

Application reference: 06/2180/HOT
WHITTON WARD

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

Site:

56 Bridge Way, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7JJ

Proposal:

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 Brown
56 Bridge Way
Twickenham
Middlesex
TW2 7JJ

AGENT NAME

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

54 Bridge Way, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7JJ, - 06.07.2006

58 Bridge Way, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7JJ, - 06.07.2006

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
93/0970/FUL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two Storey Side Extension With Additional Accommodation For Disabled Person And Provision Of Additional Parking Spac E. 	GTD	23/07/1993
06/2180/HOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single storey rear extension. 	PCO	

Constraints:

Application Ref; 06/2180/HOT
56 Bridge Way
Twickenham

Site, History and Proposal:

The application site is a two-storey semi detached residential property located on the southern side of Bridge Way, Twickenham.

Planning history includes the following:

- 93/0970/FUL Two-storey side extension with additional accommodation for disabled person and provision of additional parking space –Approved.

A single storey rear extension is proposed measuring 3.0m in depth, 6.4m in width with a mono-pitched roof. The roof will be 2.6m rising to 3.5m. There are numerous rear extensions to the surrounding properties.

The site is not located within a designated Conservation Area.

Public and other Representations

No letters from neighbouring properties have been received.

Professional Comments

The main considerations are the impact upon the privacy and amenities of the neighbouring properties and the impacts on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The design of the proposed extension is considered acceptable and is considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding properties. The materials will match the existing building.

The rear extension will not be readily visible from public viewpoints and will not result in significant detrimental effect on the appearance of the dwelling. The depth of the extension, being 3.0m from the rear wall of the property, is in compliance with Council's SPG and will not result in any unacceptable loss of daylight to neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the extension is not considered to result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties given there are no windows on the flank elevations. The proposed extension is BRE compliant.

It is considered therefore that the proposal is acceptable and will not have a detrimental impact on the privacy or amenity of the neighbouring properties or the appearance of the street.

Recommendation:

I therefore recommend **Approval**

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): LS

Dated: 23/08/06

I agree the recommendation:

A
Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Ray Summers

Dated: 24/8/06

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:

REASONS:	<u>See CAPS</u>
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: