

Application reference: 07/1043/HOT
HAMPTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
27.03.2007	27.03.2007	22.05.2007	22.05.2007

5-6-7 5-6-7

Site:

6 Manor Gardens, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2TU

Proposal:

Erection of two storey side 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 Herbert
6 Manor Gardens
Hampton
Middlesex
TW12 2TU

AGENT NAME

Englishaus Architects
30 Lawrence Road
Hampton
TW12 2RJ

DCM

DC Site Notice: printed on

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

- 42 Cardinals Walk, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2TS, - 02.04.2007 ✓
- 2 Manor Gardens, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2TU, - 02.04.2007 ✓
- 3 Manor Gardens, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2TX, - 02.04.2007 ✓
- 8 Manor Gardens, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2TU, - 02.04.2007 ✓
- 5 Manor Gardens, Hampton, Middlesex, TW12 2TX, - 02.04.2007 ✓

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
01/0557	• Proposed Conservatory.	GTD	03/05/2001
80/1163	• Erection of sun lounge.	GTD	07/10/1980
86/0018	• Erection of a first floor extension to provide new bedroom.	GTD	24/03/1986
86/0945	• Erection of 2 meter high Larchlap fencing and railings to rear corner of property (Along part of boundary with Cardinals Walk). (Amended plan H068A received on 2.10.86 and additional plan H068/2 received on 3.11.86).	GTD	14/11/1986
88/53/81	• Demolition of existing garage and erection of a new garage.	RNO	18/10/1988
88/2143	• Rear conservatory.	GTD	19/10/1988
07/1043/HOT	• Erection of two storey side extension	PCO	

Constraints:

07/1043/HOT
6 Manor Gardens, Hampton

Site, history and proposal

The site is occupied by a two-storey detached dwelling sited on the corner of Manor Gardens and Cardinals Walk, not designated a BTM or sited in a conservation area.

01/0557 – conservatory – granted
88/2143 – conservatory – granted
86/0945 – 2m fencing – granted
80/1163 – sun lounge – granted

The proposal is for the erection of a two-storey side extension to the west of the property, extending the width of the gabled bay which was erected under ref. 80/1163.

Public and other representations

One letter received wherein concerns are raised regarding the rear projection of the side extension beyond the rear main wall of No. 8 Manor Gardens.

No referral to committee requested

Amendments

Elevations received showing windows in the flank elevation (to correspond to those shown on the plan views.)

Re-consultation *(see e-mail on file)*

No letter received from the adjacent neighbour, No. 8 Manor Gardens.

Professional comments

The application follows pre-application advice wherein no objection in principle was raised and attention was raised to the development allowed on the adjacent property, No. 8 (06/3781/HOT). Hip roof preferred to gable roof.

Design and street scene

The proposed two storey side extension would be flush with the façade of the bay of the dwelling and this would accord with SPG for house extensions in that the extension would be integrated with the house. It is noted that due to previous extensions the original form of this dwelling has been eroded and as such no objection is raised to the bay's extension in width.

The proposed two storey side extension would be set 0.65m from the boundary with No. 6 Manor Gardens. SPG for house extensions recommends that 1m gaps are retained between the flank wall and the boundary, however this is more applicable to semi detached dwellings as specifically mentioned within the SPG.

Where gaps between dwellings and views of landscape behind buildings are important elements of the streetscape such gaps should be retained. The northern side of Manor Gardens is characterised by a varied architectural styles and to the west of the application site, many of the dwellings have minimal gaps between them. It is considered that a 0.65m gap from the boundary and approximate 4m gap

between the proposed flank wall and the flank wall of No. 8 would retain would retain the detached character of the street.

The first floor flank wall of No. 8 is set in from the boundary by approximately 4m thereby retaining a larger gap. However an application for a two storey side extension was recently granted to No. 8 which would be sited 0.5m from the boundary. Whilst this extension has yet to be implemented building control records confirm that an application to the department has been made (ref. 07/0536/FP).

Should both extensions be implemented a gap of 1.15m would be retained between the flank walls of the respective dwellings. It is considered that such a gap would still retain the detached character of the street, particularly as some properties are close knit and would provide sufficient views of the (limited) landscape to the north (to the rear of the properties). The proposed roof of the extension would be hipped for the entire length including the existing gable to the rear and would provide some visual relief at roof level.

Amenity

There are no existing or proposed windows on the side elevation of No. 8 and as such there is no objection to the proposed first floor windows which the plans state would be frosted in any state.

Given that No. 6 is set back beyond the building line the proposed side extension would project approximately 3.2m beyond the rear main wall of No.8, 1.5m beyond the existing single storey rear extension, yet not beyond the approved single storey rear extension. A 45-degree line taken from the existing bedroom window would not impinge on this extension whilst the same line taken from the nearest first floor approved window would. This window serves the stairwell and as an additional source of light to the master bedroom. The proposal passes BRE tests on daylight and given the above it is not considered to be of a depth that would appear overbearing and dominant from the first floor bedroom, existing and proposed ground floor rooms or the garden and patio area of No. 8.

Conclusion

Whilst a small gap would be retained should both dwellings be extended, it is considered in the context of the street scene to be of sufficient size and would thus retain the character and appearance of the street scene and visual amenity of the locality compliant with the aims and objectives of SPG for house extensions.

The proposed extension would not detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and would not result in an overbearing appearance to or result in an unreasonable loss of light or privacy to adjacent properties.

Recommendation

Approve.

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): ...*RS*.....

Dated:*22-5-7*.....

I agree the recommendation:



Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated:

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.

A Development Control Manager:*Ray Summers*.....

Dated:*29/5/07*.....

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: