

**Application reference: 06/3780/HOT**  
**HAMPTON WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
20.11.2006	28.11.2006	23.01.2007	23.01.2007

**Site:**

86 Wensleydale Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2LX

**Proposal:**

Erection of single storey rear extension

*use: SFD*

**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 Davey-Makay  
86 Wensleydale Road  
Hampton  
Middlesex  
TW12 2LX

**AGENT NAME**

Englishaus Architects  
30 Lawrence Road  
Hampton  
TW12 2RJ

**DC Site Notice:** printed on

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

*21.12.06*

**Neighbours:**

- ✓ 84 Wensleydale Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2LX, - 30.11.2006
- ✓ 86A Wensleydale Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2LX, - 30.11.2006
- ✓ Eve Risbridger, Parks And Leisure - 30.11.2006

**History:**

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
03/0913	• Erection Of Single Storey Rear Extension	GTD	07/05/2003
06/3780/HOT	• Erection of single storey rear extension	PCO	

**Constraints:**

**86 WENSLEYDALE ROAD  
HAMPTON  
HAMPTON WARD  
06/3780/HOT**

**Site, History and Proposal:**

The application site is located on the eastern side of Wensleydale Road and comprises a large two-storey, detached dwelling with single-storey side and rear extensions. The dwelling is designated a BTM, but is not located within a Conservation Area.

*03/0913/HOT – Planning permission was granted for a single storey side extension on 7/05/2003.*

*The existing rear extension is considered to have been built under permitted development.*

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing single storey rear extension and replace with a new single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would be 4.58m wide (in line with the southern main building line), would extend an overall depth of 7.22m (2.5m from the rear of the main building) with a flat roof measuring 3.80m high at the eaves, incorporating a roof lantern. The extension would be set 1.5m from the boundary with No.84. Materials to consist of render with a pair of triple sliding doors to the rear and two small obscured glazed and non-openable windows to the flank facing No.84.

The applicants also proposed to render the existing side extension and the rear of the main building at ground floor level.

**Amendments:**

The proposed rear extension has been reduced in height and depth, measuring 3.30m at the eaves and 5.5776m deep.

**Public Representations:**

No letters have been received.

**Professional Comments:**

- Supplementary Planning Guidance states that the effect of a single storey extension on daylight and sunlight is usually acceptable if the projection is no further than 4.0m for a detached property. However the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site, which may justify greater rear projections.
- Whilst the proposed rear extension has a maximum depth of 5.776m, which exceeds the recommended distance under SPG for a detached property (4.0m), a site visit reveals that:
  - a) The proposed extension would only project 1.056m rearwards of the main building,
  - b) The proposed extension is set 1.5m from the boundary with No.84 and 4.4m from the flank wall of No.84. Furthermore, there is a lean-to with frosted, Perspex roof located between the flank of No.84 and the boundary with the application site which would substantially mask visibility of the extension when viewed from No.84.

*– 84 has a frosted glass kitchen door + window in its flank with the perspex roof above these openings. This roofed enclosure already affect the outlook from these openings.*

- c) Given there is an existing 3.9m high, 2.5m deep single storey rear extension at No.86, I consider the current proposal which would be lower in height (3.3m) and 3.276m greater in depth acceptable, and in my view would not appear overbearing or unneighbourly.
- d) Although the proposed rear extension may be in many cases considered excessive in terms of height, I consider that given the above circumstances, the revised 3.3m height of the single storey rear extension would be acceptable.
- Given the above, in my view therefore there would be no unacceptable impact on No.84, in terms of increased sense of enclosure, visual intrusion and loss of daylight (a BRE has been undertaken to support this statement).
  - There would be no significant loss of privacy or overlooking for No. 84, given that the two proposed windows on the flank elevation of the extension would be non-openable, consisting of obscured glass and would also be substantially masked by the 1.8m high fence between the adjoining properties, and
  - The design of the proposed single storey rear extension would complement the existing dwelling and would comfortably sit below the base of the windows at first floor level, integrating with the host dwelling and adjoining properties. The proposed rear extension would maintain the character and appearance of the BTM and the adjoining properties. The scale and character of the extension is appropriate to the existing dwelling and represents an appropriate standard of design, in accordance with SPG.
  - Overall, I consider that the proposal is compatible with the scale and character of this house and the surrounding development, and so would not harm the character and setting of the BTM and neighbouring properties.
  - Having regard to both Design and Residential Amenity, it is considered that the proposal would be acceptable, would be compatible with the scale and character of existing development, would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, or upon the character and appearance of the BTM and neighbouring properties and would not prejudice the aims and objectives of SPG design guidelines to house extensions and external alterations.

I therefore recommend **APPROVAL**, 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): RIA

Dated: 22/1/07

I agree the recommendation:

*[Handwritten Signature]*

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated: 23/1/07

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: .....

<b>REASONS:</b>
<b>CONDITIONS:</b>
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b>
<b>UDP POLICIES:</b>
<b>OTHER POLICIES:</b>

*SEE CAPS!*

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:**