

Application reference: 06/2692/HOT ST MARGARETS, NORTH TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
14.08.2006	24.08.2006	19.10.2006	19.10.2006

Site:

15 Talma Gardens, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7RB

Proposal:

Proposed 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 O'Donnell
15 Talma Gardens
Twickenham
Middlesex
TW2 7RB

AGENT NAME

Englishhaus Limited
30 Lawrence Road
Hampton
Richmond Upon Thames
TW12 2RJ

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

13 Talma Gardens, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7RB, - 31.08.2006
27 Talma Gardens, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7RB, - 31.08.2006
17 Talma Gardens, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7RB, - 31.08.2006
Lower Flat, 25 Talma Gardens, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7RB, - 31.08.2006
Top Flat, 25 Talma Gardens, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 7RB, - 31.08.2006

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
06/2169/PS192	• Demolition Of The Existing Garage Followed By The Erection Of A Hip To Gable Loft Conversion With Rear Dormer.	GTD	03/08/2006
06/2692/HOT	• Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension.	PCO	

Constraints:

06/2692/HOT
15 Talma Gardens
Twickenham

Proposal:

Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension

Main Development Plan Policies:

BLT 11, 15 and 16

Present Use:

Single Family Dwelling

Site, History and Proposal:

The application site comprises a 2-storey semi-detached house with long rear garden on eastern side of Talma Gardens. TG is a cul-de-sac north of the A316 comprising primarily of semi-detached properties residential in both nature and type.

The property was granted on 30/06/2006 a lawful development certificate (app ref: 06/2169/PS192) for the demolition of an existing garage followed by the construction of hip to gable loft conversion and rear dormer. This has not yet been implemented.

The proposal is for the construction of a full width rear extension, single storey with hipped roof measuring 3.5m deep on the boundary with No.13 (the other half of this pair of semi-d's). The hipped roof would have eaves at 2.3m above ground level and a sloping roof rising to a maximum of 3.85m.

Materials proposed are to match existing – i.e. rendered blockwork and plain clay tiles.

Public and Other Representations

No letters received

Professional Comments

Visual Intrusion

The proposed rear extension would be largely unseen from public view and glimpses of the side wall and roofing which may be possible will not be objectionable, the building being of a design which is appropriate in both scale and form when seen in the context of the host property.

With regard to neighbour amenity, the extension does not exceed the depth recommendations contained in the Council's SPD for house extensions. The adjoining semi, No 13, has itself been extended and I am of the view that the degree of projection beyond the rear wall of this extension is insufficient to appear either unreasonably intrusive in visual terms or give rise to undue loss of light. The rear facing glazing also ensures that there would be no unusual privacy concerns.

With regard to no 17, the shared driveway with No 15 provides a gap of over 2.0m between these houses plus the flank wall of the extension facing this neighbour is chamfered. The resultant separation distance is considered sufficient to render the scale of extension proposed non-harmful to this neighbour's existing amenities.

There are no other determining factors in this case.

I therefore recommend **PERMISSION** subject to conditions and informatives:

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): ST

Dated: 22/09/06

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/~~Development Control Manager~~

Dated: 22/09/06

ST [Signature]

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

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

CONDITIONS:

INFORMATIVES:

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE: