

Application reference: 24/2301/HOT TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
12.09.2024	13.09.2024	08.11.2024	08.11.2024

Site:

14 Marble Hill Close, Twickenham, TW1 3AY,

Proposal:

First floor side extension. Additional roof light on existing front roof slope, and window on side elevation. Single storey rear extension. Change of fenestration to bedroom 4. Infilling front porch. Air conditioning unit.

APPLICANT NAME

Mr & Mrs Hind
14 Marble Hill Close
Twickenham
Richmond Upon Thames
TW1 3AY

AGENT NAME

Ellen Cullen
69-71 Windmill Rd
Sunbury on Thames
TW16 7DT

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRuT Non-Commercial Environmental Health Noise Issues

Expiry Date

11.11.2024

Neighbours:

163 Richmond Road, Twickenham, TW1 3AT, - 13.09.2024
165 Richmond Road, Twickenham, TW1 3AT, - 13.09.2024
13 Marble Hill Close, Twickenham, TW1 3AY, - 13.09.2024
15 Marble Hill Close, Twickenham, TW1 3AY, - 13.09.2024
16 Marble Hill Close, Twickenham, TW1 3AY, -
12 Marble Hill Close, Twickenham, TW1 3AY, - 13.09.2024

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 98/0231
Date: 31/03/1998 Garage Extension To Front And Various Single Storey Rear Extensions.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 98/0721
Date: 23/04/1998 Single Storey Rear Extension And Rear And Front Garage Extension.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 10/1942/HOT
Date: 24/08/2010 Proposed rear ground floor extension

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 24/1232/HOT
Date: 20/06/2024 First floor side extension. Additional roof light on existing front roof slope, and window on side elevation. Single storey rear extension. Change of fenestration to bedroom 4. Infilling front porch.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application: 24/2301/HOT
Date: First floor side extension. Additional roof light on existing front roof slope, and window on side elevation. Single storey rear extension. Change of fenestration to bedroom 4. Infilling front porch. Air conditioning unit.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 18.03.1998 Rear extension
Reference: 98/0443/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 15.02.2010 3 Windows 1 Door
Reference: 10/FEN00480/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 30.07.2010 Loft conversion and rear ground floor extension with associated works
Reference: 10/1452/IN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 22.09.2010 One or more new circuits House Dwelling Control wiring including that of
fire/security/heating/cooling/ventilation systems House Dwelling
Reference: 10/NAP00269/NAPIT

Building Control

Deposit Date: 27.09.2010 Installed a Gas Boiler
Reference: 11/FEN00975/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 31.05.2017 Install replacement windows in a dwelling Install replacement door in a
dwelling
Reference: 17/FEN01295/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 08.08.2024 Additional roof light on existing front roof slope and window on side
elevation. Single storey rear extension, change of fenestration to bedroom 4
and infilling of front porch
Reference: 24/0959/IN

Application Number	24/2301/HOT
Address	14 Marble Hill Close, Twickenham, TW1 3AY
Proposal	First floor side extension. Additional roof light on existing front roof slope, and window on side elevation. Single storey rear extension. Change of fenestration to bedroom 4. Infilling front porch. Air conditioning unit.
Contact Officer	Izabela Moorhouse
Target Determination Date	08/11/2024

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 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 application site comprises a two-storey end-of-terrace property, located on the the eastern side of Marble Hill Close. The dwelling is not designated within a conservation area and has not been identified as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM). The site is subject to the following planning constraints:

- Article 4 Direction - restricting basement development
- Critical Drainage Area
- Protected View – View from near Ham House to Orleans House
- Protected View – View to Marble Hill House (north)
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance
- Throughflow Catchment Area
- St Margarets and East Twickenham Village
- South end of Crown Road Village Character Area

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The application seeks permission for a *“First floor side extension. Additional roof light on existing front roof slope, and window on side elevation. Single storey rear extension. Change of fenestration to bedroom 4. Infilling front porch. Air conditioning unit”*.

The full planning history can be viewed above. Of relevance:

24/1232/HOT - First floor side extension. Additional roof light on existing front roof slope, and window on side elevation. Single storey rear extension. Change of fenestration to bedroom 4. Infilling front porch – **Granted**.

10/1942/HOT – Proposed rear ground floor extension – **Granted**

98/0721 – Single storey rear extension and rear and front garage extension – **Granted**

98/0231 – Garage extension to front and various single storey rear extensions – **Granted**.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

The list of neighbours notified of this application are listed above. One observational comment has been received noting no objection to the application subject to the same restrictions and limitations placed on the previously granted application be put on this current application.

5. AMENDMENTS

None.

6. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 12. Achieving well-designed places

These policies can be found at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a11af7e8f5ec000f1f8c46/NPPF_December_2023.pdf

London Plan (2021)

Policy D4 – Delivery good design
Policy D12 – Fire safety

These policies can be found at: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/the_london_plan_2021.pdf

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	Ne
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	Ne
Flood Risk	LP21	Yes	Ne

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) and its supporting documents, including all the Regulation 18 representations received, was considered at Full Council on 27 April. Approval was given to consult on the Regulation 19 Plan and, further, to submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for Examination in due course. The Publication Version Local Plan, including its accompanying documents, have been published for consultation on 9 June 2023. Together with the evidence, the Plan is a material consideration for the purposes of decision-making on planning applications. 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 Local Plan to be sound and legally compliant, officers and Councillors should accord relevant policies and allocations weight in the determination of applications taking account of the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. Note that it was agreed by Full Council that no weight will be given to Policy 4 in relation to the increased carbon offset rate, and therefore the existing rate of £95/t will continue to be applied; in addition, no weight will be given to Policy 39 in relation to the 20% biodiversity net gain requirement at this stage; all other aspects and requirements of these policies will apply.

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Flood Risk	8	Yes	Ne
Local Character and Design Quality	28	Yes	Ne
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	46	Yes	Ne

Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations
St Margarets and East Twickenham Village Planning Guidance

These policies can be found at:

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

7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

Officer Planning Report – Application 24/2301/HOT Page 4 of 8

- i Design and Impact on Heritage Assets
- ii Impact on Neighbour Amenity
- iii Flood Risk
- iv Fire Safety

Issue i - Design and Impact on Heritage Assets

Policy LP1 of the Local Plan seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area.

The Councils SPD 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. In terms of extensions, they should not dominate the existing house and should harmonise with the original appearance.

The majority of the proposals under this application are unchanged from the previously granted application and therefore the comments remain valid and have been included below.

“First floor side extension

Guidance contained within the SPD for House Extensions notes “Two storey side and rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building to ensure the extensions does not over dominate the building’s original scale and character”. The proposed first-floor extension would be located above the existing side extension, appearing as a two-storey side extension. 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 extension measures at 1.8m, less than half the width of the dwellinghouse which measures at 6.43m in width, in accordance with guidance set out in the SPD. The depth of the extension would be set back from the front elevation by approx 1m and would sit flush with the existing rear elevation.

The SPD also states that an extension can be made to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure 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 proposed side extension would be set back from the front elevation, would have a roof height lower than that of the original roof and is less than half the width of the original dwellinghouse, the proposal would be SPD compliant and appear suitably subservient to the existing house. The proposal would appear as an obvious addition and would be of a suitable scale and in keeping with the main dwellinghouse. The design is considered to respect the design and proportions of the original dwelling. Given the set in from the from the side boundary, the scheme will not result in a terracing effect or unduly unbalance the host terrace row.

The proposed materials comprise brickwork, render and tiles similar to the existing. The fenestration has been carefully designed and placed to reflect that of the remainder of the building.

The extension does achieve relative subordination to the main dwelling through careful design which lessens its visual impact. The extension retains a separation gap to the boundary allowing for views to remain between dwellings and avoiding a terracing effect.

The proposed extension would integrate with the existing roof and match the dwelling in materiality. The officer notes that the surrounding properties are varied in appearance, form and materials and therefore the proposed additional bulk and mass would not look out of character for the area.

It is noted there are existing first-floor extension in the immediate locality and as such the proposal will not harm the character or appearance of the locality.

Single storey rear extension

The proposal seeks to demolish the existing ground floor rear extension to allow for a new single storey rear flat roof extension with two rooflights, an oriel window and a set of doors. The fenestration design is considered acceptable as it retains verticality and a satisfactory window hierarchy. The roof of the extension would not exceed the cill of the first-floor rear windows and would therefore maintain subservience to the main dwelling. In terms of depth the proposal does not exceed 3m beyond the rear elevation which is considered acceptable. In terms of the immediate locality, rear extensions are a common feature and therefore the extension would not appear unduly out of character.

Front porch

The SPD states that adding a porch or canopy is one of the most significant changes a householder can make to the front of a house as it involves altering the shape of the house at its focal point.

The application site currently benefits from a front porch which would be modified. The alterations are not considered to adversely impact on the character of the street given the examples of front porches sitting flush with the bay windows along the road and in the wider area. The extension would not exceed the sill of the first-floor windows and would therefore be considered reasonably subservient addition to the host dwelling.

Alterations to fenestration

No objections are raised to the rooflight to the front roofslope. No objections are raised to the window to the side elevation of the as it matches the existing windows on the side elevation in size and design. No objections to the change to the window to the front elevation, serving bedroom 4, the opening and design remains the same so no impact will be had to the character and appearance of the front elevation”.

Air conditioning unit

The AC unit, although at first floor level, is discreetly sited to the side of the building which is only partially visible from the street due to its set back location, and therefore would not impact views towards the building. No details of an enclosure have been submitted; however, the 3D views submit do indicate an enclosure is proposed. The applicant has submitted updated drawings demonstrating an enclosure is proposed facing the flank elevation which lessens the visual impact of the unit on the surrounding area. Given the suitable setback, it would not introduce an overly dominant or visually incongruous form of development. As such, it is not considered that the development will have an adverse impact on the host building or the surrounding area.

The proposal accords with Local Plan (2018) policy LP1 and Publication Local Plan policy 28 as well as the ‘House Extensions and External Alterations’ (2015) SPD.

Issue ii- Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Policy LP8 requires all development to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties. This includes ensuring adequate light is achieved, preserving privacy and ensuring proposals are not visually intrusive.

The SPD states that in the case of terraced dwellings, single storey rear extensions should not exceed 3m. It also outlines that the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site which may justify greater projection, such as distance from the boundary; height adjacent to the boundary; use of materials and layout of neighbouring sites.

The property adjoins no. 16 to the east and neighbours no. 12 to the west. No. 12 benefits from a small rear extension and no. 16 does not benefit from any form of addition.

The majority of the proposals under this application are unchanged from the previously granted application and therefore the comments remain valid and have been included below.

“First floor side extension

The first-floor side extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling and therefore would not project further than that of no. 12. The side elevation window proposed to the extension faces a first-floor window of a similar design at no. 12. As evident from the approved application at no. 12 (ref. 23/0765/PS192), the window serves a staircase. With regards to the two, ground floor side facing window, one serves a kitchen, measuring approximately 7.8sqm, which does not constitute a habitable room. The second window serves the front hallway which again does not constitute a habitable room. Although a greater sense of enclosure and an impact to the outlook would be experienced, the existing outlook from the window is limited. Therefore, the impact of the development on the living standards to the residents of no. 12 are considered negligible. However, a condition has been placed on the permission to ensure any windows are obscure glazed to 1.7m to protect privacy.

With regard to no. 12, given the siting of the development on the opposing boundary, no harm is anticipated to these residents in terms of outlook or light or sense of enclosure.

Single storey rear extension

The SPD states that the effect of a single storey extension is usually acceptable if the projection is no further than 3m for a terraced house. The rear elevation of the proposed extension projects approximately 3m beyond the rear elevation of no. 16. Although the extension would project 4.75m beyond the rear of no. 12, this is a garage. The extension would project approximately 0.34m beyond the rear extension of no. 12. Therefore, the single storey rear extension is SPD compliant and therefore considered acceptable.

Front porch

The front porch would not be sited closer to that of no. 12 and by virtue of its siting and scale, it is not considered that would be harmful to the amenities of neighbouring properties. No harm is anticipated to the residents of no. 16.

Alterations to fenestration

No concerns are raised to the rooflights or the front elevation window”.

Air conditioning unit

A Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) by Pulsar Acoustics has been submitted to the council – received on 12/09/2024.

The submitted NIA states that outdoor noise monitoring was undertaken to determine the existing background noise climate on site. The manufacturer’s noise data was used. A receiver assessment point was positioned 1m outside the nearest openable noise sensitive bedroom window of the neighbouring house at 12 Marble Hill Close. The receiver point indicated a level of 29dBA; the lowest modal and median night-time background noise level was 32dBA L90. The noise model indicates a predicated air-conditioning noise level would be - 3dBA lower than the background sound level.

Therefore, the NIA suggests the air-conditioning unit is deemed acceptable.

The Council’s Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the submission and raises no objections and does not have any in principal objections to the proposed development subject to the satisfaction and compliance with conditions. As such, the AC unit complies with the requirements of the adopted Development Control for Noise Generating and Noise Sensitive Development SPD and with Local Plan Policies LP8 and LP10.

The proposal complies with Local Plan Policy LP8.

Issue iii - Flood Risk

Local Plan Policy LP21 requires 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 first-floor extension proposal would not exacerbate the flood risk levels on site as the proposed works would be only alterations and additions to the upper floors of the property.

In terms of the single storey rear extension, a Flood Risk Assessment Form has been submitted to the council. The proposals include a minor increase in floorspace compared to the existing, and as the floor levels proposed are no lower than that of the existing, it is not considered that any additional risk to flooding would arise, thus, the proposal complies with LP21.

In view of the above, the proposal will comply with the aims and objectives of policy LP 21.

Issue iv - Fire Safety

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

A Fire Strategy Report has been submitted to the Council - received 12/09/2024.

A condition has been included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with this Policy D12 of the London Plan.

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. 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 with conditions

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 / ~~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):IZM..... Dated:30/10/2024.....

I agree the recommendation:



Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated: ...05/11/2024.....

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: