

Application reference: 21/0679/HOT TEDDINGTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
25.02.2021	25.02.2021	22.04.2021	22.04.2021

Site:

141 Queens Road, Teddington, TW11 0LZ,

Proposal:

Erection of single storey ground floor extension to rear of property. Internal and external alterations including to windows. Some demolition to facilitate the works

Status: Pending Decision (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application)

APPLICANT NAME

Mr & Mrs Archibald
141, Queens Road
Teddington
TW11 0LZ

AGENT NAME

Adam Hargreaves
340 Old York Road
London
SW18 1SS
United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on and posted on and due to expire on

Consultations:**Internal/External:****Consultee**

LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (North)
LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (North)

Expiry Date

09.04.2021
12.03.2021

Neighbours:

10 Admiralty Way, Teddington, TW11 0NL, - 26.02.2021
100 Park Road, Teddington, TW11 0AN, - 26.02.2021
143 Queens Road, Teddington, TW11 0LZ, - 26.02.2021
139 Queens Road, Teddington, TW11 0LZ, - 26.02.2021

History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:Development Management

Status: GTD

Date: 21/01/2015

Application: 14/T0997/TPO

T1 Wellingtonia x 1 Large, mature, TPO tree. This tree has gone through the storms of last winter without suffering any damage. There is a cavity at approx. 8m on the Southeastern side. The suggested works are: To carry out a climbing inspection of the tree, including the cavities and branch unions. Remove deadwood and storm damage, tip thin end heavy lateral branches by 10%.

Development Management

Status: SPL

Date: 04/08/2017

Application: 17/T0420/TPO

T1 - Wellingtonia (Sequoiadendron Giganteum) - Carry out climbing inspection in order to ascertain condition and structural integrity: Check main forks and any cavity areas for weakness. Check major branch ends weight: Report any adverse findings. Clean out crown, remove any dead wood, dieback, weak and suppressed branches. Lift canopy all round by 1-2m to improve clearance. Reduce back by 1-2m any overlong lateral branches deemed to be too heavy/overlong and balance crown.

Development Management

Status: PDE

Date:

Application:21/0679/HOT

Erection of single storey ground floor extension to rear of property. Internal and external alterations including to windows. Some demolition to facilitate the works

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date:26/03/2021

Application:21/0680/PS192

Rear dormer roof extension. Rooflights to front elevation

Building Control

Deposit Date: 09.12.2010

One or more new circuits

Reference: 11/NIC00534/NICEIC

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES

I therefore recommend the following:

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

This application is CIL liable YES* NO
 (*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement YES* NO
 (*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online (which are not on the file) YES NO

This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): JSI

Dated: 07/04/2021

I agree the recommendation: WT

~~Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner~~

Dated:15/4/2021.....

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Head of Development Management has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Head of Development Management:

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

U0050333	NPPF Refusal - paras 38-42
U0050334	Decision drawings

Application reference: 21/0679/HOT
Site address: 141 Queens Road, Teddington, TW11 0LZ

Proposal:

The application seeks planning permission for: *“Erection of single storey ground floor extension to rear of property. Internal and external alterations including to windows. Some demolition to facilitate the works”*. Proposed materials would be facing masonry in soldier courses, single ply membrane roof and aluminium framed double glazed windows and slimline doors.

Site description:

The application site comprises a two-storey end-terrace dwelling located on the north eastern end of Queens Road, Teddington ward. The site is not statutorily or locally listed and is not in or adjacent to a conservation area. The rear garden contains a tree which is subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The site sits in Area 15 (Broad Street and Queens Road) of the Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Planning Guidance. There is an Article 4 Direction restricting basement development.

Relevant planning history:

- 21/0680/PS192 – Rear dormer roof extension. Rooflights to front elevation. – Approved 26/03/2021

There is also some planning history relating to works to trees (refs. 14/T0997/TPO and 17/T0420/TPO).

Amendments:

None.

Public and other representations:

Neighbour consultation

None received.

Internal consultation

Trees

- Comments received 11/03/2021 – **Objection**
- Further comments received 30/03/2021 – **Objection**

Internal colleagues' comments are incorporated into the main body of the assessment.

Main Development Plan policies:

Local Plan (2018)

- Policy LP1 Local Character and Design Quality
- Policy LP8 Amenity and Living Conditions
- Policy LP16 Trees, Woodland and Landscape

Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents (SPDs)

- Design Quality SPD (February 2006)
- Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Planning Guidance SPD (June 2017)
- House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (May 2015)
- Trees: Landscape, Design, Planting and Care SPG
- Trees: Legislation and Procedure SPG

Professional comments:

The main planning issues to be considered are:

- Character, design and appearance;
- Neighbouring amenities;
- Trees.

