local residents, being relatively small scale and situated away from neighbouring properties.

Overall, bearing in mind the location of the physical works and the existing long standing use of the premises as a public house, it is considered that the proposals would not be un-neighbourly or result in any undue harm to the amenities of the area. The proposal is considered to comply with adopted DMP policy DM DC 5.

#### Trees

Policy DM DC4 requires that where trees are removed, appropriate replacement planting will normally be required and that there will be a presumption against schemes that result in a significant loss of trees, unless replacements are proposed and there is good reason such as the health of the trees, public amenity, street scene or restoration of an historic garden.

There is a significant willow tree located in the centre of the garden. Whilst the extension would not impinge upon this tree, the installation of the pergola to the rear of the site, and therefore adjacent to the tree would be in close proximity to the willow. The Council's Arboricultural Officer has not raised any undue concerns subject to a condition seeking an Arboricultural Method Statement being submitted.

#### **Conclusion**

It is therefore recommended that **PERMISSION** be granted.