



LONDON BOROUGH OF
RICHMOND UPON THAMES

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE

Application reference: 24/1709/FUL
WEST TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
05.07.2024	23.07.2024	17.09.2024	17.09.2024

Site:

18 And 20 Denmark Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EN,

Proposal:

Single storey rear extension and rear extension of first floor at no.18; Rear extension of first floor at no.20.

Amended as follows on 24.07.2024:

FRA and Amended Plans, Application form have been received.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr. Vincent O'sullivan & Andrew
Pharro Vincent O'sullivan...
18 & 20 Denmark Road
Twickenham
Richmond Upon Thames
TW2 5EN

AGENT NAME

Mr Jeff Gillett
1 High road
Old Eastcote
Old Eastcote
Pinner
HA5 2EW
United Kingdom

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRuT Lead Local Flood Authority

Expiry Date

07.08.2024

Neighbours:

- 150 Hampton Road, Twickenham, TW2 5QR, - 24.07.2024
- 148 Hampton Road, Twickenham, TW2 5QR, - 24.07.2024
- 9 Bedford Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EW, - 24.07.2024
- 8 Bedford Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EW, - 24.07.2024
- 22 Denmark Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EN, - 24.07.2024
- 16 Denmark Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EN, - 24.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application: 24/1709/FUL

Single storey rear extension and rear extension of first floor at no.18;
Rear extension of first floor at no.20.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 04.06.2010

Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 10/FEN01661/GASAFE

Application Number	24/1709/FUL
Address	18 And 20 Denmark Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EN
Proposal	Single storey rear extension and rear extension of first floor at no.18; Rear extension of first floor at no.20 (as per application form)
Contact Officer	GAP
Target Determination Date	17.09.2024

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 properties are Nos. 18 And 20 Denmark Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EN, which are 2No. mid-terrace properties part of a long row of terraces of 20 properties, whose fronts faces Denmark Road and rears Bedford Road in Twickenham Village, West Twickenham Ward. The application properties are not locally listed (BTMs) or nationally listed nor located in proximity of ones (BTMs are located to the east and south of the application sites; however, given the relatively considerable separation distances sited been the BTMs and application properties, the setting of such BTMs is not considered to be significantly affected by the proposed scheme). The application sites are not in a Conservation Area nor are in proximity of one/s (the Conservation Area 10 Trafalgar Road Twickenham is in excess 70 metres to the east of the application properties).

No TPOs (protected trees) have been detected within the application site or its immediate surroundings.

The application site is located within an Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 50%), a Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency and a Throughflow Catchment Area

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises:

Single storey infilling extension at No. 18 and alterations to its existing single storey rear extension.
 Enlarging the front ground-floor window at No. 18.
 Alterations to the existing single storey extension at No. 20.
 Flat roof first-floor rear extensions at Nos. 18 and 20 and associated alterations to first-floor rear windows.
 Materials and fenestration would match the existing.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No representations have been received by the neighbouring properties.

The Council's Flooding Consultant was consulted as part of this application and their comments are included in the main body of this report.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

The NPPF (2023) can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

London Plan (2021)

D12 Fire Safety

The London Plan (2021) can be found here: <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
Flooding	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 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

apply.

Issue	Publication Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
		Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No
Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	8	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations (2015)
Twickenham Village Planning Guidance (2018)

These documents can be found at:

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

Other Local Strategies or Publications

None.

Determining applications in a Conservation Area

In considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to that duty, decisions of the court have confirmed that for development proposed to be carried out in a conservation area, a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

In applications where the decision-maker is satisfied that there will be no harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area, the statutory presumption against granting planning permission described above falls away. In such cases the development should be permitted or refused in accordance with the policies of the development plan and other material considerations.

Determining applications affecting a Listed Building

Sections 16(1) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that, when considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, or whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to this duty decisions of the court have confirmed that a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. However, this does not mean that the weight that the decision-maker must give to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting is uniform. It will depend on, among other things, the extent of the assessed harm and the heritage value of the asset in question. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to a listed building or its setting is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and visual impact
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Flooding
- iv Fire Safety

i Design and visual impact

Policy LP 1 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 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 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, so that the original form can still be appreciated. In such circumstances, the ridge of the extension should be set lower to that on the main house.

