

Application reference: 21/1974/HOT TEDDINGTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
01.06.2021	07.06.2021	02.08.2021	02.08.2021

Site:

98 Sandy Lane, Teddington, TW11 0DF,

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 Denis Holley

98

Sandy Lane

Teddington

TW11 0DF

AGENT NAME

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

Consultations:**Internal/External:****Consultee****Expiry Date****Neighbours:**

93 Clarence Road, Teddington, TW11 0BN, - 07.06.2021

100 Sandy Lane, Teddington, TW11 0DF, - 07.06.2021

96 Sandy Lane, Teddington, TW11 0DF, - 07.06.2021

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

Status: REF

Application: 21/1153/PS192

Date: 28/05/2021

Single Storey Rear Extension.

Development Management

Status: PCO

Application: 21/1974/HOT

Date:

Single Storey Rear Extension.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 20.01.2006

Installed a Gas Fire

Reference: 07/94921/CORGI

Building Control

Deposit Date: 03.08.2011

Replacement roofing.

Reference: 11/1472/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 31.07.2017 Install a gas-fired boiler
Reference: 17/FEN02429/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 31.07.2017 Install an unvented hot water storage vessel
Reference: 17/FEN02434/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 26.07.2017 Install replacement windows in a dwelling
Reference: 17/FEN01716/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 23.10.2018 Install replacement doors in a dwelling
Reference: 18/FEN01985/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 12.05.2021 Single storey rear extension
Reference: 21/0838/FP

Proposal	Single storey rear extension that would project approx. 4.40 metres from the rear wall of the host property and the one of the attached semi-detached pair at No. 100 Sandy Lane. The scheme's roof covering, a mix of sloping and flat elements, would be enclosed by parapet walls that would achieve a maximum height of approx. 3.40 metres. The proposed materials would match the existing ones.
Site description / key designations	<p>The application site is currently occupied by a two-storey semi-detached house located on the northern side of Sandy Lane in Teddington Village, Teddington Ward.</p> <p>The site does not possess any heritage or flooding designations.</p> <p>The application site is just sited outside Bushy Park, located on the opposite side of Sandy Lane compared to where the host property is situated, that among its many designations is a Conservation Area and a MOL.</p>
Planning History	<p>21/1153/PS192 - Single Storey Rear Extension - Refused 28/05/2021.</p> <p><i>Reason for Refusal: the proposal is not considered to be lawful within the meaning of section.192 of the Act, given such proposal fails to meet the requirements of Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GDPO), particularly the proposed single storey rear extension would exceed the limit set out in sub-paragraphs (f)(i), (j)(iii) and (ja) of Class A.1 of the GPDO.</i></p>
Policies	<p>The proposal has been considered having regard to the policies within the London Plan and the Council's Local Plan, in particular:</p> <p>London Plan (2021):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D12 Fire Safety <p>Local Plan (2018):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality • LP 8 Amenity and Living Conditions <p>Supplementary Planning Documents / Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015) • Hampton Wick & Teddington Village Planning Guidance SPD (2017)
Consultee	N/A.
Material representations	N/A.
Amendments	N/A.
Professional comments	<p>The proposal has been assessed in relation to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and Visual Amenity • Neighbour Amenity • Fire Safety <p>Design and Visual Amenity</p> <p>Policy LP 1 'Local Character and Design Quality' requires that all development to be of high architectural quality demonstrating a</p>

	<p>thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance, and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces and the local character. Development must respect, contribute to and enhance the local environment and character.</p> <p>The Councils SPD (2015) relating to House Extensions and External Alterations encourages the retention of the original form of the host property and any alterations should enhance the quality of the building. The original appearance should always be the reference point when considering any changes.</p> <p>The SPD (2015) states that an extension should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. It should harmonise with the original appearance, either by integrating with the house or being made to appear as an obvious addition.</p> <p>The proposal would not be visible from the Sandy Lane street scene and the Clarence Road street scene. It would be a subservient addition to the host dwellinghouse, due to its single storey nature, and the use of matching materials would strengthen its integration with the host property.</p> <p>As such, the proposed single storey extension is considered acceptable in Design and Visual Amenity, therefore, it is in line with Policy LP 1 of the Local Plan (2018) and the SPD on Housing Extensions and External Alterations (2015).</p> <p>Neighbour Amenity</p> <p>Policy LP 8 'Amenity and Living Conditions' requires all development to <i>"protect the amenity and living conditions for the occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties"</i>. The policy also seeks to <i>"ensure that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting, including through creating a sense of enclosure"</i>.</p> <p>The House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015) advises that extensions that create <i>"an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted"</i>.</p> <p>The proposal at approx. 4.40 metres depth is contrary to the SPD (2015) advice which states that the effect of a single storey extension is usually acceptable if the projection is no further than 3.5 metres to a semi-detached house. The SPD (2015) also states that 'the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site, which may justify greater rear projection'.</p> <p>The proposal at approx. 4.40 metres exceeds the SPD (2015) recommended limits and half of its parapet wall would be site outside the curtilage of the host property, namely on the land that would belong to the attached semi-detached pair at No. 100, which does not present an extension. This parapet wall would achieve a</p>
--	---

	<p>maximum height of approx. 3.40 metres. Having regard to the above and given the depth of the extension combined with its height as well as the bulk of the proposed covering, the proposal is considered to be unduly overbearing and un-neighbourly to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of No. 100 and as such, a refusal of planning permission is justified.</p> <p>The proposal is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:-</p> <p><i>By virtue of its combined excessive depth, height and siting, the proposed single storey rear extension would result in an unneighbourly, overbearing and visually intrusive form of development, which fails to safeguard residential amenity of the occupiers of No. 100 Sandy Lane. This is further exacerbated by the bulk of the proposed covering. As such, the proposal is not considered to accord with Policy LP 8 of the Local Plan (2018) and the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015).</i></p> <p>Fire Safety</p> <p>The Planning Fire Safety Strategy received is considered sufficient and proportionate to the amount of development proposed satisfying Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021).</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>It is recommended that the application reference 21/1974/HOT be refused.</p>

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): GAP Dated: 16/07/2021

I agree the recommendation: SGS

Senior Planner

Dated:30/7/2021.....

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
