

PLANNING REPORT

Printed Date: 7 July 2006

~~24~~ 24/9/06

Application reference: 06/1985/HOT
EAST SHEEN WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
13.06.2006	13.06.2006		08.08.2006

Site:

32 West Temple Sheen, East Sheen, London, SW14 7AP

Proposal:

Proposed double garage, raising of boundary wall and ~~two~~ new accesses.

Present use:

SED

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 M Stephens
32 West Temple Sheen
East Sheen
London
SW14 7AP

AGENT NAME

Bob Trimble
136 Clock Tower Road
Isleworth
TW7 6DT

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRUT Transport

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

2 Monroe Drive, East Sheen, London, SW14 7AR, -
30 West Temple Sheen, East Sheen, London, SW14 7AP, -
34 West Temple Sheen, East Sheen, London, SW14 7AP, -

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
02/2530	• Demolish Existing House. Construction Of New Single Dwelling.	WDN	23/10/2002
02/3391	• Demolition Of Existing House, Replacement With New House And Loft Accommodation; Erection Of Garage And Hardstanding With Access From Monroe Drive.	GTD	24/04/2003
04/2538/FUL	• Demolition of existing house, replacement with new detached 2/3 storey house, garage, vehicle crossover and pedestrian access to the front door (variation to application reference 02/3391/FUL).	REF	29/09/2004
04/3276/FUL	• Amendment to planning application 02/3391/FUL granted on 24/4/2003. Amendment omitting 'cut out' at first floor rear.	GTD	07/02/2005
04/3284/FUL	• Amendment to original application 02/3391/FUL with permission granted.	PCO	
06/1919/HOT	• Proposed bays to side (2 storey)	PCO	
06/1985/HOT	• Proposed double garage, raising of boundary wall and two new accesses.	PCO	

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): JK

Dated: 4/9/06

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

John Brown
5/9/06

Dated:

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:

06/1985/HOT

EAST SHEEN WARD

Contact Officer:

V Crosby

Proposal: Proposed double garage, raising of boundary wall and new access.

Applicant: Mr Trimble on behalf of Mr and Mrs Stephens.

Application received: 13th June 2006.

Main development plan policies:

UDP – First Review: BLT 2, 11, 15 and 16, TRN 2 and 4.

Present use: Single family dwellinghouse

Site, history and proposal: No 32 is a detached, two storey house set in a residential area on a corner site. The site is not listed, nor a BTM and is not within a Conservation Area, although the boundary of the Christchurch Road Conservation Area runs adjacent to the site on the eastern side.

This application seeks the erection of a detached double garage (measuring 9m wide, 6.1m deep with a hipped roof dropping from 3.7m to 2.3m), raising of the brick boundary wall to the roadside to a height of 1.9m. The existing vehicular access would be blocked up, with a new opening creating further to the west on Monroe Drive and another access on to West Temple Sheen. The pedestrian gate would be re-sited. The materials used would match those of the house.

Planning permission for the house was originally granted in 2003 (reference 02/3391) which included a single space garage in the same area as proposed here. The permission was amended in 2004 by planning permission reference 04/3276/FUL which changed the design of the house and removed permitted development rights for outbuildings. There is another current application on the property (reference 06/1919/HOT) which seeks to erect two two-storey bay windows, a single storey extension and minor changes to the fenestration.

Public and other representations: One letter of objection received objecting to the proposal as the garage would occupy a disproportionate amount of space and have an overbearing and un-neighbourly impact.

Amendments; Following comments from the Transport Officer, the plans were amended to omit the second access on West Temple Sheen and to provide visibility splays either side of the new access on Monroe Drive by replacing the existing solid brick wall with a lower wall and railings. The access has been aligned so as to be central to the garage. The manoeuvring area has been increased. Following comments from the Urban Design section, the works to the existing brick wall have been revised so that the brickwork would be raised to a height of 1.4m (infilling the lower sections currently occupied by railings) with railings above.

Reconsultation; Neighbours were re-consulted regarding the changes to the front boundary wall. The consultation period had not expired at the time of writing this report. Any additional responses will be reported verbally at Committee.

Professional comments:

Transport

In respect of off street car parking provision, the relevant policy in the UDP, First Review, is TRN 4 which refers to maximum standards being set for all types of development. This proposal provides three off-street parking spaces, two in the double garage and the area in front of the garage could provide a further space. Three spaces is the maximum number set for this development in the Council's adopted parking standards. As such, the proposed car parking provision complies with policy TRN 4. Visibility splays for the new access have now been provided as requested by the Transport section. Retaining the visibility splays would be ensured by the suggested condition below.

Neighbour amenity

The garage is not considered to harm neighbour amenity through loss of light or overbearing impact due to its siting off the boundary by at least 50cm, its relatively low height nearest the boundary, at 2.3m with shallow pitched roof sloping away from the boundaries, and the existing boundary brick wall. It is not considered to cause a loss of privacy as there are no first floor windows; the proposed side window would look out over the site's garden.

The changes to the boundary wall are not considered to raise neighbour amenity issues due to the distance to surrounding properties and the existing boundary wall and railings.

Character of the area

Although the proposed garage would be a large structure, it is considered to be of an acceptable size for the size of the garden. The garage is considered to preserve the character of the area, which contains a mixture of styles; the site is the most obviously recent building and the garage would reflect its modern design. Many of the houses in the area have tall brick walls as their front boundary, and therefore the raising of the brickwork is not objected to, now that the height has been reduced so that the proposal does not result in a "fortified" appearance by allowing some views through the railings. Most of the development is sited away from the Conservation Area, and is thus considered to at least preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion: The proposal would preserve the character of the area and adjacent Conservation Area, and not cause harm to neighbour amenity through loss of light or privacy, or overbearing impact, or to highway safety.

I therefore recommend **PERMISSION**, subject to the following conditions and informatives:

Standard conditions:

- AT01 – Development begun within 3 years
- BD08 – Materials to match existing
- BD09A – Brickwork to match existing
- ST03 – Highway sight lines pedestrian (insert "other than the railings hereby approved").

Standard informatives:

- IE05A -Noise control - building sites
- IH06B -Damage to public highway
- IL10A -Building Regulations

Civic Centre, 44 York Street, Twickenham TW1 3BZ
Tel: 020 8891 7300 Textphone: 020 8891 7120
Fax: 020 8891 7789
email: envprotection@richmond.gov.uk
website: www.richmond.gov.uk

Environment Directorate

IL12A -Approved drawing nos. - 1278/1 received 13th June 2006 and 1278/D received 30th August 2006.

IL16HA - Relevant policies and proposals; BLT 2, 11, 15 and 16, TRN 2 and 4.

IL19 – Summary reasons for granting planning permission; The proposal would preserve the character of the area and adjacent Conservation Area, and not cause harm to neighbour amenity through loss of light or privacy, or overbearing impact, or to highway safety.

Non-standard informative

Cost of highway works; The cost of reinstating the existing crossovers and installing the new crossovers will be done at the expense of the applicant/agent.

Background papers:

Application forms and drawings

Letter of representation

Application forms, drawings, Sub-committee reports and decision notices (as applicable) for previous applications (ref. 06/1919/HOT)