Character and Appearance

The proposed full-width ground-floor flat-roof rear extension is considered to be of a combined acceptable depth, height, design, scale and siting so as to successfully appear as a proportionate and subordinate addition to the main dwelling which, notwithstanding the unacceptable impact on the protected tree (assessed below) would protect the visual amenities of the area. Were the application acceptable in all other respects, a condition requiring materials to match existing would be recommended.

Residential Amenity

The proposed ground-floor rear extension would have a depth of 3m which is within the guidelines of the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations SPD and is considered to be acceptable. Notwithstanding the unacceptable impact on visual amenities from the failure to protect the TPO tree (assessed below), the application is considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenities. Were the application acceptable in all other respects, a condition restricting use of the flat roof would be recommended

Trees

Policy LP16 of the Local Plan relates to trees, woodlands and landscape. LP16(A) states that the Council will require the protection of existing trees and the provision of new trees, shrubs and other vegetation of landscape significance that complement existing, or create new, high quality green areas which deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits. LP16(B) states that to ensure development protects, respects, contributes to and enhances trees and landscapes, the Council. When assessing development proposals will:

1. Resist the loss of trees, including aged or veteran trees, unless the tree is dead dying or dangerous; or the tree is causing significant damage to adjacent structures; or the tree has little or no amenity value; or felling is for reasons of good arboricultural practice;
2. Resist development which results in the damage or loss of trees that are considered to be of townscape or amenity value the Council will require that site design or layout ensures a harmonious relationship between trees and their surroundings and will resist development which will be likely to result in pressure to significantly prune or remove trees;
3. Require, where practicable, an appropriate replacement for any tree that is felled; a financial contribution to the provision for an off-site tree in line with the monetary value of the existing tree to be felled will be required in line with the 'Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees' CAVAT;
4. Require new trees to be of a suitable species for the location in terms of height and root spread, taking into account of space required for trees to mature; the use of native species is encouraged where appropriate;
5. Require that trees are adequately protected throughout the course of development, in accordance with British Standards 5837 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations).

The application is accompanied by BS5837:2012 Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) prepared by Arbtech Consulting Limited. This identified a Category A tree in the rear garden. This is protected by a TPO.

The Council's Trees officer has reviewed the proposal and accompanying documents and agrees that the tree is Category A. The Trees officer has confirmed that the proposed

extension would be within the root protection area (RPA) of the tree, and that the RPA is not circular as illustrated in the applicant's Tree Survey/AIA and will be biased towards the soft ground. The RPA for this tree is sizeable and likely much more expansive than in the Tree Survey/AIA, where it is shown as capped at 707m² with a circular radius of 15m. The Council's Trees officer has confirmed that this is acceptable and in accordance with the BS, but adds that this is a minimal area around a tree deemed to contain sufficient roots and rooting volume to maintain the trees viability. Roots are a priority within this zone. As such, the default position is that structures are located outside of RPAs of trees to be retained. The tree has been given an A classification which is a tree of high quality. The RPA is unlikely to be circular but encompasses the whole garden regardless. Further, it is noted that BS5837:2012 states that additional information such as details of special engineering within RPA and relevant construction details can be required at planning stage as additional information. The onus is on the applicant to essentially argue that the scheme would not be of harm to the tree. It is not possible to secure this information via condition as the Council would essentially be in agreement without any transparency.

The AIA suggests the use of pile and ground or above ground beam to minimise damage to the tree. The Council's Trees officer agrees that this is an acceptable solution and of minimal harm to the tree; however, this is excavation within the RPA without any quantifiable detail provided. Ideally there would be a void left below for water infiltration and to reduce the size of excavations required to just the piles. In order to understand the impact on the tree, the Council would need to know the size and number of the ground beams being utilised to determine the scale of excavations and therefore true impact on the tree.

It is further noted that details relating to any hardstanding need to be outlined as it is presumed that there would be some degree of hardstanding this will be required on exit from the new enlarged kitchen. However, this is not currently included within the Tree Survey/AIA.

Conclusion

In the absence of a sufficiently detailed and accurate BS5837:2012 Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, the application fails to demonstrate that the protected tree would not be harmed as a result of the development, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. As such, the application fails to comply with Policies LP1, LP8 and LP16 of the Local Plan (2018) and the Council's Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Planning Guidance SPD (June 2017).

Recommendation: REFUSE