

Application reference: 06/2426/HOT
HAMPTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
26.07.2006	26.07.2006	20.09.2006	20.09.2006

Site:

68 Milton Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2LJ

demolish
EASTING ROAD EXT + REPLACE = NEW

Proposal:

Erection of single storey rear extension to ~~side of the property.~~

Present use: *SFO*

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 Humphires
68 Milton Road
Hampton
Middlesex
TW12 2LJ

AGENT NAME

Englishhaus Architectures Ltd
30 Lawrence Road
Hampton
TW12 2RJ

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

57 Malvern Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2LN, - 27.07.2006

70A Milton Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2LJ, - 27.07.2006

70 Milton Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2LJ, - 27.07.2006

66 Milton Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2LJ, - 27.07.2006

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
06/2426/HOT	• Erection of single storey rear extension to side of the property.	PCO	

Constraints:

**68 MILTON ROAD
HAMPTON
HAMPTON WARD
06/2426/HOT
Contact Officer: RIA**

Site and History:

The application site is located on the eastern side of Milton Road and comprises a two-storey, end-terraced dwelling with a single-storey rear and side extension and rear roof dormer.

Building records show that the ground floor rear and side extension was built in 1998 and the loft conversion in 2003, both assumed to be built under permitted development.

Proposal:

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing flat roofed, rear extension and replace with a new full width, 2.05m deep, single storey rear extension, with a pitched roof 2.5m high at the eaves rising to 3.35m. A 3.015m high parapet wall is also proposed on the northern boundary, which extends 6.206m in deep from the original dwelling. Two rooflights are proposed on either side of the rear extension.

Public Representation:

No objections have been received.

Professional comments:

- SPG for terraced dwellings states that the effect of a single storey extension on daylight and sunlight is usually acceptable if the projection is no further than 3m.
- The extension would be within the SPG recommendations in terms of depth (and is the same depth as the previous extension) and therefore is considered not to have an impact on daylight and sunlight on adjoining properties.
- There is a side passage to the northern side of the property and a site visit reveals an existing 2.0m high boundary fence and a significant amount of vegetation, which currently restricts views of the ground floor level. Furthermore, there are no ground floor windows on No.70, which could be affected by the proposed 3.015m boundary wall and is therefore not considered to be visual intrusive and result in a loss of light.
- The proposed extension would be 0.45m lower at the eaves on the boundary than the previous extension and is therefore considered to reduce the impact on daylight and sunlight for No.66. There would be no overlooking or loss of privacy for adjoining properties, given that there are no proposed windows on the flanks of the extension.
- The design of the proposed single storey rear extension would complement the existing dwelling, particularly in terms of the pitched roof matching the outrigger, and would integrate with the host dwelling and adjoining properties.

- In summary, the proposed extension would not result in an dominate form of development, would not result in an excessive loss of light, outlook or privacy to the adjoining properties and would not significantly detract from the character and appearance of the building or surrounding area.

Approval is recommended

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): RIA

Dated: 7/9/06

I agree the recommendation:

~~Development Control Manager~~ Development Control Manager

Dated: 08/09/06

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:	<i>SEE CAPS!</i>
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

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

CONDITIONS:	
INFORMATIVES:	

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE: