



Application reference: 24/2253/HOT
 WHITTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
09.09.2024	24.09.2024	19.11.2024	19.11.2024

Site:
 97 Hall Farm Drive, Twickenham, TW2 7PG,
Proposal:
 Single storey rear extension.

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

APPLICANT NAME
 Mr Nuraly Akhmetbayev
 97 Hall Farm Drive
 Twickenham
 Richmond Upon Thames
 TW2 7PG

AGENT NAME
 Mr Scott Hackner
 16, Peel House
 105, Regency Street
 LONDON
 SW1P 4EF

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

Consultations:
Internal/External:
Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

99 Hall Farm Drive, Twickenham, TW2 7PG, - 24.09.2024
 95 Hall Farm Drive, Twickenham, TW2 7PG, - 24.09.2024

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

Development Management

Status: REGPD Application: 24/1034/PDE
 Date: 28/05/2024 Single storey rear extension (4.00m depth, 2.95m eaves height, 3.75m overall height)

Development Management

Status: PCO Application: 24/2253/HOT
 Date: Single storey rear extension.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 19.03.2010 Installed a Gas Boiler
 Reference: 10/FEN01043/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 12.12.2013 2 Windows 1 Door
 Reference: 14/FEN00130/FENSA

Application Number	24/2253/HOT
Address	97 Hall Farm Drive
Proposal	Single story rear extension
Contact Officer	ECO
Target Determination Date	19.11.2024

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 site contains a two-storey terraced dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Hall Farm Drive.

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

- Area Proposed For Tree Planting (Site: Hall Farm Drive Twickenham 1999)
- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 214)
- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Low)
- Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency (Twickenham [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_001)
- Village (Whitton and Heathfield Village)
- Village Character Area (East of Hall Farm Drive - Area 3 Whitton & Heathfield Village Planning Guidance Page 23 CHARAREA01/03/01)
- Ward (Whitton Ward)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises a single-storey rear extension projecting 4m beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse. The maximum eaves height is 2.275m eaves height from natural ground level, and an overall maximum height of 3.5m is proposed.

The relevant planning history is as follows:

Development Management

Status: Refused Application:24/1034/PDE
 Date:28/05/2024 Single storey rear extension (4.00m depth, 2.95m eaves height, 3.75m overall height)

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
- 12. Achieving well-designed places

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
- 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

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
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	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

Supplementary Planning Documents

- House Extension and External Alterations
- Whitton and Heathfield Village Plan

These policies can be found at:

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

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- Design and impact on local character
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Fire Safety
- Flood Risk

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.

The Councils 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.

The proposed rear extension will project 4m beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse. The maximum eaves height is 2.275m from natural ground level, and an overall maximum height of 3.5m is proposed. The extension is proposed for the full width of the dwellinghouse.

It is noted that the proposed materials will match the existing dwellinghouse, ensuring that the extension complements the existing character. Additionally, the subject site will retain a large backyard area.

It is acknowledged that existing properties within Hall Farm Drive have rear extensions and that this type of development is not unduly out-of-character for the area. Additionally, the rear extension would not be visible from the streetscape and therefore will not impact the local character.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal is consistent with Policy LP1 of the Local Plan, as well as the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations in terms of local character.

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.

The SPD notes that generally an extension of 3m in depth for a terraced dwellinghouse 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 impact on neighbours such as sense of enclosure or overbearing.

The subject site has two directly adjoining properties, No. 99 to the west, No.101 to the east.

No. 99

The neighbouring dwellinghouse located at No. 99 has an existing single storey rear extension which directly abuts the subject site. The proposed extension would project approximately 1.3 beyond this extension. Given the proposed extension projects only a minimal depth beyond that of No. 99, it is not considered to result in unreasonable adverse amenity impacts on this neighbouring property.

No. 95

There is no existing rear extension at No. 95 and therefore the proposed extension would project approximately 4m depth beyond the rear wall of the neighbouring property. This exceeds the SPD guidance of 3m for terraced properties. Additionally, the extension would be 3.5m high, with an eave height of 2.275.

Given there are no existing extensions at No. 95 to mitigate the impact of the proposed extension, it is considered that the proposed extension will harm the visual amenity of this property and create a detrimental sense of enclosure for the property at No. 95. Furthermore, there is an existing extension at No. 93 which exacerbates the combined sense of enclosure created by the proposed development.

Summary

The proposed rear extension exceeds the 3m guideline set out in the SPD. Additionally, the extension would be 3.5m high, with an eave height of 2.275. It would be set directly on the boundary and there is no obvious mitigation as to its impact. The proposed extension would create a sense of enclosure on the neighbouring dwellinghouse at No. 95, particularly owing to the existing rear extension at No. 93, therefore not meeting Policy LP8 of the Local Plan and Policy 46 of the Publication local Plan.

iii Flood Risk

Local Plan Policy LP21 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. Development will be guided to areas of lower risk by applying the 'Sequential Test' as set out in national policy guidance, and where necessary, the 'Exception Test' will be applied. Unacceptable developments and land uses will be refused in line with national policy and guidance.

The site is designated by the Environment Agency as a site subject to groundwater flooding.

An Environmental Agency Flood Risk Questionnaire has been submitted. No change of use is proposed by the application and the internal floor level will be the same as existing. The scheme is able to be considered consistent with Policy LP21 of the Local Plan.

iv Fire Safety

London Plan policy D12 requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all planning applications.

A Fire Safety Statement was received by the Council.

The materials proposed are to match existing and will need to be Building Regulations compliant. The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. This permission is NOT a consent under the Building Regulations for which a separate application should be made.

Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with this Policy D12 of the London 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.

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons

The proposed extension by virtue of its combined height, depth and siting, would result in an overbearing, unneighbourly and visually intrusive form of development, which would fail to safeguard the residential amenities of nearby occupants, in particular causing an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No. 95 Hall Farm Drive. The scheme fails to comply with, in particular, Policy LP 8 of the Local Plan (2018) policy 46 of the publication local plan and the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance.

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): ECO

Dated: 16/10/204

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:

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: