

Application reference: 21/3100/HOT SOUTH TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
02.09.2021	07.09.2021	02.11.2021	02.11.2021

Site:

29 Lion Road, Twickenham, TW1 4JF,

Proposal:

Single storey rear extension.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Amy McElroy
29, Lion Road
Twickenham
TW1 4JF

AGENT NAME

Mr Stephen Talliss
Somorjay Talliss Architects
T15 Tideway Yard
125 Mortlake High Street
London
SW14 8SN
United Kingdom

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:
Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

Ground Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, -
Unit F2 First Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
Units F7 And F8 First Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
Unit F3 First Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
Unit 9 First Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
Unit F9 First Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
Unit F1 First Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
Unit F6 First Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
Units F4 And F5 Frist Floor,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
Unit F1,Electroline House,15 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JH, - 07.09.2021
31 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JF, -
27 Lion Road,Twickenham,TW1 4JF, - 07.09.2021

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

Status: PDE

Date:

Application:21/3100/HOT

Single storey extension to the rear of the property.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 16.05.2006 New consumer unit Main/ supplementary equipotential bonding
Dwelling house

Reference: 06/70901/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 28.10.2009 Removal of loadbearing wall on ground floor and change of window to
door

Reference: 09/1823/FP

Building Control

Deposit Date: 10.03.2010 Removal of loadbearing wall on ground floor and change of window to
door

Reference: 09/1823/FP/1

Building Control

Deposit Date: 24.04.2011 Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 11/FEN03489/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 12.10.2011 Installation of three UPVC double glazed windows in kitchen,
bathroom and stairwell.

Reference: 11/1975/RG

Proposal	Single storey rear extension that would project approx. 7 metres from the rear wall of the host property and would be covered by a flat roof that would achieve a maximum height of approx. 2.76 metres. This would result in the removal of the existing rear addition.
Site description / key designations	<p>The application site is currently occupied by a two-storey mid-terraced house located on the southern-western side of Lion Road in Twickenham Village, South Twickenham Ward.</p> <p>The application site is not located in a Conservation Area, neither is it locally or nationally listed. However, it is sited in a Critical Drainage Area and a Throughflow Catchment Area</p>
Relevant Planning History	N/A.
Policies	<p>The proposal has been considered having regard to the policies within the Council's Local Plan, in particular:</p> <p>Local Plan (2018):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality • LP 8 Amenity and Living Conditions • LP 16 Trees, Woodlands and Landscape • LP 21 Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage <p>Supplementary Planning Documents / Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015) • Twickenham Village Planning Guidance SPD (2018)
Consultee	N/A.
Material representations	<p>The list of neighbours notified of this application are listed above.</p> <p>Three objections along with one supporting comment that contains an objection were received whose concerns can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overbearing; • The extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the subject building, adjacent properties and surrounding area; • Loss of light; • Impeded outlook; • Overdevelopment; • The development may damage existing vegetation; • Noise; • Overlooking; and • Design.
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 • Flooding • Vegetation • 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 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 street scene and would be a subservient addition to the host dwellinghouse due to its single storey nature. The sense of belonging of the proposed box shaped extension to the host property as well as locality would be enhanced through the use of matching materials, painted brickwork and render, being used by such host property. Also, single storey additions appear to be common features in the surrounding area and therefore the scheme would not appear out of context in this instance.</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. 7 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 metres to a terraced house. The SPD (2015) also states that ‘the final test of</p>
--	--

	<p>acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site, which may justify greater rear projection.'</p> <p>The proposal at approx. 7 metres exceeds the SPD (2015) recommended limits and would straddle the boundary shared by the host dwelling and No. 27. This would have required the submission of a Certificate B that has not been submitted. The extension would achieve a maximum height of approx. 2.76 metres on the shared boundaries with Nos. 27 and 31. Although the proposal would appear to extend out from the rear façade of the existing two-storey addition at No. 31 by approx. 3 metres, such proposal would project approx. 7 metres from the rear façade of the neighbouring end-terrace dwelling at No. 27, that presents a non-full width rear addition, similar to the one that would be removed in order to make way for the proposed scheme, that leaves space for a rear opening that would appear to be the only opening bringing light to its associated space. This 7 metres projection would cause sense of enclosure and impeded outlook due to its significantly generous length. These issues would be exacerbated by its approx. 2.76 metres height.</p> <p>Overlooking would be unlikely as the scheme would be a single storey addition.</p> <p>Noise is also unlikely, because the proposal would not aim to change the current residential use whose threshold in terms of noise would not be considered to be impacted.</p> <p>Turning to overdevelopment, it is noted that the proposal would replace an existing rear addition and its layout would not appear to significantly exceed the one of this existing addition.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that, having regard to the above and given the generous depth of the extension combined with its height, the proposal is considered to be unduly overbearing and un-neighbourly to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of No. 27 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. 27 Lion Road. 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>Flooding</p> <p>Policy LP 21 'Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage' states that all developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and</p>
--	---

	<p>flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>Given the minor nature of the proposal, such proposal is not considered to exacerbate the current situation on site in term of flood risk. Therefore, it would be in line with Policy LP 21 of the Local Plan (2018).</p> <p>Vegetation</p> <p>Policy LP 16 ‘Trees, Woodlands and Landscape’ 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.</p> <p>From a desk-based study, it is noted that vegetation belonging to Nos. 27 and 31 would not appear to be of high amenity value, mainly due to their rear locations. Also, the scheme would replace an existing rear addition and its layout would not appear to significantly exceed the one of this existing addition. Therefore, such vegetation and their associated RPAs would not significantly be in danger.</p> <p>Fire Safety</p> <p>The Fire Safety Strategy Statement 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 21/3100/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: 27/10/2021

I agree the recommendation: CTA

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:28/10/2021.....

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
