



Application reference: 24/1697/HOT
HEATHFIELD WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
04.07.2024	10.07.2024	04.09.2024	04.09.2024

Site:

435 Hanworth Road, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5LQ

Proposal:

Part one, part two storey side and rear extension to roof level. Alterations to side elevation windows at ground and first floor level.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Pargat Chhina
 435 Hanworth Road
 Whitton
 Richmond Upon Thames
 TW4 5LQ

AGENT NAME

Mr Sunny Bahia
 54 Keith Road
 Hayes
 UB3 4HP
 United Kingdom

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

- 32 Wyndham Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5HZ -
- 26 Wyndham Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5HZ, - 10.07.2024
- 28 Wyndham Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5HZ, - 10.07.2024
- 24 Wyndham Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5HZ, - 10.07.2024
- 512 Hanworth Road, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5LH, - 10.07.2024
- 437 Hanworth Road, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5LQ, - 10.07.2024
- 433 Hanworth Road, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5LQ, - 10.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: CEGPD
 Date: 19/03/2024

Application: 24/0362/PDE
 single storey rear extension (6.00m depth, 2.90 m eaves height, 3.40m overall height)

Development Management

Status: PCO
 Date:

Application: 24/1697/HOT
 Part one, part two storey side and rear extension to roof level.

Alterations to side elevation windows at ground and first floor level.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 20.06.2007

BRECECA: Heating (central heating/ room heating/ hot water/ boiler/ controls) Dwelling house Main/ supplementary equipotential bonding Dwelling house

Reference: 07/BRE00029/BRECECA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 05.09.2008

Remodelling of bathroom and WC to provide level access showering facilities

Reference: 08/1829/FP

Building Control

Deposit Date: 04.12.2010

One or more new circuits

Reference: 11/ELE00411/ELECSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 29.11.2010

1 Window 1 Door

Reference: 11/FEN00294/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 07.04.2014

1 Window 1 Door

Reference: 14/FEN00952/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 30.04.2024

Single storey rear extension, loft conversion, and all associated works to a two storey dwelling house

Reference: 24/0521/IN

Application Number	24/1697/HOT
Address	435 Hanworth Road Whitton Hounslow TW4 5LQ
Proposal	Single storey side and rear extension. Rear dormer roof extension. Porch extension. Hip to gable roof extension. A roof light to the front roof slope. A window to the side elevation and a rear patio area.
Contact Officer	Matt Bayly
Target Determination Date	04/09/2024

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 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 a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse, located on the western side of Hanworth Road. It is not located within the conservation area.

The application site is situated within Whitton and Heathfield Village and is designated as:

- Area Proposed for Tree Planting (Site: 16/1/97)
- Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 400)
- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Low)
- Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater (GLA Drain London)
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000-year chance - SSA Pool ID: 46333)
- Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency
- Village (Whitton and Heathfield Village)
- Village Character Area (Argyle Avenue and surrounds - Area 7 Whitton & Heathfield Village Planning Guidance Page 35 CHARAREA01/07/03)
- Ward (Heathfield Ward)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises a part single, part two-storey side and rear extension, also involving alterations to side elevation windows at ground and first floor.

It is noted that the recently constructed dormer and hip to gable roof extension is completed and is considered part of the existing house, however, the rear extension (24/0362/PDE) is half constructed and therefore should not be included as part of the existing dwelling house. The applicant is advised to amend the plan set accordingly in any future application.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above however the most relevant planning history is as follows:

Development Management

Status: CEGPD
Date:19/03/2024

Application:24/0362/PDE
single storey rear extension (6.00m depth, 2.90 m eaves height, 3.40m overall height)

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

Four letters of representation were received.

Four letters of objection have been received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal would obstruct daylight and sunlight to adjoining properties and gardens – noting impacts on enjoyment of properties and health.
- The proposal would overlook adjoining sites impacting privacy.
- The proposed side facing windows would directly overlook neighbouring property.
- Overdevelopment of the property will cause significant detrimental visual and character impact and is not in keeping with the general character of the area – noting impacts of losing a pleasant living environment.
- There will be increased noise and light pollution to neighbouring property.
- The increase of traffic/cars being parked associated with comings and goings of what will be a very generous property which will have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding residents.
- This type of development has the possibility of being converted into an HMO in future and will impact negatively on the neighbourhood, as most of the properties are family homes.
- This development could set a worrying precedent for future proposals in the area.
- Second storey bedroom window would overlook neighbouring garden, impacting privacy.
- The extension will create a sense of enclosure, making our garden feel claustrophobic due to a reduction in openness when outside.
- The proposed development appears to contravene several local planning policies such as LP 1 - local character and design quality, LP 8 - amenity and living conditions, LP 10 - local environmental impacts, pollution and land contamination and LP 39 - infill, back land and back garden development which emphasises the need to respect the scale, character and amenity of surrounding properties.

Neighbour amenity considerations are assessed under Section 6 (impact on neighbour amenity) in the report below.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D6 Housing quality and standards
- 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
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	No

Parking Standards and Servicing	LP45	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	Publication Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No
Sustainable travel choices, Vehicular Parking, Cycle Parking, Servicing and Construction Logistics Management	47, 48	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn_plan_2018_to_2033_january_2019.pdf

Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations

These policies can be found at:

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

Biodiversity Net Gain

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain

condition does not always apply. Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because the proposal is development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A 'householder application' means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and impact on local character
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Fire safety
- iv Flooding
- v Parking

i Design and impact on local character

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.

Policy LP28 of the Publication Local Plan requires all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality. The character and heritage of the borough has been identified in the borough-wide characterisation work undertaken as part of the Urban Design Study. The 'places' as identified in the Study will need to be maintained and their character enhanced where opportunities arise. Development proposals will have to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance, and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces and the local area.

The House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out general guiding design principles for householder extensions. These are summarised below:

- Reflect existing character/detail.
- Ensure continuity of the whole – the essence of visual success is to look at the street as a whole.
- A well-designed extension, which sympathetically complements the existing house and is in character with the neighbourhood.

With specific regard to the proposal, the SPD 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.”

“roof extensions should not dominate the original roof. Normally a significant area of the existing roof should be left beneath a new dormer and on either side of the dormer, thus setting the extension well in from either side of the roof.”

“that hip to gable extensions are not desirable and will not be encouraged. This is especially so when the roof-scape and space between the buildings are important features of the character of that part of the street; and there is symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached property or within the terrace in which the building is located.”

“Avoid side extensions that project beyond the existing front elevation – Where the extension is to be subordinate to the existing house it is usually desirable to set back the extension by at least 1 metre behind the front elevation.”

“Infilling of gaps – Development, which would result in the significant reduction of an existing important space or gap between neighbouring houses, is not normally acceptable. In conjunction with existing extensions to neighbouring buildings this can have a terracing effect on the street. Consequently, two storey side extensions should be sited 1m from the side boundary.”

The proposed side and rear extensions are not supported for the following reasons:

- The side extension would be located on the boundary thereby creating the potential for a terraced effect should the neighbouring dwelling undertake a similar extension.
- The SPD recommends that double storey side extension should be set lower than the existing roof profile, set in at least 1m from the front elevation and the side boundary line. The proposal does not utilise any of these methods to reduce the bulk of the proposal.
- The proposal is considered in the context of the recently granted 6m deep rear extension that is currently under construction, and the recently completed rear dormer roof extension and hip to gable roof extension. The cumulative impacts of these past proposals in combination with the current proposal signal a significant overdevelopment of the property which would dominate the existing house.
- SPD guidance states that two-storey rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the building’s original scale and character. The proposal is significantly over scaled in this regard.

The proposed materiality and fenestration are acceptable as they replicate what is existing. Although it is noted that the existing pebble dash cladding is not an ideal finish to adopt.

Taking the above into consideration, the proposed extensions would not be subservient in comparison to the size of the existing dwellinghouse and will not result in an overall bulk and mass that is at odds with SPD guidance. Overall, the proposal is inconsistent with policy LP1 of the Local Plan, LP28 of the Publication Local Plan and the SPD.

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.

Policy LP46 of the Publication Local Plan requires proposals to:

1. *Ensure the design and layout of buildings does not have an unacceptable impact on levels of daylight and sunlight on the host building or neighbouring properties, including gardens and outdoor spaces; where existing daylight and sunlight conditions are already substandard, they should be improved where possible;*
2. *Ensure that adequate outlooks are provided for new occupants, and that heights, massing and siting of new development retains adequate outlooks for neighbouring occupants, voiding any undue sense of enclosure;*
3. *Ensure that acceptable standards of privacy are provided and retained, without a diminution of the design quality; development should not result in unacceptable levels of overlooking (or perceived overlooking); balconies should not cause unacceptable overlooking or noise or disturbance to nearby occupiers;*
4. *Ensure that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting; visual amenity from adjoining sites and from the public realm should not be unacceptably compromised;*
5. *Ensure there is no harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the use of buildings, gardens and other spaces due to increases in traffic, servicing, parking, noise, light, disturbance, air pollution, odours or vibration or local micro-climate effects;*
6. *Provide adequate outdoor amenity space for new occupiers in accordance with Policy 13 'Housing Mix and Standards ', which is free from excessive noise or disturbance, pollution, odour, sense of enclosure, unacceptable loss of privacy, wind and overshadowing.*

