

**Application reference: 24/1786/FUL**  
**WEST TWICKENHAM WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
15.07.2024	22.07.2024	16.09.2024	16.09.2024

**Site:**

63 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EF,

**Proposal:**

Proposed loft conversion with rear dormer extension and insertion of 2no. roof lights to the front

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Miss Maria Romero  
63 Elmsleigh Road  
Twickenham  
Richmond Upon Thames  
TW2 5EF

**AGENT NAME**

Harry Cowley  
41 Elmsleigh Road  
London  
TW2 5EF  
United Kingdom

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

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

10 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EG, - 25.07.2024  
12 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EG, - 25.07.2024  
11 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EG, - 25.07.2024  
72 Third Cross Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EA, - 25.07.2024  
70 Third Cross Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EA, - 25.07.2024  
68 Third Cross Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EA, - 25.07.2024  
66 Third Cross Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EA, - 25.07.2024  
65 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EF, - 25.07.2024  
59 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EF, - 25.07.2024  
67 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EF, - 25.07.2024  
61 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EF, - 25.07.2024  
57 Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham, TW2 5EF, - 25.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: PDE

Application: 24/1786/FUL

Date:

Proposed loft conversion with rear dormer extension and insertion of 2no. roof lights to the front

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>24/1786/FUL</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>63 Elmsleigh Road Twickenham TW2 5EF</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Proposed loft conversion with rear dormer extension and insertion of 2no. roof lights to the front roof elevation</b>
<b>Contact Officer</b>	<b>Phil Shipton</b>
<b>Legal Agreement</b>	<b>NO</b>

## 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 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, 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 subject site consists of a two-storey terraced dwellinghouse, located on the northeastern side of Elmsleigh Road, Twickenham. The presence of rooflights is very common throughout Elmsleigh Road. Rear dormers and other rear extensions are not a feature of the properties along Elmsleigh Road.

The application site is situated within the Area 6 Cross Roads, of the Twickenham Village Character Area Village and is otherwise designated as:

- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency
- Article 4 Direction Basements
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band – Low
- Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency
- Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater
- Take Away Management Zone
- Throughflow Catchment Area (Throughflow and Groundwater Policy Zone)

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

The proposal involves a loft conversion with rear dormer extension and extension on top of part of the existing outrigger.

- The rear dormer will include a Juliet balcony, with rooflight positioned over the staircase. Two roof lights are proposed on the front roof elevation to provide light into the loft bedroom.
- The second-floor outrigger will step down from the dormer and extend to the existing chimney. A single rear facing sash window, painted anthracite grey with frosted privacy glass is proposed.

### Amendments

It is noted that the original proposal involved the rear dormer extending from the ridgeline of the dwellinghouse and the second-floor outrigger extending close to the eaves, together resulting in a larger total loft space than the current proposal.

The applicant was informed that the design does not align with policy or the Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (the 'SPD'). The applicant subsequently provided precedent cases to the planning officer, of note 41 Elmsleigh Rd - 21/2033/FUL. The applicant was informed that the proposed design could not creep from what had been approved at No.41 and the applicant subsequently revised the proposal to match that of No.41. The resulting design includes a smaller dormer extending from a point set down from the roof ridgeline, and a smaller second-floor outrigger, setback from the eaves. This is the current proposal.

The applicant was made aware of a drawing error via email in the 12<sup>th</sup> September 2024, with regard to the proposed side elevation plan portraying the proposed dormer and outrigger extension over a roof with the opposite pitch to that of the subject site, and an incorrect portrayal of the neighbouring side elevation. This was acknowledged by the applicant and an informative is included on this matter.

The location of the roof extensions in relation to neighbouring properties was made aware to the applicant (when comparing with No.41) and as such the applicant provided 25degree BRE tests. The BRE tests provided were inconclusive and a daylight/sunlight study was subsequently provided.

There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

#### 4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of representation were received.

#### 5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

##### NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

4. Decision-making

These policies can be found at:

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

##### London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

D4 Delivering good design  
D6 Housing quality and standards  
D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency  
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

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 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	
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Design process	44	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn\\_plan\\_2018\\_to\\_2033\\_january\\_2019.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn_plan_2018_to_2033_january_2019.pdf)

### Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations  
Village Plan – Twickenham Area 6 Cross Roads

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

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are:

Community Infrastructure Levy  
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2021

## 6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

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

### 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.*

*Councils SPD states roof extensions should be kept 'in-scale' with the existing structure as to 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. Dormer windows and other roof extensions must not project above the ridgeline and should be smaller than that of windows of the floor below. Dormers should be covered in materials that match or complement the main roof.*

*Councils SPD states the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours and should harmonise with the original appearance.*

#### Rear Dormer Extension

The proposed rear dormer extension occurs from approximately 0.5m from the roof ridgeline and to approximately 0.4m from the existing rear eaves, for the full width of the dwellinghouse. As such, the proposed dormer sits within the existing roof, respecting the ridgeline and eaves with sufficient setbacks. The terraced nature of the dwellinghouse and neighbours, means the width of the dormer is considered appropriate, while retaining existing chimney features. The proposed Juliet balcony adopts the size and alignment of the existing windows on the lower floors, and the facades utilises materials to match that of the existing dwellinghouse, therefore creating a harmony with the original dwelling.

The proposed rooflights are a common feature of front roof elevation on Elmsleigh Road and therefore the two front roof elevation rooflights and one dormer rooflight are considered in keeping with the appearance of the street.

As such, in the context of the neighbouring properties, the rear dormer is consistent with the SPD and comply with Policy PL1 of the Local Plan.

## Second Floor Outrigger Extension

The proposed second floor outrigger connects to the proposed rear dormer and is stepped down to align with the crown of the chimney stack. The outrigger extends approximately 4.8m to the rear edge of the existing chimney stack and is setback approximately 0.65m from the eaves. The outrigger includes a single sash window at the rear elevation.

As the proposal largely adopts the design granted under 21/2033/FUL, the officers reasoning in 21/2033/FUL is relevant to this proposal, of which an excerpt is provided below.

*With regards to the 'L' element of the proposed dormer, officers are not aware of there being any such similar L-shaped dormers in the immediate area. Thus officers are mindful that this proposal would introduce a new roof form to the area. Turning to whether or not this would appear incongruous, officers are of the opinion that its generous set back from the eaves at the rear and also a set back from the eaves at the side, together with the fact that its height would be smaller than the dormer proposed on the main roof, would ensure that the extension would not appear visually intrusive and would largely be hidden by the rear outrigger in views from the rear.*

*Given that the site is not listed and is not in a conservation area, overall, it is considered that the rear dormer roof extensions would on the whole appear as a proportionate and subordinate addition to the main property and would not cause undue harm to the visual amenities of the area.*

The above assessment is too adopted in this case, where the second-floor outrigger extension proposed is deemed to be consistent with Policy PL1 of the Local Plan and achieves an architectural design that respects the character of the existing dwellinghouse.

## Summary

Overall, the proposed rear dormer and second-floor outrigger extensions ensure a high architectural quality that contributes to the character and context of the area and is therefore considered to comply with Policy 1 of the Local Plan, and Policy 28 of the Publication Local Plan.

### **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.*

*The SPD states that extensions that create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted. This could be due to the height, footprint or proximity of the proposals to the surrounding area.*

*Residential development should create good living conditions and should not cause any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms or gardens in neighbouring properties. New extensions should not result in any substantial loss of privacy to adjoining dwellings and gardens to prevent overlooking.*

## No.65 & 67 Elmsleigh Road

The applicant has submitted a daylight/sunlight study, illustrating the shading effect of the subject dwellinghouse during different times of the day. The study indicates that the proposal will have no impact on No.65 & 67, resultant from the sun projecting from the south. No side windows are proposed on either dormer or outrigger extension and therefore no privacy impacts are anticipated on the residents at No.65 & 67 Elmsleigh Road. As such, the amenity and living conditions of these residents is to be maintained.

## No.61 Elmsleigh Road

The proposal is considered to have no impact, in a planning sense, on the ground floor residents of the subject maisonette, at No.61. All proposed changes occur to structures within the property of No.63 and the extensions are such that they will be largely unnoticeable from the ground floor. The daylight/sunlight study shows that the existing shading of the outdoor area is not anticipated to change as a result of the extensions at No.63. As such, the amenity and living conditions of these residents is to be maintained.

## No. 57 & 59 Elmsleigh Road

The proposed Juliet balcony at the rear elevation of the dormer will look over the neighbouring property at No.57 & 59. It is noted that collective overlooking of rear gardens occurs already by virtue of the existence of Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1786/FUL Page 5 of 10

upper floor windows in the vicinity. It is therefore not considered that the addition of the dormer Juliet balcony would result in any loss of privacy for neighbouring sites above and beyond the existing situation. The principal of a rear roof dormer is considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenities, subject to it being of an appropriate size and scale. The proposed outrigger sash window is proposed to be frosted and therefore have no overlooking or other privacy impacts.

The applicant's daylight/sunlight study provides analysis of the shading effect of the existing and proposed building form, from 8am, 10am, 12pm, 2pm, 4pm and 6pm, for the 31st of March (vernal equinox) and 30th of September (autumnal equinox). When analysing the shading impacts on No.57 & 59, the floor plan of these properties has been assumed to mirror that of the subject site, due to the homogenous nature of the terraced building. The following analysis is made:

- During both vernal and autumnal equinox at 8am, there is a negligible difference in the shading impacts on No.57 & 59 between the existing and proposed built form. The proposed dormer and outrigger extension create additional shading that projects onto the roof of No.59 and does not impact any windows or other living spaces of the neighbouring property.
- During the vernal equinox at 10am, the additional built form of the dormer and outrigger extension create shade over the rear facing bedroom window of No.59, that otherwise would not be shaded by the existing built form. However, during the autumnal equinox at 10am, the rear facing bedroom window is shaded by the existing built form and the shading created by the additional built form of the dormer and outrigger extension projects onto the roof and blank side facade of No.59 only.
- During the vernal equinox at 12pm, the additional built form of the dormer and outrigger extension create shade over the ground floor side facing window of No.57, that otherwise would only be marginally shaded by the existing built form. The additional shade, however, does not shade any windows on the first floor of No.59 that are not already shaded by the existing built form. During the autumnal equinox, the additional built form of the dormer and outrigger extension create shade over just about the entire side and rear facade of No.57 & 59, that otherwise would be only partially shaded on the ground floor at No.57 and only the rear facing bedroom window at the first floor No.59.
- During both vernal and autumnal equinox by 2pm, all rear and side (southern) facing windows of No.57 & 59 are shaded by the existing built form. The proposed dormer and outrigger extension create additional shading that projects onto the side and rear facade of No.57 & 59, however, largely maintains the outrigger roof free of shading.
- From 4pm, there is a negligible difference in the shading impacts on No.57 & 59 between the existing and proposed built form, with shading occurring over the large portion of No.57 & 59 becoming completely shaded by 6pm.

Overall, the most pronounced shading impacts on No.57 & 59 occur during the middle of the day under both vernal and autumnal equinox's, where the introduction of the dormer and outrigger extension are anticipated to block sunlight to both the side facing ground floor window at No.57 and the first-floor kitchen window at No.59 at different times.

The proposed dormer and outrigger extension is also anticipated to create shading over the first-floor rear facing bedroom window at around 10am during the vernal equinox only, where it would otherwise not experience shading under the existing built form.

During other parts of the day, the proposed dormer and outrigger extension are anticipated to shade additional areas of the side, rear, and roof of No.57 & 59. The impact of this with regard to warming and/or cooling is unknown and not considered here.

Overall, the shading effects of the proposed dormer and outrigger extension are confined to the late morning and midday, and therefore does not introduce shading that is overwhelming or that results in a drastic loss in amenity and living conditions for the neighbouring residents. However, the shading is such that moderate levels of additional shading can have a more pronounced effect where they shade windows to living spaces and during the time of the day at which daylight/sunlight is most important.

Revisiting the relevant policy with regard to daylight and sunlight, the SPD states that '*residential development should create good living conditions and should not cause any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms or gardens in neighbouring properties.*'

Policy LP8 of the Local Plan states that '*All development will be required to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties. The Council will ensure the design and layout of buildings enables good standards of daylight and sunlight to be achieved in existing*

*properties affected by new development; where existing daylight and sunlight conditions are already substandard, they should be improved where possible.'*

Overall, the daylight/sunlight study provided shows the proposed dormer and outrigger extension would reduce daylight/sunlight to multiple habitable rooms on the neighbouring property (no.57 & 59) during the times of the day with highest daylight/sunlight exposure, and therefore it cannot be substantiated that 'good' standards of daylight/sunlight will be retained. In the absence of specialist daylight/sunlight expert report findings, the proposal therefore would potentially harm the amenity and living conditions of the residents of No.57 & 59, and therefore contravene Policy LP8 of the Local Plan, Policy 46 of the Publication local Plan; and would not be consistent with guidance of the SPD.

#### No. 70 & 72 Third Cross Road residents

As stated above, collective overlooking of rear gardens occurs already by virtue of the existence of upper floor windows in the vicinity. It is therefore not considered that the addition of the dormer Juliet balcony would result in any loss of privacy for neighbouring sites above and beyond the existing situation. The proposed Juliet balcony retains a distance of well over 20m to the rear of the neighbouring properties at No.70 & 72 Third Cross Road and therefore is considered to have no overlooking or other privacy impacts.

#### **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.*

The subject site is identified as having risk from surface water flooding and susceptible to groundwater flooding, elevated ground water; and being within a critical drainage area and throughflow catchment area. However, the subject site is within flood zone 1, meaning it has a low probability of flooding from rivers and the sea.

The proposal does not result in additional building footprint or change of activity, and therefore would not increase the vulnerability of the site in terms of use. The proposal is deemed compliant with LP21 of the Local Plan and Policy 8 of the Publication 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.

### **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.

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 (2023) and Development Plan, when taken as a whole.

**Refuse planning permission for the following reasons;**

Policy LP8 of the Local Plan states that *'All development will be required to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties. The Council will ensure the design and layout of buildings enables good standards of daylight and sunlight to be achieved in existing properties affected by new development; where existing daylight and sunlight conditions are already substandard, they should be improved where possible.'*

Overall, the daylight/sunlight study provided shows the proposed dormer and outrigger extension would reduce daylight/sunlight to multiple habitable rooms on the neighbouring property (no.57 & 59) during the times of the day with highest daylight/sunlight exposure, and therefore it cannot be substantiated that 'good' standards of daylight/sunlight will be retained. In the absence of specialist daylight/sunlight expert report findings, the proposal therefore would potentially harm the amenity and living conditions of the residents of No.57 & 59, and therefore contravene Policy LP8 of the Local Plan, Policy 46 of the Publication local Plan; and would not be consistent with guidance of the SPD.



**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): PS

Dated: 26/09/2024

**I agree the recommendation: TFA**

~~Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner/Senior Planner~~

Dated: .....26/09/2024.....

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**

---

U0094478	Decision Drawings
U0094477	NPPF REFUSAL - Para. 38-42
U0094602	Drawing error