

## Application reference: 21/3214/HOT HAM, PETERSHAM, RICHMOND RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
14.09.2021	16.09.2021	11.11.2021	11.11.2021

**Site:**

29 Ham Farm Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5NA

**Proposal:**

Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, Two storey rear extension, dormer roof extension and associated landscaping.

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mrs Jessica Inwood  
2 Foxton Mews  
Richmond  
TW106BS  
United Kingdom

**AGENT NAME**

Mrs Jessica Inwood  
Shape  
2 Foxton Mews  
RICHMOND  
TW10 6BS

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 20.09.2021 and posted on 01.10.2021 and due to expire on 22.10.2021

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

14D Urban D  
LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (South)  
LBRuT Ecology

**Expiry Date**

04.10.2021  
04.10.2021  
04.10.2021

**Neighbours:**

23 Ham Farm Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5NA, - 20.09.2021  
21 Ham Farm Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5NA, - 20.09.2021  
27 Ham Farm Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5NA, - 20.09.2021  
6 Ham Farm Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LZ, -  
127 Perryfield Way, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7SN, - 20.09.2021  
10 Marlowe Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LR, - 20.09.2021  
12 Dryden Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LJ, - 20.09.2021  
11 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
9 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
6 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
4 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
2 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
10 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
8 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
7 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
5 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
3 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
1 Milton Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LY, - 20.09.2021  
9 Brooke Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LX, - 20.09.2021  
16 Brooke Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LX, - 20.09.2021  
15 Brooke Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LX, - 20.09.2021  
14 Brooke Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LX, - 20.09.2021  
13 Brooke Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LX, - 20.09.2021

12 Brooke Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LX, - 20.09.2021  
11 Brooke Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LX, - 20.09.2021  
10 Brooke Court, Parkleys, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5LX, - 20.09.2021  
Ham Glebe, Church Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5HG, - 20.09.2021  
31 Ham Farm Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 5NA, - 20.09.2021

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 21/1406/HOT  
Date: 13/09/2021 Single storey side/rear extensions, dormer roof extension and rooflight to rear roof slope. Outbuilding to rear and associated landscaping.

---

Development Management

Status: PDE Application: 21/3213/HOT  
Date: Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, two storey rear extension, dormer roof extension, associated landscaping and roof terrace.

---

Development Management

Status: PDE Application: 21/3214/HOT  
Date: Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, Two storey rear extension, dormer roof extension and associated landscaping.

---

Development Management

Status: REC Application: 21/1406/DD01  
Date: Details pursuant to condition U0109221 - Pre-Start Meeting, of planning permission 21/1406/HOT.

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 13.10.2021 Extension and refurbishment of an existing detached property & associated works (excluding competent person schemes installation)

Reference: 21/1725/IN

---

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>21/3214/HOT</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>29 Ham Farm Road Ham Richmond TW10 5NA</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, two storey rear extension, dormer roof extension and associated landscaping</b>
<b>Contact Officer</b>	<b>Sukhdeep Jhooti</b>
<b>Target Determination Date</b>	<b>11.11.2021</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 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 has considered 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

The application site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located on the southern side of Ham Farm Road. The site is located within the Parkleys Conservation Area, however, does not constitute a Building of Townscape Merit. The site is within the Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan Area and is an area susceptible to surface water flooding.

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposal seeks planning permission for two storey side and single storey rear extensions, two storey rear extension, dormer roof extension and associated landscaping

The relevant planning history associated with this site is set out below:

- **21/3213/HOT** -Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, two storey rear extension, dormer roof extension , associated landscaping and roof terrace. **Pending consideration.**
- **21/1406/HOT** - Single storey side/rear extensions, dormer roof extension and rooflight to rear roof slope. Outbuilding to rear and associated landscaping. **Grant Permission.**

## 4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

1 Objection letters have been received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- Two storey side extension would appear over-dominant
- Rendering out of keeping
- Dwelling would appear as three storey
- Loss of character
- Badger survey out of date
- Impact of front rooflights on the house and area

One observation letter has been received which is outlined below:

- Condition should be placed requiring retention of the screen in perpetuity and for it be obscure glazed
- Construction management condition needed to ensure building works do not impinge upon neighbouring amenity.

- Condition should be placed to ensure construction vehicles do not park outside No. 27 or in such a way which can cause problems for No. 27 to enter and exist their driveway

## 5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

### NPPF (2021)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1005759/NPPF\\_July\\_2021.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf)

### London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D5 Inclusive Design
- D12 Fire Safety
- HC1 Heritage conservation and growth
- G6 Biodiversity and access to nature
- G7 Trees and woodlands

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

### 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,		No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3		No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	
Impact on Biodiversity	LP15	Yes	
Impact on Trees, Woodland and Landscape	LP16	Yes	

These policies can be found out:

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

### Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan (2019)

The main policies applying to the site are as follows:

Issue	Plan Policy	Compliance	
Protecting the Character of Built Areas	C3	Yes	
Character and context appraisals	C2	Yes	

These policies can be found at

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn\\_plan\\_2018\\_to\\_2033\\_january\\_2019.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn_plan_2018_to_2033_january_2019.pdf)

### Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations

These policies can be found at:

Officer Planning Report – Application 21/3214/HOT Page 4 of 10

[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:  
Parkleys Conservation Area Statement  
Parkleys Conservation Area Study

### **Determining applications in a Conservation Area**

In considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to that duty, decisions of the court have confirmed that for development proposed to be carried out in a conservation area, a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

In applications where the decision-maker is satisfied that there will be no harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area, the statutory presumption against granting planning permission described above falls away. In such cases the development should be permitted or refused in accordance with the policies of the development plan and other material considerations.

## **6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and impact on heritage assets
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Trees and Ecology
- iv Fire Safety

### **i Design and impact on heritage assets**

*Policy LP1 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area. Proposals should demonstrate an understanding of the site and its context when considering the design including layout, siting and access and the compatibility of the works to the neighbouring uses.*

*Policy LP3 requires development to conserve and, where possible, take opportunities to make a positive contribution to, the historic environment of the borough. Development proposals likely to adversely affect the significance of heritage assets will be assessed against the requirement to seek to avoid harm and the justification for the proposal.*

The application site is located within the Parkleys Conservation Area. Ham Farm Road was included within the Conservation Area as it is an extension of the estate, having been developed by the same architect Eric Lyons who also developed the Parkleys Span estate. The conservation area was therefore designated to recognise the important role which Eric Lyons played in the layout and designs of the houses and surrounding landscape.

In regard to Ham Farm Road in particular, this area was included as part of the conservation area due to its historical association as it was designed by the same architect (Eric Lyons) as the Parkleys Estate. As such, it is important to retain the individual character of the site including the landscape setting. For example, the garden directly fronting the road provides greenery and softens the appearance of the area. This is in combination with the green space on the opposite side of the road, the garden sizes associated with each plot and the tree presence all contribute to the semi-rural character of the area. The spacing between the dwellings is also important creating a rhythm within the streetscene and allowing views of the greenery in the rear gardens. While some extensions to the Ham Farm Road properties have been undertaken, these are largely sympathetic to the original design and materials.

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations sets out that alterations should avoid visual confusion and sets out a presumption in favour of reflecting the existing character and detailing and retaining the original architecture which should always be the reference point when considering any changes. In regard to side and rear extensions, the SPD sets out that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. Options are either for the extension to integrate with the host dwelling or to be formed such that it is an obvious subordinate addition.

At present, there are views from Ham Farm Road through gaps between houses to the gardens and trees beyond. The existing front wall is single storey in height, and set back behind a window in the side elevation of the main house. This space between detached buildings in this garden setting is important and affords a feeling of spaciousness; predominantly closing them by adding a two storey side extension goes against the design intention of the original development, and therefore one of the reasons for the Conservation Area designation. As such, the substantial infilling of this important gap is not supported. It is acknowledged that there are some instances along Ham Farm Road where they have been two storey extensions constructed in close proximity to the boundaries, however these generally adjoin plots with bungalows so that the spaciousness is maintained or else these were approved prior to the designation of the Conservation Area.

It is acknowledged that the side extension is set down from the ridge and back from the front elevation to achieve a degree of subordination and retain the principle proportions of the front elevation which is currently of a simple symmetrical design with end gables and chimney breasts terminating in book-end chimney stacks. However, in combination with its significant depth, the proposed two storey extension is considered to dominate the modest proportions of the host dwelling and would appear as a bulky, alien feature, out of keeping with surrounding development. It is acknowledged that there are other examples of two storey rear additions in the locality but these are not considered to carry weight as precedents and serve to evidence the harmful impact that can accrue. In particular the example at no 31 is historic appearing to date back to a 1965 permission. The rear extension at no 19 is similarly historic appearing on aerial photos from the 1960s.

The proposed rendering of façade is considered unacceptable as this was not the design intention for the original house. This is described at page 12 of the submitted Design and Access Statement. It is acknowledged there a variety of materials in the vicinity of the site, but rendering is not prevalent. Further, the Conservation Area study states that rendering can be detrimental to the character of the area.

With regards to two-storey rear extensions, the Council's SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations (May 2015) states that two storey rear extensions should be no greater than half the width of the original building, to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the building's original scale and character. It also goes on to state that two storey rear extensions should retain original brickwork as well match existing work and retain visual continuity. The proposed two storey rear extension would be finished in London Stock Brick, details of which could be secured by condition. The proposed two storey rear extension would be more than half the width of the rear elevation of the existing house and combined with its depth would fail to appear as a subordinate addition to the existing house. Moreover, the proposed glazing to the first-floor rear extension would be disproportionate in its overall size and scale, failing to complement the design of the existing house, and exacerbating the dominance of the first floor extension.

The proposed first floor extensions, by reason of their combined siting, width, design, appearance, massing, height, size and scale would erode the open and verdant character of the area and introduce an incongruous, dominant and unsympathetic form of development which will be harmful to the original character of the building and negatively impact and fail to preserve or enhance the significance, character and appearance of the Parkleys Conservation Area. As such, the proposal fails to comply with, in particular, with policies LP1, LP3 of the Local Plan (2018) and Supplementary Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations'(2015).

In terms of the proposed landscape proposals to the site frontage, these retain the more informal planting and open landscape setting with lawn which borders the pavement and the road, typical of this era of house design.

In relation to the proposed rear dormer window it has previously been approved as part of decision reference: 21/1406/HOT. The size, scale, siting and design is no different to what was approved as part of this previous planning application.

It is proposed to replace fenestration on the existing building as well as altering the existing porch canopy to make it smaller. The Parkleys Conservation Area study states 'the form, detailing and use of materials of the houses are varied' but also that 'modern uPVC or aluminium framed windows... can be detrimental to the character'. The replacement windows would be timber, which will offer the opportunity for slim frames and is considered to be a high-quality material. The proposed windows would largely retain the scale of the existing openings and given that the fenestration arrangement of other dwellings along the stretch Ham Farm Road is varied, the replacement fenestration is considered acceptable in this instance. The reduction in width of the

Officer Planning Report – Application 21/3214/HOT Page 6 of 10

porch canopy is not considered to have a significant impact on the character of the site itself or the locality in general. It is noted these changes have been approved under decision reference: 21/1406/HOT.

The proposed rooflight to the rear has been approved as part of decision reference: 21/1406/HOT. The proposed front rooflights are permitted development and do not require planning permission.

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'. In this instance, whilst the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the setting, character and appearance of the conservation area, there is no public benefit arising from the proposal as such it is contrary to the NPPF. The applicant notes that credit should be given to the removal of existing poor quality additions but given the fallback position of implementation of planning permission 21/1406/HOT this is not considered to outweigh the harm identified.

In view of the above, the proposal fails to comply with the aims and objectives of policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan.

## ii Impact on neighbour amenity

*Policy LP8 states that development must protect the amenity and living conditions of existing, adjoining and neighbouring occupants. Design must allow for good daylight standards, avoid overlooking or noise disturbance, avoid visual intrusion, overbearing impacts or harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the uses of buildings and gardens. Harm may arise from various impacts such as noise, air pollution, odours or vibration.*

The application site adjoins Nos. 27 and 31 Ham Farm Road to the north west and south east respectively. To the rear of the site are garages associated with the flats at Brooke Court.

No. 31 has a lower building height than the application dwelling. The proposal would pass the 45-degree BRE test on daylight sunlight when taken from the centre of the first-floor front and rear habitable room windows of this adjoining dwellinghouse. It would not in significant increases in the levels of overlooking to habitable room windows and garden area of this property compared with the existing situation. Notwithstanding the above as number 31 has a lower building height, the proposed two storey side and rear extension would by virtue of its combined height, depth and design appear over-dominant and obtrusive addition when viewed from the habitable room windows and garden areas at No. 31 Ham Farm Road. Consequently, it would fail to comply with policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018).

The proposed two storey side and rear extension would be set significantly away from No. 27 and would have a neutral impact on the amenities enjoyed by the inhabitants of this property as a result.

The flank elevational windows facing towards No. 27 Ham Farm Road could be conditioned to be obscure glazed non opening above 1.7m finished floor level to restrict overlooking. The proposed rear dormer window would not cause significant increases in the levels of overlooking compared with existing as well as the proposed rear elevational glazing.

The proposed single storey rear extension has been approved under decision reference 21/1406/HOT. It would be sited up to the shared boundary and would replace an existing rear extension. It would extend no deeper than the existing along this shared boundary, however, would be approximately 0.1m higher. This increase in height is not considered to result in the proposed extension materially worsening the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property at No. 27 in comparison to the existing situation in terms of loss of light or the extension appearing overbearing. No concerns are therefore raised in this regard.

Towards the south eastern boundary, the proposed extension would replace an existing store and utility room which are sited up to the boundary. The proposed extension would extend slightly beyond the single storey rear extension at No. 31 Ham Farm Road, it would be set off the shared boundary with this property by approx. 1m. As such, it is not considered that the single storey extension would have a significant impact on this neighbouring property in terms of loss of light, nor would it appear over dominant or obtrusive.

The proposed rooflights would not result in direct overlooking of neighbouring properties due to their siting and profile.

Having regard to the length of the garden at the application site, and therefore the separation distance between the proposed works and the properties at Brooke Court, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupants of these properties.

Overall, by virtue its combined height, depth and design the proposed two-storey side and rear extension would appear as an over-dominant and obtrusive addition when viewed from the habitable room windows and garden areas of No. 31 Ham Farm Road.

For reasons outlined above, the proposal would fail to safeguard neighbour living conditions and would fail to accord with policy LP8 of the Local Plan.

### **iii Trees and Ecology**

Policies LP15 and LP16 seek to protect biodiversity and health and longevity of trees, woodland and landscape in the borough. Local Plan policy LP16, subsection 5 requires;

"That trees are adequately protected throughout the course of development, in accordance with British Standard 5837 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, Recommendations (2012)."

The application site is located within the Parkleys Estate Conservation Area, which affords trees both within and adjacent to the site of the proposal, statutory protection. However, there are currently no recorded Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) within or adjacent to the site of the proposal.

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted in support of the application which has been reviewed by the Councils Tree Officer. A BS5837:2021 survey is included within this report which identified 32x trees that could be impacted by the proposal and recommends the removal of 19 of these trees.

The Councils Tree Officer has reviewed the Landscape proposals. The loss of 19x trees in the front and rear garden to facilitate the construction is regrettable, and neighbours concerns in this regard are noted. However, no objections are raised to their removal given their condition and classification on the BS5837 survey. More importantly, the outline landscape proposal for planting of 19 No. trees goes a long way to compensating for this loss. However, additional detail on the replacement trees and soft landscaping is required to ensure they are adequate.

The proposed use of native species is welcomed; however, shading from the birch trees could be an issue with the proposed wildlife hedge along the rear boundary and the use of a shade tolerant species is therefore suggested. Honeysuckle and Laurel should not be used as these will likely outcompete other plants and take over.

Were the proposal to be recommended for approval, conditions regarding a tree planting scheme would have been imposed.

Given the presence of badgers in Ham, the Councils Ecologist has also been consulted on the proposal and raises no objections subject to the inclusion of conditions. These would have been imposed were the application to be recommended for approval.

### **iv Fire Safety**

London Plan policy D12 requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all planning applications. A Fire Safety Strategy was received by the Council following the Officers request. Were the application to be recommended for approval, a condition will be included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis.

## **7. 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

A construction management condition could have been placed given the sensitivities of the site and the extensive works proposed were the application to be approved. An informative would have been placed to remind the applicant that construction vehicles should not block the driveway of No. 27 or to park in an anti-Officer Planning Report – Application 21/3214/HOT Page 8 of 10



social/unneighbourly manner which would make it difficult for occupants of No. 27 to exist and enter their driveway in a safe and easy manner. This would have been included were the application to be approved. Moreover, any construction management statement would need to include details of where on-site operatives would park their vehicles and the LPA would have encouraged the applicant to park away from No. 27 for the above reasons.

**8. RECOMMENDATION**

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process. In making this recommendation consideration has been had to the statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the requirements set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the adverse impacts of allowing this planning application would significantly outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in NPPF (2021) and Development Plan, when taken as a whole.

**Refuse planning permission for the following reasons**

**The proposed first floor extensions, by reason of their combined siting, width, design, appearance, massing, height, size and scale would erode the open and verdant character of the area and introduce an incongruous, dominant and unsympathetic form of development which will be harmful to the original character of the host building and negatively impact and fail to preserve or enhance the significance, character and appearance of the Parkleys Conservation Area. As such, the proposal fails to comply with the NPPF and, in particular, with policies LP1, LP3 of the Local Plan (2018) and Supplementary Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations'(2015) and supported by the Parkleys Conservation Area Statement and Study.**

**By virtue its combined siting, height, depth and design the proposed first floor side/rear extensions would appear as an over-dominant and visually intrusive addition when viewed from the habitable room windows and garden areas of No. 31 Ham Farm Road, detrimental to this neighbours amenity. Consequently, it would fail to comply with policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018).**

**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): SJH

Dated: 21.10.2021

**I agree the recommendation:**

This application has been subject to representations. The Head of Development Management / South Area Team 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.

South Area Team Manager: ..... *N. Patel* .....

Dated: .....25.10.2021.....