

19B ALBERT ROAD
TEDDINGTON
TW11 0BD

DESIGN + PLANNING STATEMENT

Proposed single-storey rear extension to existing two-storey
maisonette in existing, three-storey, detached building.

For Ms. S Kivity

19B ALBERT ROAD TEDDINGTON TW11 0BD

Proposed single-storey rear extension to existing two-storey maisonette in existing, three-storey, detached building.

1.0 SYNOPSIS

- a. The proposal comprises a single-storey rear extension to an existing two-storey maisonette on the ground and first floors of a three-storey detached building. The second floor is a self-contained flat.
- b. The extension allows for the formation of a Kitchen/Dining space on the ground floor with access to the private rear garden space, replacing the existing Kitchen on the first floor and providing a new dedicated Dining space.
- c. The property is not Listed or designated a Building of Townscape Merit. It is located within the Park Road Teddington Conservation Area No22 but is not located in any other Designated Area. It is not subject to any relevant Article 4 Directions.
- d. The proposal will not result in any overlooking or loss of privacy to any other property. The criteria set out in the BRE document 'Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight' confirm that the proposal will not result in any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to any other property. The Shadow Studies confirm that the proposal will not result in any significant overshadowing of the neighbouring properties.
- e. The proposal will not result in any increase in residential density or additional car-parking requirement.
- f. The proposal complies with the relevant Guidance set out in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document - "House Extensions and External Alterations SPD May 2015."
- g. The proposal has been carefully designed to suit the client's requirements and to match, complement and enhance the existing property as well as respecting the adjoining properties.
- h. The new work will be to current construction standards including thermal performance. It will update and enhance the existing property and will provide a valuable, high-quality and sustainable addition to the local residential capacity making best use of the existing housing stock.
- i. The client is officially registered as severely visually impaired and has occupied the property for many years. The proposed extension will give space to move the existing kitchen from the first floor to the ground floor and provide a new dedicated Dining space with access to the private rear garden. It will also allow the provision of a ground floor, accessible shower room.
- j. The extension will improve and enhance the usability and functionality of the property and will enable the client to continue to live in the property and the area with which she has become familiar.
- k. We would be grateful for the LPA's early advice if additional information is required. Also, we would appreciate the planning authority's early advice if there is any aspect of the proposal which would prevent it being recommended for approval.

2.0 PLANNING STATUS

- a. The property is not Listed or designated a Building of Townscape Merit. It is located within the Park Road Teddington Conservation Area 22 but is not located in the Greenbelt or any other Designated Area. It is not subject to any relevant Article 4 Directions.
- b. Planning Approval for the original building was granted in 1964 - reference 316/64 - and it is understood to have been constructed circa 1964. It has not been extended or received any significant alterations since construction.
- c. A Planning Application was made in October 2023 for a two-storey rear extension - reference 23/2704. The application was refused, an Appeal against the Refusal is being considered. The reasons for Refusal given on the Decision Notice have been addressed in this application as set out below.

3.0 DESCRIPTION

- a. Albert Road is a residential road with properties of different ages, sizes, styles and designs.
- b. The existing building is a three-storey, detached property understood to have been constructed circa 1964 on the north side of Albert Road comprising a two-storey maisonette on the ground and first floors with a self-contained flat - 19c, on the second floor. The existing building is set in from the boundaries on both sides to provide independent access to the separate demises.
- c. The property is traditionally constructed with facing brickwork elevations under a grey interlocking tiled pitched roof.
- d. The proposal includes the removal of the existing separate brick outbuilding. This too is understood to have been constructed circa 1964 and stands at the rear of the main building on the boundary with No19 .
- e. The adjacent property to the west at 19 Albert Road is a semi-detached property also of three-storeys which has received a side infill extension - Planning Application reference 19/3257. It has also received a first floor balcony to the rear elevation. The original property had previously been converted into two flats but has now been returned to a single-family dwelling house.
- f. The property adjacent to the east at 21 Albert Road is a two-storey detached house on a large plot with the original house in the southeast corner some distance from the proposed extension to 19b. The nearest part of the house to 19b is an extension constructed circa 1964 described in the planning application reference 834/64 as comprising garages on the ground floor and a studio on the first floor. The rear elevation of this extension includes roof glazing to top light the studio.
- g. The proposal is to construct a ground floor rear extension, 3.0m depth, set in from the existing flank walls on both sides, to provide a Kitchen Dining space on the ground floor with access to the private rear garden. The existing kitchen is on the first floor and there is no dedicated Dining room. The proposal also includes a ground floor accessible shower room.

- h. The new glazed doors to the rear elevation of the proposed extension face the private rear garden space and will not give rise to any overlooking or loss of privacy to any other property. The new ground floor windows to the flank walls will not give rise to any overlooking or loss of privacy. There are no new windows at first floor level.
- i. The proposed materials and components are to match the existing property including the facing brickwork elevations and the interlocking tiled pitched roof.
- j. The client has been officially registered as severely visually impaired for three years. As a result, she is no longer able to work in her chosen career of tourism/travel and is now permanently based at home. The proposed extension will give space to provide a modern, easy to use kitchen at ground floor level replacing the existing kitchen on the first floor. It will also allow for a dedicated dining space which the existing property does not have. The new windows, glazed doors and roof windows will provide as much natural light as possible and the doors will give access from the kitchen dining room to the garden. The extension will improve and enhance the usability and functionality of the property and will enable the client to continue to live in the property and the area with which she has become familiar.

4.0 FLOOD RISK

- a. A Flood Risk Design Strategy is included in the application along with the Environment Agency Flood Risk Form, but the salient points are set out below.
- b. Whilst the site lies on the edge of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Critical Drainage it is located in Flood Risk Zone 1 on the Environment Agency Flood Risk Map indicating that the site has a Low Probability of flooding defined as - "Land having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding."
- c. The Environment Agency Flood Risk Map indicates that the site is at "Very Low Risk" of Flooding from Rivers or Sea and at "Very Low Risk" of Flooding from Surface Water. The Environment Agency advises that while the site is at risk of flooding from Reservoirs this is "extremely unlikely" and that flooding from groundwater is "unlikely".
- d. The proposal does not include a basement or sleeping accommodation at ground floor level.

5.0 PLANNING IMPACT

- a. The planning impact is examined in detail below but to summarise - The proposal represents only a modest increase in the footprint of the property of 15.8% – see item 6.3.g below. It will not result in any increase in residential density or any additional on-street or off-street car-parking requirement. The proposal will not result in any overlooking or loss of privacy to any other property. It will not result in any significant loss of light or overshadowing to any other property. It will not cause any harm to the character of the Conservation Area. No existing trees will be affected.

