

## Application reference: 21/1852/HOT EAST SHEEN WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
21.05.2021	26.05.2021	21.07.2021	21.07.2021 EOT 30.07.2021

**Site:**

16 Shrewsbury Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8JZ

**Proposal:**

Single Storey rear extension

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr Robin Beynon  
104 Palewell Park  
East Sheen  
London  
SW14 8JH  
United Kingdom

**AGENT NAME**

Robin Beynon  
104 Palewell Park  
East Sheen  
London  
SW14 8JH  
United Kingdom

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

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

15 Muirdown Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8JX, - 27.05.2021  
13 Muirdown Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8JX, - 27.05.2021  
14 Shrewsbury Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8JZ, - 27.05.2021  
18 Shrewsbury Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 8JZ, - 27.05.2021

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

Status: GTD                      Application: 18/0543/HOT  
Date: 11/04/2018                single storey extension to rear

Development Management

Status: PCO                      Application: 21/1852/HOT  
Date:                                Single Storey rear extension

Building Control

Deposit Date: 15.07.2004        Loft conversion and rear extension.  
Reference: 04/1489/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 29.06.2011        One or more new circuits  
Reference: 11/NIC01935/NICEIC

Enforcement

Opened Date: 20.08.2004      Enforcement Enquiry  
Reference: 04/0370/EN/UBW

---

Enforcement

Opened Date: 14.09.2005      Enforcement Enquiry  
Reference: 05/0459/EN/UBW

---

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>21/1852/HOT</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>16 Shrewsbury Avenue East Sheen London SW14 8JZ</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Single Storey rear extension</b>
<b>Contact Officer</b>	<b>Benjamin Leigh</b>
<b>Target Determination Date</b>	<b>21/07/2021</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This application is of a nature where the Council's Constitution delegates the authority to make the decision to Officers rather than it being determined by the Planning Committee.

Before preparing this summary report the planning officer has considered any relevant previous planning applications in relation to the development and considered any comments made by those interested in the application such as consultees with specialist knowledge and nearby residents.

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant Local Plan Policies, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, any comments received in connection with the application and any other case specific considerations which are material to the decision.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

16 Shrewsbury Avenue is a two-storey terraced house located on the north side of Shrewsbury Avenue. The application property is located in East Sheen Village in the Palewell Park, Hertford Avenue and surrounds - Character Area.

The application site is subject to the following planning constraints:

- Area Poorly Provided With Public Open Space
- Critical Drainage Area
- Main Centre Buffer Zone (East Sheen Town Centre Boundary Buffer Zone)
- Protected View (Indicative Zone) (View 7 RICHMOND PARK TOWARDS ST PAULS CATHEDRAL)

## 3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

18/0543/HOT - Single storey extension to rear. Granted 11/04/2018.

## 4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

The list of neighbours notified of this application are listed above.

No letters of representation were received.

## 5. AMENDMENTS

None

## 6. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

### NPPF (2019)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places

These policies can be found at:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/810197/NPPF\\_Feb\\_2019\\_revised.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf)

### London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- Policy D4 - Delivering Good Design
- Policy D12 - Fire Safety

These policies can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/london-plan-2021>

### Richmond Local Plan (2018)

The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated Local Plan policies are:

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1	Yes	<del>No</del>
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	<del>No</del>
Impact on Views and Vista	LP5	Yes	<del>No</del>

These policies can be found at

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted\\_local\\_plan\\_interim.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf)

### Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations  
East Sheen Village Plan

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning\\_policy/local\\_plan/supplementary\\_planning\\_documents\\_and\\_guidance](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance)

### Other Local Strategies or Publications

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are:

## 7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design/Visual Amenity
- ii Neighbour Amenity

### Issue i - Design/Visual Amenity

Policy LP1 of the Local Plan seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area.

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations specifies the external appearance of any extension must be carefully designed in order to avoid the visual confusion that can result when the style and materials of the original house are ignored. The overall shape, size and position of rear and side extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. They should harmonise with the original appearance, which should be taken as the starting point for any future changes.

The application property is part of a terrace of 5 properties all of which have a rear extension and the two adjoining neighbours of the application property (nos. 14 and 18) have extensions of similar height, depth and width to the existing extension at the site.

The proposed extension consists of a further 3 metre single-storey extension to the rear of the property. This rear extension is attached to an existing extension of 2.3 metres.

The proposal will include a change in the floor level to incorporate the approximately 1.3 metres difference in floor level between the internal property and the rear garden. The extension has a glazed sloping roof that is set below that of the existing extension.

The walls will be white painted render, the roof will be glazed and GRP felt, the doors and windows will be dark grey aluminium framed and the doors will be glazed. The new rear extension will have a mono-pitched roof set on the lower ground level.

The design is acceptable in terms of its siting, shape, position and size which are subservient and harmonise with the original appearance of the house. The extension will be glazed extending from the existing rear projection. The primarily glazed appearance will have a lightweight feel, and would be sympathetic to and respond to the existing character of the immediate area, picking up on the largely glazed appearance of neighbouring extensions.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered consistent with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Officer Planning Report – Application 21/1852/HOT Page 4 of 8

Local Plan.

## **Issue ii - Neighbour Amenity**

Policy LP8 requires all development to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties. This includes ensuring adequate light is achieved, preserving privacy and ensuring proposals are not visually intrusive.

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 3m in depth for a terraced property will be acceptable however a larger rear extension may be acceptable subject to site specific circumstances.

The SPD specifies that a projection of 3m is acceptable regarding the residential amenity for a terraced dwellinghouse, where a larger projection is proposed, the eaves should be reduced to 2.2m. The proposal will extend beyond 3 metres from the original building as it will be connected to an existing extension. And the maximum eaves height will exceed 2.2m when measured from the ground level. However due to its stepped design with lower roof and floor level than the existing extension, it will not cause material harm to neighbouring properties as outlined below.

Furthermore, the new fenestration of the proposed rear extension will be rear facing and will not be at a greater height than the existing extension. Therefore, no impact on loss of privacy or overlooking is anticipated. No side windows are proposed. As such, having regard to its siting, design and scale, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have a material impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties and no objections have been received in this regard.

### 14 and 18 Shrewsbury Avenue

14 and 18 Shrewsbury Avenue are situated adjacent on either side of the application property and form part of the same terrace. These properties have rear extensions of a similar height to the proposed extension and of full width.

The proposed extension will not exceed 3m in depth when measured from the rear elevation of the adjoining properties as such combined with the lowered level, it will not cause any material harm to the amenity of these adjacent properties or appear a visually intrusive or overbearing feature.

### 15 and 13 Muirdown Avenue

15 and 13 Muirdown Avenue border the rear garden of the application property to the north. There is a significant distance (and a boundary fence) between these properties and the proposed extension. Therefore, no material harm is envisaged.

As such, having regard to its siting, design and scale, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have a material impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties and no objections have been received in this regard.

The proposal will comply with LP8.

## **Other Matters**

### **Fire Safety**

The applicant has submitted a Fire Safety Strategy as required under Policy D12 Of the London Plan (2021). The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. If permission were granted this permission would not be consent under the Building Regulations for which a separate application would have to be made.

## **8. LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS**

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker. The Mayor of London's CIL and Richmond CIL are therefore material considerations.

On initial assessment this development is not considered liable for the Mayoral or Richmond CIL however this is subject to confirmation by the CIL Administration Team.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

Although some aspects of the scheme are not in strict conformity with the technical standards set out in the Officer Planning Report – Application 21/1852/HOT Page 5 of 8

SPD, there are mitigating circumstances (reduced height) to ensure that the scheme would not compromise the aims of adopted policy or cause demonstrable harm. Therefore, in this case, there are circumstances to justify an exception to the strict application of guidance and policy.

Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains how the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. For the reasons set out above, this application falls to be determined in accordance with the test under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the proposal is in general conformity with the Development Plan overall and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify refusal.

**Grant planning permission with conditions**

**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

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): ...BL.....

Dated: ...30/072021.....

**I agree the recommendation:**

Principal Planner

Dated: .....WWC.....30/7/21.....

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: .....

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

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**

---