

Application reference: 06/2127/HOT
TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
29.06.2006	29.06.2006		24.08.2006

Site:

235 Richmond Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 2NN

Proposal:

Single storey rear extension. Amendment to planning permission 05/1175/HOT, change to elevations from that approved..

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 D Surplice And Ms S Walter
235 Richmond Road
Twickenham
Middlesex
TW1 2NN

AGENT NAME

Mr P Stephen-ward
1 Popham Gardens
Lower Richmond Road
Richmond
TW9 4LJ

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

2B Sandycumbe Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 2LX, - 06.07.2006
2 Sandycumbe Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 2LX, - 06.07.2006
233 Richmond Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 2NN, - 06.07.2006
237 Richmond Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 2NN, - 06.07.2006
2A Sandycumbe Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 2LX, - 06.07.2006
2C Sandycumbe Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 2LX, - 06.07.2006

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
03/0226	• Provision Of Vehicular Access.	GTD	04/03/2003
03/0743	• Loft Conversion Incorporating Extended Ridge, Mansard Rear Dormer And Raised Flank And Gable Walls And Front Dormer.	REF	25/04/2003
05/1175/HOT	• Single storey rear extension.	GTD	27/07/2005
06/2127/HOT	• Single storey rear extension. Amendment to planning permission 05/1175/HOT, change to elevations from that approved..	PCO	

Constraints:

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): UJ

Dated: 22/08/2006

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/~~Development Control Manager~~

Dated: Wally Fowler 22/08/2006 RS

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:

Site, proposal and history: The property is a semi-detached single-family dwelling located on the Richmond Road. The site backs onto Cambridge Park Conservation Area, and is opposite Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area.

The most relevant history is an approval in 2005 for a single storey rear extension (05/1175/HOT). This was 3.85m in depth, infilling the space between the existing rear outrigger and the boundary with No. 231, and 2.2-3.9m in height. (This scheme incorporates increasing the height of the existing ground floor roof by approx. 0.5m at eaves level from 0.9m off the flank wall of the host property).

This proposal is for a single storey rear extension (amendments to planning permission 05/1175/HOT – changes to elevations from that approved). The principle differences between this scheme and the previously approved (05/1175/HOT) are:

- Design of the rear elevation (windows have been replaced with a further door);
- Slightly wider main monopitch roof (by approx. 0.1m);
- Omission of the side circular windows;
- New window on the side elevation of the host property;
- Incorporation of brickwork on rear elevation;

The scheme maintains the same depth.

Main development plan policies: BLT2, 11, 15, 16 and SPG 'Design guidelines for house extensions and external alterations'.

Material considerations: One letter of representation has been received:

- Internal layout of the extension
- Drainage, soil pipe, run off and sewerage
- Excavation and harm to fabric of adjacent building

These are not material planning considerations as they have already been taken into account. Not done.

There is no request for the application to be referred to Planning Committee.

Professional comments:

Siting and design: The extension will abut an existing rear outrigger and infill the gap between this structure and the neighbouring rear extension at No. 233 Richmond Road. The proposed extension would be in keeping with the appearance of the existing house and the surrounding properties, given the monopitch roof, and pebbledash and brickwork to match the existing. The omission of the windows and replacement with an additional door on the rear elevation, omission of circular windows on the flank elevation, and incorporating of brickwork on the rear elevation are all acceptable and not compromise the properties appearance.

Given the extension is to the rear of the property, and limited in height, scale and depth, the proposal will at least preserve the character, appearance and setting of nearby Conservation Areas.

Residential amenity:

SPG states that the effect of a single storey extension on daylight and sunlight is usually acceptable if the projection is no further than 3.5m for semi-detached properties. However, the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site, which may justify greater rear projections. In this instance, despite the extension having a rearward projection of approx. 3.9m, there will be an insignificant effect in terms of visual obtrusiveness and sunlight and daylight on the neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be in keeping with SPG.

There is currently an approx. 1.9m gap between the flank walls of the host property and No. 237 to the east. No. 237 has a rear conservatory, with flank and rear windows, and two kitchen windows on the flank wall facing the application site. Given the proposed extension does not extend past the existing outrigger on the host site, and the raising of the roof only becoming 0.1m closer to No. 237 than the approved scheme, and the height of the existing flank wall of the outrigger, the proposal will not have an unacceptable relationship with this property in terms of visual impact and light. (Given the existing relationship a BRE test is not considered necessary in this instance). There is an existing window on the east elevation of the property. This will be partly blocked up, and the upper section remain clear glass. Given the window element is 2.5m above ground level, and approx. 2m above floor level, this will not result in unacceptable overlooking.

The proposal will have an insignificant impact on the neighbouring property at No. 233 as the proposed extension will abut and project less than No. 233's rear extension. With respect to overlooking, given the additional door and previously approved doors are only on the rear elevation at ground floor level, the scheme will not cause unreasonable privacy implications to the occupants at No. 233.

Summary: By reasons of the extensions siting, scale and design, and the minor alterations between this and the approved scheme, this proposal will not compromise the character, appearance and amenities of the site, locality, nearby Conservation Areas and nearby residents. Nor will the scheme prejudice the aims of the SPG 'Design guidelines for house extensions and external alterations'.

Background papers:

Submitted forms and application
Adopted UDP and SPG
Application 05/1175/HOT