The SPD (2015) mentions that:

- *two storey side and 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 SPD (2015) stipulates that it is preferable that new window openings would echo the proportions and sizes of those of the main house.

No. 18

The single storey rear extension at No. 18 (the infilling to the existing single storey rear extension and the alterations to such existing extension would form a new single storey rear extension assessed here) would be a subservient addition to the host property given its single storey nature, and the use of matching materials and fenestration would trigger sense of belonging.

The first-floor rear extension would be approx. 0.23 metres in excess of half the width of the original building, however, its flat roof would not exceed the eaves height but rather that set in line with it compensating for the aforementioned excess and triggering subservience to the host property. The use of matching materials and fenestration would trigger sense of belonging.

No objection is raised to enlarging the front ground-floor window to match the existing openings. This is because the ground floor openings of the neighbouring properties are either windows or bay windows and therefore a lack of consistency in the street scene is acknowledged. Furthermore, the proposed enlarged window other than being in keeping with the existing openings would also resemble the large openings found in the street scene in the nature of bay windows.

No. 20

The alterations to the existing single storey rear extension at No. 20 are acceptable and the use of matching materials and fenestration would trigger sense of belonging in relation to these alterations.

The first-floor side extension would be approx. 0.23 metres in excess of half the width of the original building, however, its flat roof would not exceed the eaves height but rather that set in line with it compensating for the aforementioned excess and triggering subservience to the host property. The use of matching materials and fenestration would trigger sense of belonging.

In light of the above, the proposals are considered in accordance with Local Policy LP 1 and the SPD (2015) as a whole as well as the emerging Local Plan Policy 28.

ii Impact on neighbour amenity

Policy LP 8 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 3 m 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 properties likely to be affected by the scheme would be Nos.16 and 22 Denmark Road.

No. 16

Following advice from the Case Officer, the height of the single storey rear extension on the shared boundary with this neighbour has been reduced at approx. 2.2 metres (the original extension and current extension exceed the recommended depth of 3 metres). In doing so, No. 16 would not experience significant overbearing issues.

Moving to the first-floor rear extension, this extension present a depth of approx. 2.3 metres and would be set back from the shared boundary with No. 16 by approx. 1.66 metres. The above along with the extension's height not exceeding the eaves of No. 18, would ensure that No. 16 would not experience significant overbearing issues.

In terms of loss of daylight and sunlight, the report submitted as part of this application, Daylight and Sunlight Report, provides reassurance that No. 16, as a result of the current scheme, would not experience significant loss of daylight and sunlight.

The proposal would not significantly exacerbate the mutual degree of overlooking current experienced in the locality.

No. 22

The proposed alterations to the existing single storey rear extension at No. 20 would not change its overall current mass, size and scale and therefore amenity issues as a result of these alterations are not anticipated.

Moving to the first-floor rear extension, this extension present a depth of approx. 2.3 metres and would be set back from the shared boundary with No. 22 by approx. 1.66 metres. The above along with the extension's height not exceeding the eaves of No. 20, would ensure that No. 22 would not experience significant overbearing issues.

In terms of loss of daylight and sunlight, the report submitted as part of this application, Daylight and Sunlight Report, provides reassurance that No. 22, as a result of the current scheme, would not experience significant loss of daylight and sunlight.

The proposal would not significantly exacerbate the mutual degree of overlooking current experienced in the locality.

In view of the above, the proposals would comply with the aims and objectives of Policy LP 8 of the Local Plan, Policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan and SPD (2015) on House Extensions and External Alterations.

iii Flooding

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 submitted Flood Risk Assessments provide reassurance in terms of flood risk concerns at the sites.

iv Fire Safety

A Reasonable Exception Statement that would justify why Policy D12 is not relevant to the development has been provided and it is considered acceptable.

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. In making this recommendation consideration has been had to the statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the requirements set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Grant planning permission

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 (which are not on the file) YES NO

This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): GAP

Dated: 21/08/2024

I agree the recommendation:

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

Dated: 12/09/2024.....

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:

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