

Application reference: 24/1646/HOT
TEDDINGTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
28.06.2024	03.07.2024	28.08.2024	28.08.2024

Site:

41 Arlington Road, Teddington, TW11 8NL,

Proposal:

Single storey rear extension.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Ms EM Aitchison and Mr JA
Woodman
41 Arlington Road
Teddington
Richmond Upon Thames
TW11 8NL

AGENT NAME

Alastair MacLeod
23 CONNAUGHT ROAD
TEDDINGTON
TW11 0PX

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

38 Arlington Road, Teddington, TW11 8NJ, - 03.07.2024
130 Waldegrave Road, Teddington, TW11 8NA, - 03.07.2024
43 Arlington Road, Teddington, TW11 8NL, - 03.07.2024
39 Arlington Road, Teddington, TW11 8NL, - 03.07.2024
132 Waldegrave Road, Teddington, TW11 8NA, - 03.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 14/5207/PS192
Date: 27/01/2015 Rear dormer roof extension to rear outrigger

Development Management

Status: REF Application: 24/1073/HOT
Date: 21/06/2024 Single storey rear extension.

Development Management

Status: PDE Application: 24/1646/HOT
Date: Single storey rear extension.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 05.06.2000 Loft conversion

Reference: 00/1085/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 11.10.2001 Single storey rear extension. COMMENTS: Cheque bounced 7.11.01

Reference: 01/1897/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 28.02.2004 FENSA Notification of Replacement Glazing comprising 1 Windows and 0 Doors. Installed by Everest Ltd. FENSA Member No 12404. Installation ID 1520620. Invoice No LW0052AI

Reference: 04/5745/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 18.12.2004 FENSA Notification of Replacement Glazing comprising 5 Windows and 0 Doors. Installed by Everest Ltd. FENSA Member No 12404. Installation ID 2324855. Invoice No LW2034AI

Reference: 04/8191/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 21.09.2010 1 Window

Reference: 10/FEN01658/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 17.04.2014 1 Window 1 Door

Reference: 14/FEN00933/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 16.12.2014 Rear loft (outrigger) extension to existing house

Reference: 14/2766/FP

Building Control

Deposit Date: 11.02.2015 Rear loft (outrigger) extension to existing house

Reference: 14/2766/FP/1

Building Control

Deposit Date: 13.09.2018 Removal of rear chimney breast at 1st and loft floors

Reference: 18/1621/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 29.04.2019 Install a gas fire

Reference: 19/FEN01683/GASAFE

Application Number	24/1646/HOT
Address	41 Arlington Road Teddington TW11 8NL
Proposal	Single storey rear extension
Contact Officer	Phil Shipton
Target Determination Date	28/08/2024

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 has visited the application site if required to assess the application, 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 is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, observations during any site visit, 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 three-storeys and forms part of a late-Victorian/Edwardian terrace on the west side of Arlington Road. At the rear, the houses have two storey outriggers. No.41 Arlington Road has a partial infill extension with a pitched roof between the outrigger and the boundary with No.39 Arlington Road.

The application site is situated in Teddington and has the following designations:

- Area Poorly Provided With Public Open Space (Area poorly provided with Public Open Space)
- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 337)
- 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 (Teddington [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_006 /)
- Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater (GLA Drain London)
- Main Centre Buffer Zone (Teddington Town Centre Boundary Buffer Zone - A residential development or a mixed use scheme within this 400 metre buffer area identified within the Plan does not have to apply the Sequential Test (for Flood Risk) as set out in Local Plan policy LP21.)
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 39678)
- Take Away Management Zone (Take Away Management Zone)
- Village (Teddington Village)
- Village Character Area (Cambridge Road and surrounds - Area 2 Hampton Wick & Teddington Village Planning Guidance Page 21 CHARAREA11/02/01)
- Ward (Teddington Ward)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposal is to extend to the rear of the outrigger at a single level across the full width of the rear elevation, to line up with the rear extension of No.43 Arlington Road.

The extension would be approximately 2.4m deep, 4.5m wide and 2.8m high, with a slight roof angle at the boundary with No.39 Arlington Road, resulting in a height of 2.2m at the boundary. The extension is proposed with brick walls to match the existing; rear French doors and window; a flat roof with dark grey membrane; and two plateau rooflights.

The proposed extension will replace the existing impermeable patio area. A new rear terrace is to be provided in permeable paving. A new excess rainwater attenuation system is proposed to accommodate the additional runoff from the proposed roof area, further detailed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

The proposal provides a revision of the rear extension recently refused under application 24/1073/HOT on the 21st June 2024.

The application was refused as it was deemed that the extension would detract from the amenity and living conditions of neighbours and would not comply with policy LP8 of the Local Plan and the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations; and that the proposal had not adequately demonstrated suitable mitigating measures of flood risk and drainage issues and therefore would not comply with Chapter 14 of the NPPF, policy D11 and policy SI13 of the London Plan and policy LP21 of Local Plan. Further detail is provided below for the respective points of refusal.

- The previously proposed extension would add an additional 2.4m to the existing 3.57m extension from the rear of the house, creating a total combined extension of 5.97m along the boundary. As stated in the Officer Report, *“This would be greater than the 3m guideline set out in the SPD on House Extensions. The extension would be nearly 2.8m high at the eaves which is greater than the 2.2m guideline in the SPD. It would be set directly on the boundary and there is no obvious mitigation as to its impact. A sunlight/daylight plan has been submitted with the application, but this is not very conclusive as to the impact on light. Given the existing outrigger at No.39, the proposed extension would create a further sense of enclosure and tunnelling effect on the rear window of the house.”*
- No Flood Risk Assessment or Drainage Statement has been provided, other than a short summary in the Design and Access Statement which was not considered to be an adequate assessment of the impacts. As such it was deemed unclear if the proposal would not increase the vulnerability of the site to flood risk or drainage issues.

It is noted that the existing infill extension as well as extension to the rear of the outrigger appears to have been carried out in the 2000’s together with the existing infill extension, possibly under permitted development rights. A comprehensive list of planning history related to the subject site is provided above.

4. AMENDMENTS

No amendments were received.

5. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

The list of neighbours notified of this application are listed above. No letters of representation were received.

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
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

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
- SI13 Sustainable Drainage

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

Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	No
---	------	-----	----

These policies can be found at

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

Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version)

The Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) was published on 9 June 2023 for public consultation which ended on 24 July 2023.

The Publication Version Local Plan, together with all the representations received during the representation period, the plan and its supporting documents were submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 19 January 2024. The submission documents do not form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough, however, by publishing and submitting the Borough Local Plan for independent examination the Council has formally confirmed its intention to adopt the Publication Plan.

The Publication Version Local Plan, including its evidence base, are material considerations for decision-making. The weight to be given to each of the emerging policies and allocations will depend on an assessment against the criteria set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF. As the Council considers the emerging Borough Local Plan to be sound and legally compliant, officers and Councillors should accord relevant policies and allocations significant weight in the determination of applications taking account of the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. Therefore, the weight afforded to each policy at this stage will differ depending on the level and type of representation to that policy. This will be addressed in more detail in the assessment below if/where it is relevant to the application.

Note that it was agreed by Full Council on 27 April, when the Publication Plan was approved, that no weight will be given to Policy 4 in relation to the increased carbon offset rate, and therefore the existing rate of £95 will continue to be used; in addition, no weight will be given to Policy 39 in relation to the 20% biodiversity net gain requirement; all other aspects and requirements of these policies will apply.

Issue	Draft Local Plan	Compliance	
	Policy	Yes	No
Local character and design quality / Design process	Policy 28 / Policy 44	Yes	No
Amenity and Living Conditions	Policy 46	Yes	No
Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	Policy 8	Yes	No

These policies can be found at:

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/fomccpcf/publication_local_plan_low_resolution.pdf

Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations
Village Plan - Teddington

These policies can be found

at: https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance

7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i. Design and local character
- ii. Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii. Flood Risk
- iv. Fire Safety

- i. **Design and local character**

Policy Context

Chapter 12 of the NPPF advises that poorly designed developments should be refused, especially where designs do not reflect local design policies, guidance and supplementary planning documents. It also says that significant weight should be given to designs which reflect local character, or to ones which are innovative designs in achieving high levels of sustainability, or which help improve the general standard of design in an area and fit in with the 'overall form and layout of their surroundings'.

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 Council's 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.

Analysis

The proposed extension would have a similar form and footprint to others in the street. For example, No.45 Arlington Road has an extension to the side and rear of the outrigger with a partially flat and partially pitched roof (18/2701/HOT).

The proposed extension would be 2.4m deep measured from the outrigger and the full width of the plot, it is not thought that this would be overly dominant in relation to the house. The proposed materials would match the existing house and help the extension integrate relatively well. The rooflights may be visible and slightly detract from the appearance of the extension. It would be preferable if they were screened by a parapet. However, this is a relatively minor point.

As such, it is thought that the proposed extension would not harm the character of the house or the local area.

In view of the above, the proposal can be said to comply with the aims and objections of Chapter 12 of the NPPF, policy D4 of the London Plan and policy LP1 of the Local Plan, as well as the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.

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 two houses most affected by the proposals would be No. 39 and No.43 Arlington Road.

No.43 has a 2.4m deep extension to its outrigger approved under 23/1914/HOT. The extension at No.41 would be the same depth and a similar height. As such, it is not anticipated it would have any negative impacts on No.43.

No.39 Arlington Road does not have any rear extensions. The existing infill extension at No.41 projects 3.57m from the rear of the house. The proposed extension would add an additional 2.4m, creating extensions of 5.97m along the boundary. This would be greater than the 3m guideline set out in the SPD on House Extensions. However, the proposed angle roof of the extension to a height of 2.2m at the boundary with No.39 Arlington Road partially mitigates the sense of enclosure, consistent with the guideline set out in the SPD on House Extensions.

