

## Application reference: 21/4264/HOT ST MARGARETS, NORTH TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
13.12.2021	15.12.2021	09.02.2022	09.02.2022

**Site:**

49 Newry Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PJ,

**Proposal:**

Single storey wrap around extension

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Daniel Epps  
49, Newry Road  
Twickenham  
London  
TW1 1PJ

**AGENT NAME**

AA Drafting Solutions  
3-7  
Sunnyhill Road  
London  
SW16 2UG

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

**Consultations:****Internal/External:****Consultee****Expiry Date****Neighbours:**

132 Haliburton Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PH, - 15.12.2021  
138 Haliburton Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PH, - 15.12.2021  
134 Haliburton Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PH, - 15.12.2021  
136 Haliburton Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PH, - 15.12.2021  
47 Newry Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PJ, -  
51 Newry Road, Twickenham, TW1 1PJ, - 15.12.2021

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

Status: GTD Application:00/0099  
Date:31/01/2000 Loft Conversion And Dormer Extension.

Development Management

Status: WNA Application:01/1941  
Date:30/08/2001 Proposed Ground Floor Rear Extension.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:15/2177/HOT  
Date:17/08/2015 Extension to the rear side infill.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:21/3837/PS192  
Date:06/01/2022 Rear dormer roof extensions. Rooflights to front elevation

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:21/4264/HOT  
Date: Single storey wrap around extension

<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 14.01.2000 Reference: 00/0057/FP	Loft conversion
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 01.04.1998 Reference: 98/0534/BN	Structural opening to rear ground floor wall and new first floor bathroom partition.
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 18.10.2005 Reference: 06/80726/BRECECA	Heating (central heating/ room heating/ hot water/ boiler/ controls) Dwelling house
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 18.10.2005 Reference: 06/95618/CORGI	Installed a Gas Boiler
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 11.12.2006 Reference: 06/07603/FENSA	1 Window
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 14.02.2007 Reference: 07/0301/BN	En-suite bathroom to front bedroom, partial removal of first floor chimney breast and support on gallows
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 30.03.2007 Reference: 07/07693/FENSA	1 Window 2 Doors
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 18.10.2005 Reference: 07/80593/BRECECA	BRECECA: Heating (central heating/ room heating/ hot water/ boiler/ controls) Dwelling house
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 19.06.2007 Reference: 07/COR00246/CORGI	Installed a Gas Boiler
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 16.03.2011 Reference: 11/0479/PP	Structural opening between kitchen and diner

**Application Reference: 21/4264/HOT**

**Address: 49 Newry Road**

**Proposal**

Single storey wrap around extension.

**Site Description / Key Designations**

The application site is a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling which is situated on the western side of Newry Road. The site is not a Building of Townscape Merit and is not located within a Conservation Area. The application site is situated within Character Area 7 of the St Margarets Village Planning Guidance. It is also designated as:

- Article 4 Direction Basements

**Recent / Relevant Planning History**

21/3838/PS192 – Rear dormer roof extensions. Rooflights to front elevation – Granted 06/01/2022

15/2177/HOT – Extension to the rear side infill – Granted 17/08/2015

01/1941 – Proposed ground floor rear extension – Decided as no further action be taken 30/08/2001

00/0099 – Loft conversion and dormer extension – Granted 31/01/2000

**Policies**

Local Plan (2018)

- LP1 Local character and design quality
- LP8 Amenity and living conditions

Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance

- House Extensions and External Alterations (2015)
- St Margarets Village Planning Guidance (2016)

**Material Representations**

Two objections were received, stating:

- The plans submitted are inaccurate, and do not accurately convey the existing site. There is also a discrepancy between the submitted plans as to whether the proposal touches the party wall or not
- Constitutes an overdevelopment of the site, as there is already a loft conversion approved under 21/3838/PS192.
- Would lead to a loss of outlook and light, as the proposed depth, height and eaves height are considered excessive in relation to the application site and when considering the adjoining properties
- Negative impact on visual amenity due to the proposed scale and size of the proposal. The height would also be higher than the boundary treatment, further worsening the visual amenity of the site.

One observation was received, stating that the proposal is of similar size and scale to that approved under 17/3629/HOT at 50 Newry Road.

**Professional Comments**

The application has been assessed in relation to the following issues:

- Character and Design
- Neighbour Amenity
- Fire Safety

### Character and Design

Policy LP1 Local Character and Design Quality outlines that developments should illustrate “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”

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.

The SPD (2015) states that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbour. It should harmonise with the original appearance, either by integrating with the house or being made to appear as an obvious addition, so that the original form can still be appreciated. In such circumstances, the ridge of the of the extension should be set lower to that on the main house.

The SPD (2015) stipulates that it is preferable that new window openings would echo the design, proportions and size of those of the main house.

A single storey wrap around extension is proposed. The proposal would provide a depth of approx. 7.8m from the existing rear wall of the dwelling and a width of approx. 4.4m. The proposal would have a dual pitched roof with 5 rooflights, with a maximum height of 3.4m and an eaves height of 2.5m. It is noted that there are examples of single storey rear extensions of similar proportions present along this road. As such, it would not detrimentally impact the character of the area. The proposed eaves and roof height from a design point of view would appear subservient to the main dwelling. It is considered that the proposal is of an appropriate design and scale. Large glazed doors and new windows are proposed to the rear. These are also considered acceptable given the siting at the rear of the property. The extension will be constructed with materials to match the existing dwellinghouse.

Two objections were received from nearby occupiers, stating the plans submitted were inaccurate and that the height of the proposal would exceed the existing boundary treatment, leading to a negative impact on visual amenity. One objection states that the flank brick wall that would run along the boundary with No. 51 would be higher than the existing boundary treatment, which would result in a significant impact on the visual amenity of the rear garden. Further, the flank wall would be proposed yellow stock brick, which does not confirm whether the proposal would be in London Yellow Stock Brick to match the existing dwelling and would worsen the impact on visual amenity. However these issues will be dealt with in the section below.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy LP1 of the Local Plan and associated SPD guidance.

### Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Policy LP8 states that in considering proposals for development, the Council will seek to protect adjoining properties from unreasonable loss of privacy, pollution, visual intrusion, noise and disturbance. The Council will generally seek to ensure that the design and layout of buildings enables sufficient sunlight and daylight to penetrate into and between buildings and that adjoining land or properties are protected from overshadowing in accordance with established standards.

The House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015) advises that extensions that create “an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted”.

Further guidance is provided in Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'House Extensions and External Alterations'. In particular, this states that extensions which create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted, and that a new extension should not result in any substantial loss of privacy to adjoining dwellings and gardens.

The proposal at approx. 7.8m depth is contrary to the SPD (2015) advice which states that the effect of a single storey extension is usually acceptable with regards to neighbouring amenity if the projection is no further than 3 metres to a terraced house and 3.5m for a semi detached house. Furthermore, the proposed eaves height of 2.5m (higher than the recommended 2.2m) would result in a sense of enclosure and loss of light/outlook to neighbouring occupiers. The SPD also states that 'the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site, which may justify greater rear projection'. In this instance, two objections were received relating to a loss of outlook from neighbouring rear facing windows. It is stated in the objections that the development would result in significant loss of light and outlook, as the proposal is a long, large, imposing, tall brick-walled structure that would extend along the boundary with No. 51. It is considered that the proposal would have a negative impact on the residential amenity of No. 51 as the proposed height of the eaves and roof ridge would cause enclosure and a loss of light and outlook.

One objection expressed concern that the existing plan does not accurately show how the proposal would relate to No. 47. As such, the impact of the proposal on No. 47 cannot be sufficiently assessed. The submitted plan shows a gap/recess, which is an incorrect representation of the existing site. Within the representation, the objector has provided plans from 12/1977/HOT, which accurately show the distance between the existing rear extension at No. 47 and the existing rear extension at No. 49, showing that there is a slight gap between the walls.

Given that there is an existing rear extension at No. 47 approved under 12/1977/HOT, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a worsening of residential amenity to No. 47 as the proposed increased depth would not be of significant scale or depth in relation to the existing rear extension. Overlooking to Nos 47 and 51 would be unlikely as the scheme would be a single storey addition.

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. 51 Newry Road and as such, a refusal of planning permission is justified. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy LP8 of the Local Plan

### Fire Safety

A Fire Strategy Report was supplied on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2020. It is considered that this is adequate to meet the requirements of D12A. 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.

### **Other Matters**

The objections received make reference to the discrepancies between the plans, and the inability to see whether the proposal makes contact with the party wall not. Party wall disputes are not a planning concern, but due to the inaccuracies of the plans it is noted that the full extent of the proposal, including any harm that could be caused by its siting near or on the party wall, could not be judged accurately by the neighbours consulted. However officers have sufficient information to determine the application.

The objections also made reference to the previously approved loft conversion at 21/3838/PS192, stating that this in conjunction with the proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site. The loft conversion was deemed to be permitted development, and does not form a material consideration in the determination of the current proposal. Regardless, this was approved while the

current application was being determined, and it would have prejudiced a positive outcome to include the previous application within the submitted existing plans.

**Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

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.

**Recommendation**

Refusal.

**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): LC

Dated: 08/02/2022

**I agree the recommendation: WT**

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

Dated: .....09/02/2022.....

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**

---