

**Application reference: 06/2128/PS192**  
**FULWELL, HAMPTON HILL WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
04.07.2006	04.07.2006		29.08.2006

**Site:**

68 Kings Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0QE

**Proposal:**

Erection of single storey rear 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**

Mr And Mrs Measures  
68 Kings Road  
Teddington  
Middlesex  
TW11 0QE

**AGENT NAME**

DNA Architecture  
Unit 6B  
Tannery House  
Tannery Lane  
Send, Nr Woking GU23 7EF

**Consultations:**

*Internal/External:*

**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

-

**History:**

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
06/2128/PS192	• Erection of single storey rear extension	REC	

**Constraints:**

Professional Comments:

- 2 storey end terrace house, sited on the corner of Kings Rd + Windsor Rd.
- property has an original rear projection with a steep sloping roof.
- proposal is for a sm s/s with an adjacent to outwigger volume of which is as follows:-

Flat roof section

$$\begin{matrix} 3-4 \\ (l) \end{matrix} \times \begin{matrix} 3-1 \\ (w) \end{matrix} \times \begin{matrix} 1-6 \\ (h) \end{matrix} = 16-86m^3$$

Sm. sloping roof section

$$\begin{matrix} 0-9 \\ (l) \end{matrix} \times \begin{matrix} 3-3 \\ (w) \end{matrix} \times \begin{matrix} 1-6 \\ (h) \end{matrix} = 4-752$$

Total 21-61m<sup>3</sup> (Agents rules = 19-2m<sup>3</sup>)

- Str reveals property also has triangular gabled gable on main roof, volume of which is:-

$$\frac{0-9 \times 2-8 \times 1-8}{2} = 2-268$$

$$\frac{2-268}{2} = 1-134m^3$$

No garage in rear garden

It is unclear if copy:open windows on front  
+ side elevations are original. Even if these wd  
were included, cost: (10) wd be less than the  
\$0m3 allowed for this property.

Re: proposal is PD + a LIC shd be granted.

**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): *AK*

Dated: *3/8/06*

I agree the recommendation:

*AK*  
Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated: *3/8/06*

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

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

**ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:**