

Application reference: 05/2203/HOT/HOT
TEDDINGTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
26.07.2005	09.08.2005		04.10.2005

Site:

97 Waldegrave Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW11 8LA

Proposal:

Erection rear dormer roof extension

Present use:

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

APPLICANT NAME

Richard Muraszko
97 Waldegrave Road
Twickenham
Richmond Upon Thames
TW11 8LA

AGENT NAME

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Neighbours:

95 Waldegrave Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW11 8LA, - 16.08.2005
99 Waldegrave Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW11 8LR, - 16.08.2005

History:

99/1826/FP Single storey side extension & formation utility room
99/0133/BN Formation of through lounge.
~~00/2382~~ Loft Extension With Rear Dormer.
96/3062/FUL Creation Of Vehicular Access And Hardstanding
05/2203/HOT Erection rear dormer roof extension

Constraints:

Professional Comments:

- - 2 storey end terrace house with original rear projection and a s/s ext adjacent to rear projection, likely to have been built as PD in 1999 (BC ref 44/1826/FP).
- 00/2382/FuX granted pp on 3/10/00 for erection of lg rear roof ext, full width, mansard style ext on rear roof slope - not implemented.
- current app also proposes roof ext + covering letter explains pp being sought to have previous app extended.
- hence proposal is for a full width / full height, mansard style roof ext. Wd be clad in plain grey tiles
- No Regs rec'd.
- pp granted under 00/2382/FuX would expire on 30th 2000. Reason for time limits on pp is to enable the LPA to assess whether there has been a material change in circumstances since original decision.
- in this case material change is the current SP4 for household ext which came into effect in Sept. 2002. In accordance with Gov guidance, SP4 seeks to achieve higher standard of design in new dev. It states roof ext shld not dominate original roof + roof ext

should be set in from all sides, above eaves + below ridge. Having regard to the advice, current proposal is clearly contrary to guidelines.

SLO reveals that there have not been any roof ext in vicinity, except for property adjoining No. 95 (pp granted for roof ext under 89/0948/12C) a considerable time before. Hence roofscape of this terrace is relatively unaltered by roof ext.

The app property, being end terraced + adjacent to a roadway that serves the office building, is highly exposed. In addition the flank of the property is visible from the street, as is demonstrated by the applicants own photos.

In these circumstances and having regard to the current SPG + Gov advice on good design, I consider a refusal is justified in this case.

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): ADP

Dated: 14/9/05

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated: ADP
14/9/05

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

CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE: