

Application reference: 21/3112/HOT WEST TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
03.09.2021	13.09.2021	08.11.2021	08.11.2021

Site:

474 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5JD,

Proposal:

Proposed first floor side extension and 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

Mr Nicholas Smart
474 Staines Road
Twickenham
London
TW2 5JD

AGENT NAME

Mr Patrick Ettwein
40 Westholm
London
London
NW11 6LH
United Kingdom

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

5 South Close, Twickenham, TW2 5JE, - 14.09.2021
9 South Close, Twickenham, TW2 5JE, - 14.09.2021
7 South Close, Twickenham, TW2 5JE, - 14.09.2021
476 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5JD, -
472 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5JD, - 14.09.2021

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

Status: REF Application:64/1337
Date:15/02/1965 Rebuilding of garage and store with extension of 2 bedrooms over.

Development Management

Status: REF Application:67/0434
Date:12/06/1967 Rebuilding of existing garage and erection of extension to dwelling house.

Development Management

Status: REF Application:06/4203/HOT
Date:14/02/2007 First Floor Side Extension and side facing dormer window.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:07/1516/HOT
Date:07/06/2007 Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension.

Development Management

Status: PDE Application:21/3112/HOT
Date: Proposed first floor side extension and single storey rear extension

Building Control

Deposit Date: 28.03.2001 Convert garage to habitable room

Reference: 01/0589/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 08.10.2008 Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 08/COR02283/CORGI

Building Control

Deposit Date: 23.12.2019 Install a gas-fired boiler

Reference: 20/FEN00307/GASAFE

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: 03/11/2021

I agree the recommendation: WT

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

Dated:3/11/2021.....

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

U0055832	Decision Drawings
U0055833	NPPF Refusal paras 38-42

Application reference: 21/3112/HOT
Site address: 474 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5JD

Proposal:

The application seeks planning permission for: *'Proposed first floor side extension and single storey rear extension'*.

Site description:

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with front and rear garden located on the north side of Staines Road, West Twickenham ward. The site is not in or adjacent to a conservation area and there are no other heritage assets to consider. It sits in Area 1 (Rivermead and surrounds) of the Twickenham Village Planning Guidance.

The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is not identified as being susceptible to surface water flooding, though it is in an Area Susceptible to Ground Water Flooding. There is an Article 4 Direction restricting basement development.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, comprising mainly of two-storey inter-war housing. Staines Road is a busy red route A-road. Directly opposite the site to the south on the other side of Staines Road is Fulwell Public Golf Course, which is designated Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), Public Open Space and Other Site of Nature Importance (OSNI).

Planning history:

- 64/1337 – Rebuilding of garage and store with extension of 2 bedrooms over. – Planning permission REFUSED 15/02/1965

Reason(s) for refusal:

1. *That no provision has been made for adequate breaks between buildings and the proposed development would be likely therefore to create a cramped appearance thereby being prejudicial to the visual appearance of the locality.*
- 67/0434 – Rebuilding of existing garage and erection of extension to dwelling house. – Planning permission REFUSED 12/06/1967

Reason(s) for refusal:

1. *The proposed two-storey extension adjoining the site boundary is undesirable in that: -*
 - (i) *it would leave an inadequate break between buildings and give rise to a cramped and congested appearance, and*
 - (ii) *be likely, by reason of its size, to have an adverse effect on the amenities of the adjoining residents, and*
 - (iii) *create an undesirable precedent for similar extensions to other properties in the area which would be capable of development in a like manner*
- 06/4203/HOT – First floor side extension and side facing dormer window. – Planning permission REFUSED 14/02/2007

Reason(s) for refusal:

1. *The proposed extension by reason of design, height, bulk, mass and close proximity to the boundaries of the site would appear an overly dominant addition to the existing house detrimental to its appearance and character and would give rise to the closure of an important visual gap in the street scene detracting from the appearance of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy BLT 11 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan – First Review 2005 and the Council’s Design Guidelines for House Extensions and External Alterations, which has been adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.*
- 07/1516/HOT – Proposed single storey rear extension. – Planning permission APPROVED 07/06/2007 – *[Officer note: This permission has not been built out.]*

The site dwelling also benefits from a rear roof dormer extension, which was apparently built out in the 1970s under permitted development rights.

Other matters:

None.

Amendments:

None.

Public and other representations:

Neighbour consultation

One letter of objection has been received from the owner/occupier of No. 476 Staines Road which raises an objection to the single-storey rear extension on grounds of overshadowing and reduction of light to a habitable room.

Main Development Plan policies:

London Plan (2021)

- Policy D12

Local Plan (2020)

- Policy LP1 Local Character and Design Quality
- Policy LP8 Amenity and Living Conditions
- Policy LP13 Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Local Green Space
- Policy LP15 Biodiversity

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

- Design Quality SPD (February 2006)
- House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (May 2015)
- Twickenham Village Planning Guidance SPD (February 2018)

Professional comments:

The main issues for consideration are:

- Character, design and appearance’
- Impact on Fulwell Public Golf Course;
- Neighbouring amenities;
- Fire safety.

Character, Design and Appearance

Local Plan Policy LP1 (Local Character and Design Quality) Part A states that the Council will require all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality. The high quality character and heritage of the borough and its villages will need to be maintained and enhanced where opportunities arise. Development proposals will have to demonstrate 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 area. To ensure development respects, contributes to and enhances the local environment and character, the following will be considered when assessing proposals:

1. compatibility with local character including the relationship to existing townscape, development patterns, views, local grain and frontages as well as scale, height, massing, density, landscaping, proportions, form, materials and detailing;
2. sustainable design and construction, including adaptability, subject to aesthetic considerations;
3. layout, siting and access, including making best use of land;
4. space between buildings, relationship of heights to widths and relationship to the public realm, heritage assets and natural features;
5. inclusive design, connectivity, permeability (as such gated developments will not be permitted), natural surveillance and orientation; and
6. suitability and compatibility of uses, taking account of any potential adverse impacts of the collocation of uses through the layout, design and management of the site.

All proposals, including extensions, alterations and shopfronts, will be assessed against the policies contained within a neighbourhood plan where applicable, and the advice set out in the relevant Village Planning Guidance and other SPDs relating to character and design.

The Council's House Extensions and External Alterations SPD states that the external appearance of any extension must be carefully designed in order to avoid the visual confusion that can result when the style and materials of the original house are ignored. The overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. Extensions should harmonise with the original appearance, which should be taken as the starting point for any future changes.

Turning first to the proposed single-storey rear extension, this would be 3.5m in depth, full width with a flat roof 3m in height. Materials would be painted render finish, rear sliding patio doors with white finish aluminium frames and 2no. rooflights on the flat roof. Whilst the proposed ground-floor extension is noted to be wide, occupying the full width of the existing dwelling and site, it has a modest depth and height and is thus of an overall acceptable size and scale and together with use of sympathetic materials, would successfully appear as a proportionate and subordinate addition to the main dwelling and not cause harm to the visual amenities of the locality.

Turning now to the proposed first-floor side extension, this would sit on an existing ground-floor side extension, extending the full depth of the main house albeit it would be set in slightly by 0.3m from the principle front elevation and also from the shared boundary. It would have a pitched roof whose ridge and eaves would match those of the main house. Materials would match existing and 2no. rooflights are also proposed in the side and rear.

The Council's House Extensions and External Alterations SPD advises that extensions should be designed to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main
Officer Planning Report – Application 21/3112/HOT Page 7 of 9

structure, so that the original form can still be appreciated. In such circumstances, the ridge of the extension should be set lower to that on the main house. Further, two-storey side and rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building, to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the building's original scale and character. The SPD further advises to avoid side extensions that project beyond the existing front elevation. Where the extension is to be subordinate to the existing house it is usually desirable to set back the extension by at least 1m behind the front elevation. Finally, development, which would result in the significant reduction of an existing important space or gap between neighbouring houses, is not normally acceptable. In conjunction with existing extensions to neighbouring buildings this can have a terracing effect on the street. Consequently, two-storey side extensions should be sited 1m from the side boundary

The proposed first-floor extension does not comply with the relevant SPD guidelines. It would be set back only minimally from the front and side, would not be set down from the main roof ridge, and at 3.12m wide, would be greater than half the width of the original house (5.56m wide). The overall result would be an extension which, by virtue of its combined excessive width, height, lack of set in at the front and overall bulk and siting, would result in an incongruous, visually dominant and unneighbourly form of development which fails to appear as a proportionate and subordinate addition to the main dwelling, and would appear unduly horizontal, squat and cramped in its plot and give rise to the closure of an important gap in the streetscene, thus causing harm to the character and appearance of the main house and the visual amenities of the locality.

It is further noted that the proposal is not materially dissimilar to that which was refused under planning application 06/4203/HOT in 2007, the only key difference being that the modest side roof dormer has been omitted. Whilst each application is assessed on its own merits as outlined above the proposal is considered contrary to Policy LP1 of the Local Plan.

Impact on Fulwell Public Golf Course

The site is directly adjacent to Fulwell Public Gold Course, which is designated MOL and OSNI. Local Plan Policies LP13 (Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Local Green Space) and LP15 (Biodiversity) are relevant. Officers consider that the application site, which is separated from the golf course by the busy Staines Road, is of a sufficient distance to ensure that the proposals would not impact on the character and openness of the MOL or its ecological value.

Residential Amenity

Local Plan Policy LP8 (Amenity and Living Conditions) seeks to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties from development. Further guidance is provided in the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations SPD which states that extensions that create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted. This could be due to the height, footprint or proximity of the proposals to the surrounding area.

With regards to single-storey extensions, the SPD advises that the effect of a single-storey extension is usually acceptable if the projection is no further than 3.5m for a semi-detached house. The proposed ground-floor extension would be within this guideline. It is noted that the neighbour at adjoining No. 476 raises concerns about overshadowing and loss of light from the extension; however, given that it's rear projection would be within the recommended SPD guidelines and taking account its overall acceptable height and design, it is not considered that it would impact on neighbouring amenities in any way that would be unacceptable to a degree which would warrant refusal of the scheme. Were the application acceptable in all other respects a condition would be recommended restricting use of the flat roof.

Turning to the proposed first-floor side extension, this would not protrude beyond the existing rear building line and so would not appear overbearing to the neighbours at No. 472. It would face flank windows but these are likely serving a hallway, which is not a habitable room. No windows are proposed in this elevation. It is noted that no concerns were raised about this element of the proposal in the assessment of the most recently refused scheme. Were the application acceptable in all other respects, a condition would be recommended restricting the installation of windows on this flank.

Other Matters – Fire Safety

Policy D12 Fire Safety of the recently adopted London Plan requires all development to meet the highest standards of fire safety. The applicant has submitted a Fire Statement prepared by the scheme's architect which sets out proposed safety measures as per the relevant criteria of Policy D12. This is considered proportionate and acceptable for an application of this nature and scale and the application is considered to comply with London Plan Policy D12.

Conclusion:

The proposed first-floor side extension, by virtue of its combined excessive width, height, lack of set in at the front and overall bulk and siting, would result in an incongruous, visually dominant and unneighbourly form of development which fails to appear as a proportionate and subordinate addition to the main dwelling, and would appear unduly horizontal, squat and cramped in its plot and give rise to the closure of an important gap in the streetscene, thus causing harm to the character and appearance of the main house and the visual amenities of the locality. As such, the application fails to comply with relevant policies, in particular, LP1, of the Local Plan (2018), and the following of the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents: Design Quality (February 2006), House Extensions and External Alterations (May 2015), St Margarets Village Planning Guidance (February 2018).

Recommendation: REFUSE