

## Application reference: 21/1544/HOT FULWELL, HAMPTON HILL WARD

| Date application received | Date made valid | Target report date | 8 Week date |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 30.04.2021                | 20.07.2021      | 14.09.2021         | 14.09.2021  |

**Site:**

59 Fulwell Road, Teddington, TW11 0RH,

**Proposal:**

Proposed single-storey side/rear extension.

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Ms. Sonya Brazier  
59, Fulwell Road  
Teddington  
TW11 0RH

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Graham Pratt  
11 Avenue Gardens  
Teddington  
TW11 0BH  
United Kingdom

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

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

Consultee

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

61 Fulwell Road, Teddington, TW11 0RH, - 07.05.2021  
57 Fulwell Road, Teddington, TW11 0RH, - 07.05.2021  
60 Fulwell Road, Teddington, TW11 0RA, - 07.05.2021  
54 Sunnyside Road, Teddington, TW11 0RT, - 07.05.2021  
52 Sunnyside Road, Teddington, TW11 0RT, - 07.05.2021  
58 Fulwell Road, Teddington, TW11 0RA, - 07.05.2021  
62 Fulwell Road, Teddington, TW11 0RA, - 07.05.2021  
50B Sunnyside Road, Teddington, TW11 0RT - 07.05.2021  
50A Sunnyside Road, Teddington, TW11 0RT - 07.05.2021

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

Status: GTD

Date: 12/02/2021

Application: 20/3698/PS192

Proposed loft extension to an existing two-storey plus loft, end-terrace, single-family dwelling house

Development Management

Status: REF

Date: 15/03/2021

Application: 21/0150/HOT

Proposed part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension to existing two-storey plus loft, end-terrace, single-family dwelling house.

Development Management

Status: PDE

Date:

Application: 21/1544/HOT

Proposed single-storey side/rear extension.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 15.01.2007      2 Windows

Reference: 07/07143/FENSA

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 16.08.2007      Loft conversion

Reference: 07/1794/FP

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 19.09.2007      Loft conversion

Reference: 07/1794/FP/1

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 09.10.2007      Loft conversion

Reference: 07/1794/FP/2

---

**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: 27/09/2021

**I agree the recommendation: WT**

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

Dated: .....27/9/2021.....

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: .....

|                        |
|------------------------|
| <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**

---

|          |                           |
|----------|---------------------------|
| U0054820 | NPPF Approval paras 38-42 |
| U0054821 | Composite informative     |
| U0054822 | Building Regs             |

**Application Reference:** 21/1544/HOT

**Site Address:** 59 Fulwell Road, Teddington, TW11 0HR

**Proposal:**

The application seeks planning permission for: 'Proposed single-storey side/rear extension'. The application follows the refusal of a similar scheme though no longer proposes a rear extension at first floor.

**Site description:**

The application site relates to a two-storey end-terrace dwelling located on the south side of Fulwell Road, Teddington ward. There are no statutorily or locally listed buildings to consider and the site is not in or adjacent to a conservation area. The site sits in Area 1 (Stanley Road North) of the Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Planning Guidance. There is an Article 4 Direction restricting basement development. The site sits in Flood Zone 1 and is not identified as susceptible to surface water flooding, though the site is designated as Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding (= < 75%) and a Critical Drainage Area.

**Relevant planning history:**

- 20/3698/PS192 – proposed loft extension to an existing two-storey plus loft, end-terrace, single-storey family dwelling house. – Approved 12/02/2021
- 21/0150/HOT – Proposed part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension to existing two-storey plus loft, end-terrace, single-family dwelling house. – Refused 15/03/2021

Reasons for refusal:

1. *Visual Amenity – The proposed extensions by reason of their siting, and footprint, would constitute an overdevelopment of the site and would result in overly dominant extensions that would erode the original character of the property and wider area. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy LP1 of the Local Plan (adopted 2018) and Supplementary Planning Document on 'House Extensions and Alterations' (2015).*
2. *Neighbour Amenity – In the absence of information to confirm that the ground floor side windows on 57 Fulwell Road are not serving habitable rooms, the proposal is likely to lead to overshadowing, loss of light and a tunnelling effect to the neighbouring property. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy LP8 of the Local Plan (adopted 2018) and Supplementary Planning Document on 'House Extensions and Alterations' (2015).*

**Amendments:**

- Revised drawings showing proposed rear extension in the 'front elevations'. – Received 20/07/2021
- Description of development amended to clarify that the proposed ground-floor extension would be rear/side. – 27/09/2021

None of the additional information/amendments materially changed the scheme and so neighbours were not reconsulted.

**Material representations:**

**Neighbour consultation**

None received.

**Main Development Plan policies:**

London Plan (2021)

- Policy D12 Fire Safety

Local Plan (2018):

- Policy LP1 Local Character and Design Quality
- Policy LP8 Amenity and Living Conditions

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

- Design Quality SPD (February 2006)
- Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Planning Guidance SPD (June 2017)
- House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (May 2015)

**Professional comments:**

The pertinent issues to consider are:

- Character and appearance
- Neighbouring amenities
- Fire safety
- Whether the application addresses previous reasons for refusal.

Design, siting and appearance

Local Plan Policy LP1 relates to character and design. Further guidance is provided in the Council's supplementary planning guidance on House Extensions and External Alterations and the Village Planning Guidance for the area.

The application property is one of a group of two-storey Victorian terraced houses. The building is characterised by its single storey front porch projection. To the rear the property benefits from a full width dormer extension to the main rear-facing roof slope and an original two storey rear outrigger.

The application follows the refusal of a similar scheme, though no longer proposes a rear extension at first floor. With regards the extension proposed at ground-floor, no alterations to the refused scheme have been made. The application continues to propose a full-width side/rear infill extension 1m in rear projection from the rear outrigger with predominantly flat roof 3.18m in height sloping to 2.2 to the eaves at the eastern boundary.

It is noted that in the officer report for the refused the ground-floor rear extension was considered to have a combined excessive depth and height which would dominate the property. However, it is further noted that officer concerns related to the proposed development as a whole, with particular reference to the addition to the outrigger at first floor. It was overall considered that "the proposed extensions would result in bulky additions of poor design" and that: "The bulk of the proposed two-storey side extension would result in a significant alteration and unbalancing of the proportions of the property and the roof form of the outrigger. The proposed extensions along with the existing enlargement to the roof would constitute an overdevelopment of the modest property".

Whilst it is recognised that the ground-floor side/rear extension proposed in this application is the same as the refused scheme, the omission of the first-floor addition from the proposal is considered to mitigate the overall harm previously identified and it is no longer considered that the site would appear overdeveloped to a harmful degree. Taking into consideration the fact that other properties along this row have been similarly extended at ground-floor to the rear (such as No. 53), the generous depth of garden/yard which can accommodate the rear projection, the use of appropriate materials and the fact that the

extension would be at ground floor to the rear thus not publicly visible from street views, it is overall considered that the proposal would read as a proportionate and subordinate addition to the dwelling which would not cause unacceptable harm to the visual amenities of the area. A condition is recommended ensuring materials match existing.

#### Neighbouring amenities

Policy LP8 of the Local Plan relates to neighbour amenities. Further guidance is provided in the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations SPD. Para. 3.1.2 states that the impact of a ground-floor extension is usually acceptable where the rear projection is no greater than 3m for terraced dwelling. However, the SPD also advises in para. 3.1.3 that the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site, which may justify greater rear projection. Para. 3.1.4 states that infill extensions to Victorian properties are fairly typical around the borough. In such instances, where the depth exceeds that outlined above, the eaves height should be limited to 2.2m to mitigate the sense of enclosure.

No objections were raised in the assessment of the refused scheme regarding the impact on No. 61. The proposed ground-floor extension would extend 1m from the rear building line of the property's adjoining outrigger which is well within the SPD guidelines.

With regards the impact on No. 57, concerns were raised during the assessment of the refused scheme about the tunnelling effect the development would have on these neighbours. The first-floor element has been removed from the amended scheme, and whilst the ground-floor extension would have a rear projection greater than 3m at this boundary, the eaves height would be 2.2m and thus the proposal is fully SPD compliant.

The application is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenities, subject to a condition restricting use of the new flat roof.

#### Fire Safety

[London Plan Policy D12](#) Fire Safety Part A requires the submission of fire safety information on all planning applications. The applicant has submitted a Fire Safety Statement which addresses each of the criteria set out in Policy D12 Part A. The submitted information is considered to be proportionate and acceptable for a development of this scale and nature. The applicant is advised that alterations and extensions to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations in all respects including fire safety and that this permission is NOT a consent under the Building Regulations for which a separate application should be made. It is recommended that this advice be attached via an informative.

**Recommendation:** APPROVE subject to conditions and informatives