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 3.5m in depth for a semi-detached 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 neighbouring properties requiring assessment are 433 and 437 Hanworth Road to the north and south respectively. For completeness, properties on Wyndham Crescent are also assessed below.

433 Hanworth Road

The proposal is set back approximately 2.7m from the shared side boundary and does not project past the neighbouring rear elevation. Due to the siting of the proposal, neighbours will not have consistently direct views of the proposal, therefore, undue dominance and by extension shading are not considered to be anticipated outcomes.

No glazing is proposed to face no.433, therefore acceptable privacy can be maintained.

437 Hanworth Road

The proposed side extension, whilst located on the shared boundary, adjoins the neighbouring side elevation and extends beyond the neighbouring rear elevation by no more than 1m. This is considered an acceptable depth, as set out in the SPD, to retain reasonable levels of neighbouring amenity. The proposal is northeast of these neighbours therefore shading impacts are considered minimal.

The proposed side facing windows are obscure glazed and non-opening above 1.7m, therefore acceptable privacy can be maintained.

Properties at Wyndham Crescent

Properties located on Wyndham Crescent are at least 14m away from the proposed development. The rear garden affords enough space for all dominance and shading effects to be negated when viewed from these neighbouring properties. The proposal would result in additional rear facing windows which would orient towards these neighbours; however, the separation distance is not short enough to warrant the refusal of the proposal on grounds of undue impact to privacy. Utilising the rear of the site for primary outlook is standard and encouraged in a residential environment.



Figure 1: Proposed block plan in relation to neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

Given the above, amenity pertaining to privacy, dominance and daylight access are not considered to be unduly impacted by the proposal. Overall, the proposal will not harm neighbour amenity to a degree where refusal is warranted and is consistent with policies LP8 of the Local Plan, LP46 of the Publication Local Plan and the SPD.

iii Fire Safety

A Fire Safety Statement was submitted with the application. 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, taking into account the scale of the works, the scheme is consistent with Policy D12 of the London Plan.

iv Flooding

Policy LP21 states that all developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, taking into account climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) are required in all proposals.

Whilst the site is not located within a flood zone, other flood-related hazards are listed as present.

The applicant has confirmed that the floor levels of the extension will be set no lower than the that of the existing house, and that flood proofing will be incorporated where appropriate, in accordance with Environmental Agency guidance.

Accordingly, any contribution to flood sources is considered to be minimal and there will be no increase in safety risk to occupants. The proposal is therefore consistent with LP21.

iv Parking

LP 45 Parking Standards and Servicing sets out that “the Council will require new development to make provision for the accommodation of vehicles in order to provide for the needs of the development while minimising the impact of car based travel including on the operation of the road network and local environment.” The Transport Supplementary Guidance 2020 outlines that “dimensions for new or re-built garages are 3.0 x 6.0m. The measurements are clear internal dimensions and will allow most vehicles to park and the doors to open sufficiently for passengers to alight.”

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/zakdxqdr/richmond_transport_spd.pdf

Measuring 2.4m in width, the existing garage is no longer fit for purpose, and in common with numerous other properties within the street, is no longer used to park a vehicle. Whilst it may be desirable for parked vehicles to be hidden from the streetscape, there are no provision in the Local Plan which control where vehicles can be parked on a site. Regardless of whether the garage is utilised for its intended use, the proposal retains enough space for one parked car within the existing driveway. In this respect, the conversion of the garage is unlikely to result in any noticeable changes to parking arrangements on the site.

Similarly, any increase in risk to pedestrian safety will be negligible compared to existing, with no changes proposed to the access and manoeuvring arrangements.

The scheme is therefore compliant with policy LP45 of the Local Plan.

7. 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.

8. RECOMMENDATION

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

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): ...MBA.....

Dated: ...20/08/2024.....

I agree the recommendation:

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

Dated: 02/09/2024.....

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: