

Application reference: 21/3260/HOT HAMPTON WICK WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
16.09.2021	22.09.2021	17.11.2021	17.11.2021

Site:

58 St Winifreds Road, Teddington, TW11 9JR,

Proposal:

Proposed ground floor rear extension, facade alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Manojkumar Krishnamurthy
58, St Winifreds Road
Teddington
TW11 9JR

AGENT NAME

Mr Alberto Ochoa
International House
Canterbury Crescent
Brixton
London
SW9 7QD

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:
Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

67 Atbara Road, Teddington, TW11 9PA, - 23.09.2021
69 Atbara Road, Teddington, TW11 9PA, - 23.09.2021
65 Atbara Road, Teddington, TW11 9PA, - 23.09.2021
55 St Winifreds Road, Teddington, TW11 9JT, - 23.09.2021
59 St Winifreds Road, Teddington, TW11 9JT, - 23.09.2021
57 St Winifreds Road, Teddington, TW11 9JT, - 23.09.2021
60 St Winifreds Road, Teddington, TW11 9JR, - 23.09.2021
56 St Winifreds Road, Teddington, TW11 9JR, - 23.09.2021

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

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date: 07/06/2000

Application: 00/1276

Two Storey Side/front Extension To Replace Existing Garage. Single Storey Rear Extension.

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application: 21/3260/HOT

Proposed ground floor rear extension, facade alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application:21/3261/HOT

Proposed two storey side and front extension, new driveway / entrance, hip to gable roof conversion, floor plan redesign and all associated works

Building Control

Deposit Date: 08.11.2000

Reference: 00/2087/BN

Single storey rear and side extension.

Proposal	<p>The proposal would aim to replace the existing rear/side addition that is proposed to present a flat roof and a further projection of approx. 1.78 metres on the side facing No. 56 St Winifreds Road compared to the existing projection of the addition that would be replaced.</p> <p>The proposal would also aim to re-arrange and replace the first-floor rear openings which are proposed to be constituted by a central Juliet balcony sided by No. 2 windows.</p>
Site description / key designations	<p>The application site is currently occupied by a two-storey detached house located on the southern side of St Winifreds Road in Teddington Village, Hampton Wick Ward.</p> <p>The site does not possess any heritage designation and it is located in Floodzone 2 and a Critical Drainage Area.</p>
Planning History	<p>00/1276 - Two Storey Side/front Extension To Replace Existing Garage. Single Storey Rear Extension - Granted 07/06/2000.</p> <p>21/3261/HOT - Proposed two storey side and front extension, new driveway / entrance, hip to gable roof conversion, floor plan redesign and all associated works - Pending.</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 • 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) • 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 • Flooding • 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</p>

	<p>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 SPD (2015) stipulates that it is preferable that new window openings would echo the proportions and sizes of those of the main house.</p> <p>The proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the locality given the presence of single storey additions in such locality, including the one of the host dwelling and the rear addition at No. 60 St Winifreds Road, one of the adjoining neighbours.</p> <p>The proposal would be a subservient addition to the host dwelling, due to its single storey nature, and the use of matching materials would trigger the sense of belonging to such host dwelling.</p> <p>The upper floor rear openings would echo the design of those of the main house.</p> <p>As such, the proposals are considered acceptable in Design and Visual Amenity, therefore, they are 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>In regard to the scale of the proposed extension, the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) states that in the case of a detached dwelling, extensions should not exceed 4 metres in depth in order to mitigate detriment to neighbour amenity in terms of overbearing, visual obtrusion and loss of light. However, it states that</p>
--	--

	<p>the final test of acceptability will be based on the circumstances of the subject site itself.</p> <p>The properties likely to be affected by the proposal would be Nos. 56 and 60.</p> <p>The proposed scheme, compared to the existing addition on site, would show a further projection on the side facing No. 56 of approx. 1.78 metres. The maximum height of the proposed extension would be approx. 2.95 metres and the maximum height of the existing addition is approx. 3.45 metres, although this would have eaves set at approx. 2.48 metres. The distance between the shared boundary with this neighbour and the existing and proposed additions would remain unaltered, the setback of No. 56 from the shared boundary and the presence of an outhouse on such shared boundary belonging to this neighbouring property, would mean that the proposal would be acceptable and would not significantly be perceived by the occupiers of No. 56 in terms loss of light and overbearing.</p> <p>On the side facing No. 60, the projection of the existing and proposed extensions would approx. remain relatively unchanged.</p> <p>The presence of existing upper floor rear windows would ensure that loss of privacy would not significantly be beyond the mutual overlooking currently perceived on site.</p> <p>As the proposals would not adversely impact the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, overbearing and overlooking, such proposals are considered to meet the aims and objectives of Policy LP 8 of the Local Plan (2018) and the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015).</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 flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>The submitted Flood Risk Assessment states that the proposal would be set no lower than the existing floor level and consequently the proposal would not increase flood risk. This is in line with Policy LP 21 of the Local Plan (2018).</p> <p>Fire Safety</p> <p>The Fire Safety Report received is considered sufficient to satisfy Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021), therefore, a compliance condition is attached.</p> <p>The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. This permission is NOT a consent under the Building Regulations for which a separate application should be made.</p>
--	---

Recommendation	It is recommended that the application reference 21/3260/HOT be granted approval subject to conditions.
-----------------------	---

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: 22/10/2021

I agree the recommendation: WT

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:15/11/2021.....

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
