

Application reference: 07/0531/HOT HAMPTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
15.02.2007	15.02.2007	12.04.2007	12.04.2007

Site:

66 Percy Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2JR

Proposal:

Single story 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 And Mrs Deo
66 Percy Road
Hampton
Middlesex
TW12 2JR

AGENT NAME

Englishhaus Architects Ltd
30 Lawrence Road
Hampton
Middx
TW12 2RJ

DC Site Notice: printed on

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

15 Chestnut Avenue, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2NY, - 23.02.2007
64 Percy Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2JR, - 23.02.2007
68 Percy Road, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2JR, - 23.02.2007
11 Chestnut Avenue, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2NY, - 23.02.2007

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
07/0531/HOT	• Single story rear extension.	PCO	

Constraints:

Professional Comments:

- 2 storey detached house with attached garage located on the NE side of Perry Rd, backing onto gardens of properties in Chestnut Avenue.
- proposal is for a s/s rear ext, full width + measuring 3-785m deep max with roof overhang. Ext will have hip end tiled roof over, approx 3-6m high. Part of an existing rear chimney stack will be removed
- materials to match existing.
- One letter recd from No. 64 expressing concerns about the impact of the proposal on the structural integrity of 64 and concerns relating to the survival of trees + shrubs near the common boundary.
- At 3-785m depth, proposal complies with SPC, for house ext which recommends that s/s ext up to 4m may be acceptable to detached houses, depending on the on-site circumstances
- Properties either side of 66 are also detached. No 68 projects deeper into its plot than No. 66 hence the combination of the separation from the boundary of some 1-315m and the rearward projection of 68 + since ext will have a hipped roof sloping away from the boundary, will result in an acceptable impact on the amenities of

The occupiers of No. 68.

Similarly No. 64 is also detached,

having a s/s ext separating the main building of 64 from 66. The boundary between 64 + 66 is also well regulated

Having regard to the above circumstances, proposal considered compliant with SPG + the grant of PP is
∴ appropriate.

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

Case Officer (Initials): *AKB*

Dated: *3/4/07*

I agree the recommendation: *AKB*

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated: *3/4/07*

[Signature]

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Development Control Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Development Control Manager:

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:

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE: