

**Application reference: 24/1809/HOT**  
**ST MARGARETS AND NORTH TWICKENHAM WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
16.07.2024	17.07.2024	11.09.2024	11.09.2024

**Site:**

22 Chudleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 7QR,

**Proposal:**

Single storey wrap around extension

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

MR FARAZ NASIR  
22 Chudleigh Road  
Twickenham  
Richmond Upon Thames  
TW2 7QR

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Matthew Langley  
12 Killester Gardens  
Worcester Park  
KT4 8TZ  
United Kingdom

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

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

45 Chudleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 7QP, - 18.07.2024  
43 Chudleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 7QP, - 18.07.2024  
41 Chudleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 7QP, - 18.07.2024  
1 Russell Road, Twickenham, TW2 7QT, - 18.07.2024  
20 Chudleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 7QR, - 18.07.2024  
24 Chudleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 7QR, - 18.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: REF

Date: 19/06/2024

Application: 24/1048/HOT

Single storey wrap-around extension with pitched roof to side and rear; hip-to-gable loft conversion with rear dormer; rooflights to front elevation

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application: 24/1809/HOT

singles storey wrap around extension

Building Control

Deposit Date: 04.03.2020

Install a gas-fired boiler

Reference: 20/FEN00920/GASAFE

**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 two-storeys and forms part of a terrace with No.20 and No20a. The group is located on the corner with Russell Road.

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

- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 50%)
- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 339)
- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Higher)
- Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency (Twickenham [Richmond] / Ref: Group8\_001 / )
- Floodzone 2 (Fluvial Models)
- Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater (GLA Drain London)
- Surface Water Flooding (Area Susceptible to) - Environment Agency ( )
- Take Away Management Zone (Take Away Management Zone)
- Village (Twickenham Village)
- Village Character Area (Heatham Estate (incl. Richmond upon Thames College & The Stoop) - Area 16 Twickenham Village Planning Guidance Page 48
- CHARAREA13/16/01)
- Ward (St. Margarets and North Twickenham Ward)

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

The proposal would demolish the garage at the side of the house as well as the existing rear extension and construct a single storey extension to the side and rear of the house. The extension would have a pitched roof with tiles and rooflights. At the front it would have a window and, at the rear, a window and glazed opening doors.

A previous application at No.22 for a side and rear extension as well as loft conversion was refused under ref. 24/1048/HOT. The reasons for refusal were:

- *The proposed scheme, due to the height, depth and siting of the side extension and the size, scale, siting and massing of the proposed roof extensions, would detract from the character and appearance of the subject site and of the local area. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Chapter 12 of the NPPF, policy D4 of the London Plan, policy LP1 the Local Plan, policy 28 of the Publication Local Plan, as well as the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.*
- *The proposed side extension, by reason of its height, depth and siting, would result in an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development which would compromise unacceptably the amenity and living conditions of No.24 Chudleigh Road and fail to comply with policy LP8 of the Local Plan, policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan, and the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.*

There is relevant planning history at neighbouring houses, including:

- At No.21 a side and rear extension with flat roof was approved under 10/1709/HOT. This is well set back from the front building line.
- At No.40 a single storey side and rear wrap around extension with pitched roof was approved under 98/2900.
- At No.51 a side and rear wrap around extension with a pitched roof 4m high at the rear, 3.6m high at the front, and set on the building line of the front elevation was approved under 14/0034/HOT.
- At No.55 Chudleigh Road a single storey side extension with pitched roof was granted under

13/1569/HOT. However, this did not wrap around into a rear extension, but retained the existing approximately 3m deep rear extension.

- At No.57 a side extension with pitched roof was approved under 10/0378/HOT with a pitched roof of 3.6m height and set on the line of the front elevation. Also, part of the application was a rear extension 4m deep, however, neighbouring houses already had extensions of similar depth.

It should be noted that these examples pre-date current policy and guidance, in particular the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations published in 2015.

#### 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](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
- SI12 Flood Risk management
- 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	
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	
Waste Management	LP24	Yes	
Sustainable Travel Choices	LP44	Yes	
Parking Standards and Servicing	LP45	Yes	

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)

##### 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 Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1809/HOT Page 3 of 10

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 Policy
Local character and design quality/ Design process	Policy 28/ Policy 42
Amenity and Living Conditions	Policy 46
Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	Policy 8
Waste and the circular economy	Policy 7
Sustainable travel choices	Policy 47
Vehicular Parking Standards, Cycle Parking, Servicing and Construction Logistics Management	Policy 48

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/fomccpcf/publication\\_local\\_plan\\_low\\_resolution.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/fomccpcf/publication_local_plan_low_resolution.pdf)

### Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Quality  
House Extension and External Alterations  
Transport  
Village Plan – Twickenham

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

n/a

## 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
- v. Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing

### i. Design and impact on heritage assets

#### 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 D4 of the London Plan states that the ' design of development proposals should be thoroughly scrutinised' and that 'design quality development should be retained through to completion'.

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.

Section 8 of the Council's SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that roof extensions should be 'in-scale' with the existing house, not extend beyond the eaves or the ridge and use similar materials to the existing roof.

Section 5.5 of the Council's SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that windows are important features, that an inappropriate choice can easily spoil an otherwise satisfactory design and that new windows should maintain a consistent style and detail with those on the existing house.

Section 8.3 states that chimney stacks should be retained where possible and repaired in a style and material which reflect the original.

### Analysis

Most of the houses on Chudleigh Road are semi-detached houses from the interwar period, mostly with double height bays and gables on the front elevations, some with half-timbering. They were originally laid out with generous gaps between the houses. Some houses have garages to the side. Other have been extended to the side. As noted above, several other houses in the street have carried out similar extensions to the side and rear with a pitched roof wrapping around the rear corner of the house. As also noted above, these were generally approved before current guidance came into place, but, nonetheless, form part of the character of the area. It is necessary that each application is assessed on its merits and particular circumstances.

The proposed side extension would be 2.35m wide, infilling the entire space between the house and the boundary and run for 11.8m along it, from the front corner of the house to 3.5m beyond the rear. At the front of the house, it would be 2.2m high at the eaves, and, due to the change in ground levels, 2.47m high at the rear. This space between No.22 and No.24 is already somewhat infilled by the existing garage when viewed from the street as well as the rear extension to No.24. However, this extension well set back from the street at the rear corner of the house. In contrast the proposed wrap-around extension would be set directly on the building line of the front elevation. This would make it more visually prominent in the street. However, several other extensions in the street are built to the same line with a similar form and bulk as proposed here. As such, it is not thought that the side extension would be out of character, per se. The height of the proposed extension would be significantly less than that previously proposed which would have been 3.4m at the eaves, or some 1m higher, therefore, be marginally larger than the existing garage, but not overly dominant in the streetscape or in relation to the house.

The rear of the house can be seen from Russell Road. The proposed rear extension would be similar in height and form to the existing rear extension as well as the extensions to No.20 and 20a which have a pitched roof running up to the house below the first-floor windows. As shown on the proposed elevations, the pitch of the roof at No.22 would match the neighbours. The key difference in the current proposal is that it would be half a metre deeper than the neighbouring extensions and wrap-around the house running across to the boundary with No.24. It would not be significantly deeper than the neighbouring house or No.24 and the wrap-around element would not be prominent when seen from Russell Road. As such, the rear element of the proposed extension would be acceptable in terms of impact on local character.

The fenestration on the existing house is somewhat mixed. The proposed fenestration would be reasonably in-keeping with the rest of the house and not look out of place. The walls would be faced with render which is thought to be acceptable provided roughcast render was used to match the rest of the house. It is thought that this can be secured by condition.

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 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 proposed rear extension would project 0.5m approximately beyond the rear of No.20 Chudleigh Road. It is not thought that that this would result in any particular negative impacts to their amenity.

No.24 has a rear extension already which is set away from the boundary. It has some side-facing windows at ground floor level serving a toilet and living space as secondary windows. No.22 already has building along the boundary with No.24 including the garage and a shed. The proposed extension would add approximately 1.4m to the depth of the building line on the boundary to 11.6m in total. At present the buildings are between 2.2m and 2.4m high on the boundary. The proposed side extension would be a similar height on the boundary. As such, it is not thought that the side extension would have a significantly greater impact on the visual amenity of No.24 than the existing situation.

On balance, therefore, the proposed extension would not detract from the amenity and living conditions of neighbours and would comply with policy LP8 of the Local Plan and the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.

## **iii. Flood Risk and Drainage**

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 SI12 of the London Plan states that 'Development proposals should ensure that flood risk is minimised and mitigated, and that residual risk is addressed.' 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.'

The site is in Flood Zone 2, an Area Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding, an Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood, an area for increased potential elevated groundwater, and a Critical Drainage Area. The proposals would not increase the vulnerability of the site in terms of use.

A Flood Risk Assessment has been provided which is considered to adequately address the flood risk and to identify mitigating measures.

This makes cursory mention that a soakway would be incorporated into the scheme. As noted above, developments must show that adequate drainage measures are incorporated into a given scheme to achieve the required runoff rates. It is not clear the proposals would achieve this. However, it is thought that details could be provided by condition.

Therefore, it is not considered that the application would unduly increase flood risk on site and that the proposals would comply with Chapter 14 of the NPPF, policy D11 and policies SI12 and 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.

#### **v. Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing**

Policy LP24 of the Local Plan states that: 'All developments, including conversions and changes of use are required to provide adequate refuse and recycling storage space and facilities, which allows for ease of collection and which residents and occupiers can easily access, in line with the guidance and advice set out in the Council's SPD on Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements'.

Policy LP44 of the Local Plan states that the Council will work in partnership to promote safe, sustainable and accessible transport solutions, which minimise the impacts of development including in relation to congestion, air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions, and maximise opportunities including for health benefits and providing access to services, facilities and employment. Policy LP45 of the Local Plan outlines that development must demonstrate an appropriate level of off-street parking to avoid an unacceptable impact on on-street parking conditions and local traffic conditions. It is further stated that in areas with a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating (1-4), it is particularly important that parking standards are met. Appendix 3 'Parking Standards' of the Local Plan. The Council's Transport SPD is also relevant. As noted above, there is a street tree immediately adjacent to the site. Therefore, it is thought that a Construction Management Plan would need to be submitted in the event of an approval to ensure this was adequately protected.

The proposal would not result in additional bedrooms and it is not thought that the servicing requirements of the property would increase and that current waste storage would be adequate.

The proposal would also remove the existing garage. The existing garage does not meet modern standards for a parking space (a minimum of 2.4m x 4.8m). As such, it is of no value as a parking resource to alleviate parking stress in the area and the conversion of the garage to residential space would not have an unacceptable impact in terms of parking. It is noted that there would remain off-street parking at the property. It is thought that the proposals would leave enough space at the rear of the property for adequate cycle parking as required.

Consequently, the proposals are considered to comply with policies LP24, LP44 and LP45 of the Local Plan as well as the SPD on Transport.

### **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.

**Grant planning permission subject to conditions**



**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 (which are not on the file)  YES  NO

This application has representations on file  YES  NO

Case Officer (Initials): JPH

Dated: 19/08/2024

**I agree the recommendation:**

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

Dated: 04/09/2024.....

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: .....

<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**

---