- b. Information included on the Richmond Planning website indicates that of the 25 properties in Albert Road 15 properties have received approval for extensions, some properties have received more than one extension. Of these 15, nine have received extensions with a greater rearward projection and/or a larger percentage increase in footprint than the application proposal for 19b.
- c. The impact of the proposal upon the daylight to No19 has been established using the criteria set out in the BRE document 'Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice, second edition' and this confirms that the loss of daylight to No19 will not be significant. The BRE document advises that if the centres of the windows in the adjacent property lie outside the 45deg line on elevation impact upon the daylight to the adjacent property is likely to be small – para 2.2.15, figure 17 in the BRE document. The windows to No19 are all outside the 45deg lines on plan and elevation except for the lower corner of the glazed screen to the ground floor rear elevation. The glazed screen is approximately 8.5m² in area of which 0.22m² lies within the 45deg lines.
- d. The Shadow Studies included in the application confirm that the overshadowing of No19 arising from the proposed extension is minimal.
- e. No21 occupies a large plot with the main house in the south east corner a significant distance from the proposed extension to 19b. The existing building at 19b projects some 8.2m beyond the rear elevation of No21 and there is a separation of 2.4m between the properties. The nearest part of No21 to 19b is the 1964 extension comprising garages on the ground floor and a top lit studio space on the first floor. The impact of the proposal upon the daylight to No21 has been established using the criteria set out in the BRE document 'Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice, second edition' and this confirms that the loss of daylight to No21 will not be significant. The existing rear windows to No21 are outside the 45deg lines on elevation and plan so the effect upon the daylighting to No21 resulting from the proposal will not be significant.
- f. The Shadow Studies included in the application confirm that the overshadowing of No21 arising from the proposed extension is minimal.
- g. Because of its location at the rear of the host property and the narrow gap between No19 and 19b/c the proposed extension will not be visible from this part of Albert Road. Similarly, the gap between the extension to No21 and 19b/c allows only a very restricted view of the east flank wall to the rear of 19b/c - see image 05 in Section 8 - Site Photographs below. It follows that the proposed extension will not be clearly visible from Albert Road and the existing appearance of the property from the street will be unchanged. No visual disharmony will be created within the streetscape and the proposal will not cause harm to the character of the Conservation Area.
- h. There is a very limited view of the upper parts of the existing property at 19b/c from the public realm in the gap between 16 and 14a/b Victoria Road but the proposed extension would not be visible – see Image 06 in Section 8 - Site Photographs below. There are no other viewpoints from Victoria Road – Nos 2 to 14 Victoria Road are terrace properties with no gaps between. There are no gaps between the properties on the relevant part of Adelaide Road which would provide a view from the public realm of the proposed extension.
- i. The officer's report for the previous application ref 23/2704 contains a comment that 'the depth of the existing building already matches the outer limit of the extended neighbouring properties and that the extension would project the rear building line further, out of keeping with the local context'. No source is quoted on the planning status or relevance of a 'rear building line'. Reference to the Location Plan shows that there is no alignment of the rears of the properties facing the application

site in Albert Road, Victoria Road, Adelaide Road or Park Road. The rear of the existing building at 19b is set back from Nos 19 and 17 and does not match them. No 9 Albert Road extends beyond the other properties in this part of Albert Road.

- j. The officer's report for the previous application ref 23/2704 also comments upon the appearance of the existing building. However, it is of its time, represents the design approach of the 1960's era and was granted Planning Approval. When extending a building the design approach preferred by LPAs is to follow the design parameters of the existing building rather than impose a design approach from an earlier or later design period.
- k. Item 4.1.1. of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document – "House Extensions and External Alterations SPD May 2015" requires that the design must - "avoid the visual confusion that can result when the style and materials of the original house are ignored", "reflect the existing character/detail" and "ensure the continuity of the whole". The design of the extension "sympathetically complements the existing house".

6.0 COMPLIANCE WITH DESIGN GUIDANCE

The proposal has been designed in accordance with the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document – "House Extensions and External Alterations SPD May 2015" and the references below are to that document -

6.01 Section 3 - Impact on Residential Amenity -

- a. The projection of the proposed single-storey extension beyond the existing rear elevation to No 19 is modest. The pitched roof results in lower eaves than the eaves of a flat roof and reduces the impact of the extension. Accordingly the proposal will not "create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms" as set out in item 3.1.1.
- b. No 21 occupies a large plot with the main house in the southeast corner a significant distance from the proposed extension to 19b. The existing building at 19b projects some 8.2m beyond the rear elevation of No 21 and there is a separation of 2.4m between the properties. The nearest part of No 21 to 19b comprises the garages and top lit studio. Given the relationship and the distance between the proposed extension and the existing rear windows to the main house at No 21 the effect upon the amenity and outlook of No 21, resulting from the proposal, will be minimal.
- c. The rear projection of the proposed extension is 3.0m. - less than the 4.0m suggested for an extension to a detached house as set out in item 3.1.2.
- d. The proposed extension is single-storey with no new windows above ground floor level and given its position and relationship with other properties it will not "result in any substantial loss of privacy to adjoining dwellings and gardens" as set out in item 3.2.1.
- e. The roof will not be used as a balcony as set out in item 3.2.1.
- f. When tested using the criteria set out in the BRE document 'Site Layout for Daylight and

Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice, second edition’ – para 2.2.15, figure 17, the proposed extension will not “cause any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms or gardens in neighbouring properties” as set out in item 3.3.1. The 45 degree assessment angles set out in the BRE document are indicated on the proposed plans and elevations submitted and clearly demonstrate compliance.

- g. The Shadow Studies included in the submission demonstrate that the proposal will not result in any significant overshadowing of the neighbouring properties.
- h. The modest footprint of the proposed extension will not lead to a substantial reduction in the existing garden area as set out in item 3.4.1. - The footprint of the main existing building to 19b is 76.0m² and the footprint of the proposed extension is 15.3m². The existing brick outbuilding which is to be removed is 3.3m² so the increase in footprint is 15.3 – 3.3 = 12.0m². This represents a modest increase in the footprint of 15.8%.
- i. The rear garden space was set out in separate areas for each demise (19b and 19c) as part of the original construction circa 1964. The existing private garden space to 19b measures 57.3m². The footprint of the proposed extension is 15.3m². The removal of the brick outbuilding releases 3.3m² of space so the reduction in usable garden space is 15.3m² - 3.3m² = 12m². The remaining garden space is 57.3 – 12 = 45.3m². This represents a reduction in the existing garden space of 20.9%. Therefore the remaining private garden space is more than the 40m² required for 2-bedroom properties as set out in item 3.4.1. See also item 5.b above.

6.02 Section 4 - Guiding Principles –

- a. The external appearance of the proposed extension has been carefully designed in order to avoid the visual confusion that can result when the style and materials of the original house are ignored as set out in item 4.1.1. The design “reflects the existing character/detail”, “ensures the continuity of the whole” and the proposed extension is “well-designed, [and] sympathetically complements the existing house”.

6.03 Section 5 – Side and Rear Extensions

- a. The overall shape, size and position of the rear extension does not dominate the existing building or its neighbours and it harmonises with the original appearance as set out in item 5.2.1.
- b. The principle of retaining the existing gap between the application property and the adjacent properties at 19 and 21 has been followed. The existing gap is increased by setting in the extension flank walls from the line of the existing flank walls - all as set out in item 5.2.3.
- c. The brickwork to the extension elevations will match the elevations of the existing property all as set out in item 5.3.1.
- d. The new windows will match the existing windows to 19b all as set out in item 5.4.1.

6.04 Section 8 – Roofs

- a. The proposed roof is a pitched roof to match the existing property, the pitch and eaves detail

also match the existing building – all as set out in item 8.2.1.

6.05 Section 9 – Detailed Advice

- a. The materials and details of the proposed extension match the existing property and retain the visual continuity all as set out in items 9.1. and 9.2.
- b. The design of the scheme has been approached from first principles and takes into account all the relevant factors set out by the client and the overall context of the building and its relationship with the surrounding properties. The new work is in scale with and is in keeping with the design ethos of the existing property and will match exactly the form, design and materials of the existing property.
- c. The current proposed has been discussed with the neighbouring properties at 19. 19c and 21.

6.06 Permitted Development

- a. Whilst a maisonette does not enjoy Permitted Development rights the criteria for these rights give an indication of what the Government considers to be acceptable in terms of extensions to residential buildings. For example, a 3.0m depth single-storey rear extension to a terrace house could be constructed without requiring Planning Approval – the acceptable depth for a detached house would be 4.0m. The eaves height of 2.75m and overall height of 3.95m of the proposed extension fall within the height criteria set out in the document 'Permitted development rights for householders Technical Guidance September 2019 HCLG'.

6.07 Conclusion

The proposal complies with all of the relevant advice in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document – “House Extensions and External Alterations SPD May 2015”.

8.0 SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



Image 01 – Front : South Elevation – No17 left, No19 centre, No19b at right, No21 extreme right.



Image 02 – Front : South Elevation – No19 extreme left, No19b left of centre, No21 right.



Image 03 – Rear : North Elevation – No19b centre.



Image 04 – Rear : North Elevation – No19b left, No19 to right.



Image 05 – Gap between No19b/c and No21 from Albert Road, No19b/c left, No21 right.



Image 06 – Gap between No16 Victoria Road left, No14a/b Victoria Road right, with roof to No19b/c just visible centre.