A sunlight/daylight plan has been submitted with the application, showing the proposed extension with angles roof line to a height of 2.2m at the boundary with No.39 Arlington Road, would meet the 45-degree test as set out in the SPD on House Extensions.

A comparison of the previously proposed (refused) and currently proposed sunlight/daylight plans are shown below.



24/1073/HOT



24/1646/HOT

The 45-degree test is taken from the midpoint of the window, where an extension should not create shadow over or beyond the midpoint of the window from both an elevation view and plan view (as illustrated in Fig 2 of the SPD on House Extensions). It is noted that the existing rear extension at the subject site does not meet the 45-degree test on both elevation and plan view. As such, the existing dwellinghouse is not consistent with the SPD on House Extensions with regard to sense of enclosure and sunlight/daylight impacts on neighbouring residential amenity.

Nevertheless, the extension proposed by 24/1646/HOT provides a roof angle which meets the 45-degree test, providing adequate sunlight/daylight for the area of No.39 Arlington Road which is adjacent to the proposed extension.

When viewed from the window at No.39, any further sense of visual enclosure and tunnelling effect would be predominantly created by the 2.2m height of the extension at the boundary. The proposed extension would sit slightly above the existing boundary fence height and be immediately visible from the window at No.39. Based on photos submitted on the 15th of August 2024, it can be inferred that the angle of the roof of the extension would largely be obstructed by the existing wall at the subject site. As such, this largely achieves the design intention of the angled roof to reduce a sense of enclosure and allow sunlight/daylight in accordance with the 45-degree test.

In so far as complying with the SPD on House Extensions, the proposed extension appropriately mitigates the sense of enclosure created by the additional extension by reducing the eave height to 2.2m, which allows sufficient sunlight/daylight within the outlook of the window at No.39. As such, the proposed extension would comply with policy LP8 of the Local Plan and the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.

iii. Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy Context

Chapter 14 of the NPPF specifies that site-specific flood risk assessments are required for development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and that in Flood Zone 1, assessments should only be provided for sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use.

Paragraph 168 states that minor development, including householder development, should provide flood risk assessments if required, but should not have to apply the sequential or exception tests.

Policy D11 of the London Plan states that 'development proposals should maximise building resilience and minimise potential physical risks, including those arising as a result of extreme weather, fire, flood and related hazards.'

Policy SI 13 of the London Plan states that 'Development proposals should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible.'

Policy LP21 of the Local Plan states that all developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Part C of the policy requires the use of Sustainable

Drainage Systems (SuDS) in all development proposals and that applications demonstrate either a 'reduction in surface water discharge to greenfield run-off rates wherever feasible' or, 'where greenfield run-off rates are not feasible, this will need to be demonstrated by the applicant, and in such instances, the minimum requirement is to achieve at least a 50% attenuation of the site's surface water runoff at peak times based on the levels existing prior to the development.'

Analysis

The site is in Flood Zone 1, an Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood, an area for increased potential elevated groundwater, and a Critical Drainage Area. It is also in the Main Centre buffer Zone, meaning a sequential test does not need to be applied. The proposals would not increase the vulnerability of the site in terms of use.

A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted and concludes that the increase in the proposed site coverage is minimal; the extension occupies an area of existing impermeable to surface and the new patio area would be of permeable construction; and the proposed extension would not generate any additional load upon the foul water system.

The runoff from the new flat roof will be stored for later use in a rainwater butt connected to the rear rainwater down pipe and the excess attenuated by storing in a 5 m³ sustainable crate system and set 5m away from any building. The soak-away is larger than is required by the application of the flow rates within the Approved Document and based on a CIRIA recommendation of 90litres/ m² and as such will provide the 50% attenuation of the additional and rear roof surface water runoff at peak times.

It has been adequately demonstrated that suitable mitigating measures are incorporated into the proposal, and as such would not increase the vulnerability of the site to flood risk or drainage issues.

Therefore, the application complies with Chapter 14 of the NPPF, policy D11 and policy SI13 of the London Plan and policy LP21 of Local Plan.

iv. **Fire Safety**

Policy D12 Fire Safety of the London Plan Part A requires all development to demonstrate the highest levels of fire safety. All non-major applications require the submission of a Fire Safety Strategy, unless reasonable exemption has been demonstrated.

The applicant has submitted a Fire Safety Strategy which is considered to adequately address the relevant criteria of Policy D12.

Any work carried out will need to fully comply with Building Regulations. A planning permission, if granted, is *not* a consent under the Building Regulations.

8. 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.

9. RECOMMENDATION

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

Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains how the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. For the reasons set out above, this application falls to be determined in accordance with the test under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the proposal is in general conformity with the Development Plan overall and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify refusal.

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES

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 YES NO
 (which are not on the file)

This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): PSH Dated: 20/08/2024

I agree the recommendation:

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

Dated: 27/08/2024.....

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

U0093824	Composite Informative
----------	-----------------------