

Application reference: 21/4266/HOT HAMPTON NORTH WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
13.12.2021	10.01.2022	07.03.2022	07.03.2022

Site:

84 Rectory Grove, Hampton, TW12 1EE,

Proposal:

Single storey rear extension

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

APPLICANT NAME

MR K RAVISHANGAR
84, Rectory Grove
Hampton
TW12 1EE

AGENT NAME

Mrs SARAH WRIGHT
NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
CENTRE
PO BOX 65
NORWICH
NR6 6EJ
NORFOLK

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

80 Rectory Grove, Hampton, TW12 1EE -
21 Browning Close, Hampton, TW12 1EN, - 10.01.2022
86 Rectory Grove, Hampton, TW12 1EE, - 10.01.2022
82 Rectory Grove, Hampton, TW12 1EE, -

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

Status: PCO

Application: 21/4266/HOT

Date:

Single storey rear extension

Building Control

Deposit Date: 22.05.2004

FENSA Notification of Replacement Glazing comprising 8 Windows and 3 Doors. Installed by Anglian Windows Ltd. FENSA Member No 13229. Installation ID 1716650. Invoice No S101271773

Reference: 04/6165/FENSA

Application Number	21/4266/HOT
Address	84 Rectory Grove Hampton TW12 1EE
Proposal	Single storey rear extension
Contact Officer	Emily Williams
Target Determination Date	07/03/2022

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 property is two-storeys and forms part of a terrace.

The application site is situated within Twickenham and is designated as:

- Area Proposed for Tree Planting – Site: Wordsworth Road 1999
- Article 4 Direction – Basements Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Low)
- Village Character Area – Longford River Estates Area 1 Hampton Village

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposal seeks a single storey rear extension.

There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

Three letters of representation were received from three neighbouring properties, all three being objections. These outlined the following issues below. It is noted that only material planning considerations can be considered when assessing the application.

Objection - 80 Rectory Grove, Hampton TW12 1EE

- Proposed extension to be built over existing public foul sewer run and inspection cover. This will cause block drains.

Objection - 82 Rectory Grove, Hampton TW12 1EE

- Concerns that the proposed extension is to be built over the shared sewerpipe that runs along the rear of the row of terraces no. 80 to no. 86.
- Building over these existing drains/sewers will damage or block the pipes.

Objection - 86 Rectory Grove, Hampton TW12 1EE

- Light onto the property will be reduced by the proposed extension.
- Wall to be built is too close to the shared boundary line.
- The proposed extension is to extend 2.5m past the existing conservatory.
- The proposed extension is to be built over the sewer drain which will become blocked.

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

These policies can be found at:

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
- D12 Fire Safety

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	Yes	Ne
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	Ne

These policies can be found at

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf

Supplementary Planning Documents

- House Extension and External Alterations
- Hampton Village Planning Guidance

These policies can be found at:

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:

- Article 4 Direction – Restriction on basement development

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- 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.

The Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions 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.

The proposal seeks a single storey rear extension extending 3.5m rearwards with an eave height of 2.2m. The SPD specifies that in the case of terraced dwellings, a rear extension should be no larger than 3m. In this instance, a rearward projection of 3.5m is proposed, thus not complying with SPD guidelines. However, this is offset by the compliant eave height of 2.2m and is deemed acceptable for this reason.

Double doors and four windows are proposed on the rear elevation. A pitched roof is proposed with a combination of roof tiles and glass glazing to create an orangery. Framed double doors and associated windows are proposed to the rear elevation.

The materials proposed are to be similar to that of existing. The roof is to have traditional roof tiles, and the exterior walls are to use brickwork to match that of existing. The windows are to be white PVCu frames with tinted double glazed sealed units. Flank windows are proposed on the side elevations of the proposed extension.

In view of the above, it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 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 SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 3m in depth for a terrace property will be acceptable. Where the proposed extension seeks a larger depth, the eaves should be reduced to 2.2m at the shared boundary to mitigate detrimental impact on neighbours such as sense of enclosure or overbearing. However, the final test of acceptability is dependent on the specific circumstances of the site which may justify greater rear projection.

The proposed flank windows will be 1.7m from ground level and therefore will not afford loss of privacy for adjoining properties.

The neighbouring properties most likely to be affected by the proposal are no. 82 Rectory Road and no. 86 Rectory Road. The SPD advises that extensions that create “an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens should not be permitted”.

When considering no. 82 Rectory Road, the proposed extension will lie along the shared boundary wall. The proposed extension will extend 3.5m from the adjoining property and therefore may result in being visually overbearing for this property. Saying this, the extension is only single storey and the reduced eave height of 2.2m offsets this.

When considering no. 86 Rectory Road, the proposed extension provides mitigation as it will project 2.5m past the rear line of the adjoining dwellinghouse, 0.5m short of the suggested SPD guidance at 3m. As the proposed extension is adjoining the boundary line, loss of light should be considered. Further, the adjoining neighbours will only lose light for a short period of time in the morning given the positioning of the garden.

As such, the proposed ground floor rear addition on balance is considered compliant aims and objectives of the Councils SPD and satisfies Policy LP8 of the Local Plan.

iii Fire Safety

A fire safety strategy was received by council on 10th January 2022. A condition will be included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. The materials proposed are to match existing and will need to be Building Regulations compliant. The applicant is advised that alterations to existing building should comply with building regulations. This permission is NOT a consent under the Building Regulations for which a separate application should be made. Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with Policy D12 of the London Officer Planning Report – Application 21/4266/HOT Page 4 of 7

Plan.

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.

8. RECOMMENDATION

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process.

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

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): EW

Dated: 03/03/2022

I agree the recommendation: CTA

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:03/03/2022.....

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:

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

U0059449	NPPF REFUSAL - Para. 38-42
U0059450	Decision Drawings