

## Application reference: 23/1922/HOT WEST TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
12.07.2023	18.07.2023	12.09.2023	12.09.2023

**Site:**

129 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5BD,

**Proposal:**

Two storey side and rear extensions, removal and replacement of existing garage, alteration to boundary fence and gates along street and new gate to street

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr John Nortje  
129 Staines Road  
Twickenham  
Richmond Upon Thames  
TW2 5BD

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Redmond Ivie  
10 Barley Mow Passage  
London  
W4 4PH

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

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

2 Campbell Road, Twickenham, TW2 5BY, - 18.07.2023  
127 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5BD, - 18.07.2023  
3 Gothic Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EH, - 18.07.2023  
1 Gothic Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EH, - 18.07.2023  
1A Gothic Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EH, - 18.07.2023  
2 Gothic Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EH, - 18.07.2023  
2A Gothic Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EH, -  
131 Staines Road, Twickenham, TW2 5BD, -

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:94/0141/FUL  
Date:21/03/1994 Erection Of Double Garage At Rear

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:95/1041/FUL  
Date:17/05/1995 Demolition Of Existing Garage Lean To And Erection Of New Garage Lean-to And Brick Wall

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:95/1041/DD01  
Date:05/03/1996 Details Pursuant To Condition Bd11 (garage Roof) Of Planning Permission 95/1041/ful Dated 17/5/95

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:88/2018

Date:05/10/1988                      Single storey side extension. (Amended Plan No.(s) RAA/88019 received on 26th September 1988).

---

Development Management

Status: REF                              Application:73/2055  
Date:11/12/1973                      Demolition of existing properties and erection of a 3-storey building comprising 6 two-bedroom flats together with the erection of 6 garages.

---

Development Management

Status: REF                              Application:22/3464/HOT  
Date:20/01/2023                      TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS, REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING GARAGE, ALTERATION TO BOUNDARY FENCE AND GATES ALONG STREET AND NEW GATE TO STREET

---

Development Management

Status: PDE                              Application:23/1922/HOT  
Date:                                      Two storey side and rear extensions, removal and replacement of existing garage, alteration to boundary fence and gates along street and new gate to street

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 12.06.1995              Garage extension to side of building  
Reference: 95/0670/BN

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.11.2022              Capital: panamera eco with Descriptor Install a solid fuel dry fuel room heater stove or cooker  
Reference: 22/HET00172/HETAS

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 15.02.2023              Install replacement windows in a dwelling  
Reference: 23/FEN00276/FENSA

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 20.02.2023              Install a replacement consumer unit  
Reference: 23/NIC00657/NICEIC

---

Enforcement

Opened Date: 13.03.1995              Enforcement Enquiry  
Reference: 95/00131/EN

---

Enforcement

Opened Date: 06.10.1995              Enforcement Enquiry  
Reference: 95/00511/EN

---

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>23/1922/HOT</b>
<b>Address</b>	129 Staines Road Twickenham TW2 5BD
<b>Proposal</b>	Two storey side and rear extensions, removal and replacement of existing garage, alteration to boundary fence and gates along street and new gate to street.
<b>Contact Officer</b>	Alice Murphy
<b>Target Determination Date</b>	12/09/2023

## 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 application site is occupied by a two storey semi-detached dwelling house located on the South eastern side of Staines Road in Twickenham.

The application site is situated within Twickenham Village and is designated with the following site constraints.

Item Found	More Information
Area Proposed for Tree Planting	Site: 22/1/97
Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency	Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 50% <75% - SSA Pool ID: 213
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Community Infrastructure Levy Band	Low
Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency	Strawberry Hill [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_003 /
Take Away Management Zone	Take Away Management Zone
Throughflow Catchment Area (Throughflow and Groundwater Policy Zone)	Adopted: October 2020, Contact: Local Plan Team
Village	Twickenham Village
Village Character Area	Cross Roads - Area 6 Twickenham Village Planning Guidance Page 28 CHARAREA13/06/01
Ward	West Twickenham Ward

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposal is for construction of a two storey side and rear extensions, removal and replacement of the existing garage, alteration to boundary fence and gates along street and new gate to street.

Relevant planning history for the site

- **22/3464/HOT** - Two Storey Side And Rear Extensions, Removal And Replacement Of Existing Garage, Alteration To Boundary Fence And Gates Along Street And New Gate To Street. **Refused.**  
Reason for refusal –
  - *Rear extension* - the proposed first floor rear extension by virtue of its excessive width would exceed half of the width of the original dwelling and with the proposed hipped and pitched roof would form an incongruous form of development contrary to local character and to the detriment of the design and appearance of the host building.
  - *Side extension* - The proposed two storey side and first floor rear extension by virtue of its scale, volume and proximity to street would create a visually intrusive development with an overbearing impact on Gothic Road to the detriment of the visual amenity of the street and surrounding areas contrary to policy LP1 of the Local Plan and the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD.

#### 4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

Two written representations were received, both letters of observation. These outlined the following issues:

- Scheme is similar to previously refused
- Majority of works consistent with character of main house, including materials
- Party Wall arrangement
- Proposed boundary fence
- Access arrangement to no.131.
- Request for new fence to be of a low height.

It is noted that Party Wall issues are not material planning matters that can be considered in the assessment of this application, rather a civil matter.

Design, amenity and access will be further discussed in section 6 below.

#### 5. Amendments

No amendments were requested.

#### 6. 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](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	No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted\\_local\\_plan\\_interim.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf)

##### Supplementary Planning Documents

- Design Quality
- House Extension and External Alterations
- Twickenham Village Planning Guidance
- Transport SPD.

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning\\_policy/local\\_plan/supplementary\\_planning\\_documents\\_and\\_guidance](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:
- Community Infrastructure Levy

#### 7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and Appearance
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Fire Safety Strategy

**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 application property is a corner property located at the junction of Staines Road and Gothic Rd, hence as seen below highly visible from both streets. The site has been extended by a single storey side to rear extension with flat roof and single storey rear extension with mono-pitched roof.

The proposal is for a two storey side extension with hipped and pitched roof, part first floor rear extension with hipped and pitched roof, removal and replacement of the existing garage, alteration to boundary fence and new gate to street facing Gothic Rd. It is noted that the side extension element has been reduced since the previous refusal. The host dwelling is originally built with a ground floor front bay window with front entrance slightly set back. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation by 1m which is consistent with the Council's SPD and will therefore appear subordinate to the front elevation. Further, the hipped and pitched roof where the roof would set below the main roof by about 40cm.

At the rear the existing two storey outrigger is proposed to be extended to the side creating an out of proportion first floor rear extension and its flat roof is proposed to be changed to hipped and pitched. Rooflights are also proposed. The first floor rear extension remains largely unchanged from the previous refusal therefore the reason for refusal has not been overcome.

The proposal to extend the existing first floor outrigger to almost the full width of the side extension (0.3m reduction from previous refusal) would result in a disproportionate rear extension that would measure greater than half of the width of the original house with detrimental impact on the design and appearance of host building, surrounding and the street scene contrary to planning policy LP1.

Considering the combination of the proposed and existing extensions, the resultant extensions are not considered to have a positive impact on site and the street scene.

As per the previous application, the proposal to replace the garage appears to result in a slight increase in the footprint and whilst it is meant to be a double garage, it measures 5.4m x 5.2m, hence not a compliant double garage in terms of size as it would be too small for a double garage and too big for a single garage. Whilst the proposed design of the garage is not objected to, questions arise in terms of its use and practicality. No objection is raised for replacement of timber fences and new gate to side meadow. It should be noted that no details of new fences are proposed apart from its 2.5m height, it is assumed that the existing timber fences would be replaced with new ones, however, if that is not the case then the applicant is required to submit details of the proposed fences as part of any future application should one be pursued.

Overall, the proposed application does not overcome the previous reasons for refusal. The proposal therefore is not considered to respect the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Local Plan and above SPD and is not considered to be an acceptable scheme in terms of design and appearance.

**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.*

As previously concluded, the proposal is not considered to create negative impact on amenities of neighbouring properties but will impact visual amenities of the neighbouring sites and that of the street and therefore is considered to be harmful to visual amenity of the site and surrounding, hence, contrary to policy LP8 of the Local plan.

**iii. Fire Safety Strategy**

A Fire Safety Statement was submitted with the application and was received 18<sup>th</sup> July 2023. A condition would have been included to ensure this was 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 buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. A separate application should be made for Building Regulation requirements. Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with this Policy D12 of the London Plan.

**9. Local Finance Contribution**

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, had this scheme was an approval, the CIL liability would have been confirmed by the CIL Administration Team.

**9. RECOMMENDATION**

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): .....AMU.....

Dated: .....08/09/2023.....

**I agree the recommendation:**

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

Dated: 11/09/2023.....

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**

---

U0083063	NPPF REFUSAL - Para. 38-42
U0083067	Decision Drawings