

## PLANNING REPORT

# **Application reference: 24/1082/HOT**

## WHITTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
29.04.2024	16.07.2024	10.09.2024	10.09.2024

Site:

43 Grasmere Avenue, Whitton, Hounslow, TW3 2JG

Proposal:

Demolition of existing rear extension and replacement with new.

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

**APPLICANT NAME** 

Mr Thampiah Sivathasan

43 Grasmere Avenue

Whitton

Richmond Upon Thames

TW3 2JG

United Kingdom

**AGENT NAME** 

Mr Kevin Marchesi

232 Tolworth Rise South

Surbiton

surrey

KT5 9ND

england

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

**Consultations:** Internal/External:

> Consultee **Expiry Date**

#### Neighbours:

Kerswell Hall, Wills Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW3 2JF, - 17.07.2024 45 Grasmere Avenue, Whitton, Hounslow, TW3 2JG, - 17.07.2024 41 Grasmere Avenue, Whitton, Hounslow, TW3 2JG, - 17.07.2024

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

**Development Management** 

Status: PCO Application:24/1082/HOT

Date: Demolition of existing rear extension and replacement with new.

**Building Control** 

Deposit Date: 28.07.2004 Removal of chimney breast

Reference: 04/1569/BN

**Building Control** 

Deposit Date: 30.05.2008 10 Windows

Reference: 08/FEN01267/FENSA

	T
Proposal	Single storey rear extension that would project approx. 4 metres from the rear wall of the host property and would be covered by a lean-to-roof enclosed by parapet walls that would achieve a maximum height of approx. 3.25 metres. The extension would replace the existing extension/conservatory. The rear chimney stack would be removed as part of the scheme.
Site description /	The application site is currently occupied by a two-storey end-of-
key designations	terrace house located in bend of Grasmere Avenue in Whitton and Heathfield Village, Whitton Ward.
	The site is in an Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flood and Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater.
Planning History	N/A.
Policies	The proposal has been considered having regard to the policies within the Council's Local Plan, in particular:  London Plan (2021):
	D12 Fire Safety
	Local Plan (2018):
	LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality
	LP 8 Amenity and Living Conditions
	LP 21 Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage
	Supplementary Planning Documents / Guidance:
	House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015)
	Whitton & Heathfield Planning Guidance SPD (2017)
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 is addressed in more detail in the assessment below 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 In this regard, the following Polices are considered Material Planning

Considerations in this instance:

- Policy 28 Local character and design quality
- Policy 46 Amenity and Living Conditions
- Policy 8 Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

## Consultee/s Material representation/s

N/A. N/A.

## Amendment/s

None requested or received.

#### **Professional** comments

The proposal has been assessed in relation to the following issues:

- **Design and Visual Amenity**
- **Neighbour Amenity**
- Flood Risk
- Fire Safety

## **Design and Visual Amenity**

Policy LP 1 'Local Character and Design Quality' requires that all development to be of high architectural quality demonstrating 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 character. Development must respect, contribute to and enhance the local environment and character.

The Councils SPD (2015) relating to House Extensions and External Alterations encourages the retention of the original form of the host property and any alterations should enhance the quality of the building. The original appearance should always be the reference point when considering any changes.

The SPD (2015) states that an extension 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.

The SPD (2015) mentions that it is preferable to retain all chimneystacks and pots as well as newly installed window openings should echo the design of the existing window openings of the dwellinghouse.

The application seeks approval for:

single storey rear extension that would project approx. 4 metres from the rear wall of the host property and would be covered by a lean-toroof enclosed by parapet walls that would reach a maximum height

of approx. 3.25 metres. The extension would replace the existing extension/conservatory. The rear chimney stack would be removed as part of the scheme.

The proposal would be visible from the street scene and a consistent pattern of rear extension is visible in the locality, including the one at No. 45 Grasmere Avenue, one of the adjoining neighbours, also visible from Grasmere Avenue. It would be a subservient addition to the host dwellinghouse and the use of matching materials would sufficiently trigger integration with the host property.

No objection is raised to the removed features.

As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in Design and Visual Amenity, therefore, it would be in line with Policy LP 1 of the Local Plan (2018) and the SPD on Housing Extensions and External Alterations (2015).

### **Neighbour Amenity**

Policy LP 8 requires all development to "protect the amenity and living conditions for the occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties". The policy also seeks to "ensure that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting, including through creating a sense of enclosure".

The House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015) advises that extensions that create "an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted".

The proposal, at approx. 4 metres depth, is contrary to the SPD (2015) advice which states that the effect of a single storey extension is usually only acceptable if the projection is no further than 3 metres to a terraced house. The SPD (2015) also states that 'the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site, which may justify greater rear projection'.

The proposal at approx. 4 metres exceeds the SPD (2015) recommended limits and would be sited on the boundary with the neighbour at No. 41 Grasmere Avenue. The extension would reach a maximum height of approx. 3.25 metres on the boundary with No. 41 which has no extension presently. No. 45 presents a side window at ground level, that given its close proximity to the proposed extension, and its combined depth and height, not offset by the gap between the host property and No. 45, this would also be impacted by the extension. Having regard to the above and given the depth of the extension combined with its height as well as the bulk of the parapet walls, the proposal is considered to be unduly overbearing and unneighbourly to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of Nos. 41 and 45 and as such, a refusal of planning permission is justified. The proposal would also cause loss of light issues.

The proposal is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:-

	By virtue of its combined excessive depth, height and siting, the proposed single storey rear extension would result in an unneighbourly, overbearing and visually intrusive form of development, which fails to safeguard the residential amenity of the occupiers of Nos. 41 and 45 Grasmere Avenue. This is further exacerbated by the bulk of the proposed parapet walls. The proposal would also cause loss of light issues. As such, the proposal is not considered to accord with Policy LP 8 of the Local Plan (2018) and the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015) and Policy 46 Amenity and Living Conditions of the Emerging Local Plan (Regulation 19).
	Flood Risk
	Policy LP 21 'Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage' 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.
	The proposal would be set no lower than the existing floor level mitigating flood risk concerns.
	Fire Safety
	The submitted Fire Safety Statement is considered sufficient to satisfy Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021).
Recommendation	It is recommended that the application reference 24/1082/HOT be refused.

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} \textbf{Recommendation:} \\ \textbf{The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES \\ \end{tabular}$ 

## I therefore recommend the following:

1. 2. 3.	REFUSAL PERMISSION FORWARD TO COMMITTE	ΞE				
This app	lication is CIL liable		YES* (*If yes, comple	NO ete CIL tab in Uniforn	n)	
This app	lication requires a Legal Agreer	ment	YES* (*If yes, comple	NO ete Development Cor	ndition Monitoring in Unifo	rm)
	lication has representations onl	line	YES	■ NO		
`	lication has representations on	file	$\square$ YES	■ NO		
Case Of	ficer (Initials): GAP	Dated:	28/08/2024			

I agree the recommendation: TFA

+eam Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner/Senior Planner
Dated:30/08/2024
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 b	y running the template o	nce items have been	entered
into Uniform	-		

## **SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES**

CONDITIONS	
INFORMATIVES	