

Application reference: 24/2547/PDE
ST MARGARETS AND NORTH TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
08.10.2024	08.10.2024	19.11.2024	19.11.2024

Site:

13 Lancaster Place, Twickenham, TW1 1HR,

Proposal:

Single storey rear extension (4.00m depth, 2.47m eaves height, 3.78m overall height).

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

APPLICANT NAME

Ms Nadine Emsley
13 Lancaster Place
Twickenham
TW1 1HR

AGENT NAME

Mr Philip Robinson
14 Deacon Close
Southampton
SO19 7BP

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

10 Lancaster Place, Twickenham, TW1 1HR -
GROUND FLOOR, BURLEY HOUSE, HIGH STREET, RAYLEIGH TOWN, RAYLEIGH, SS6 7EW -
14 Lancaster Place, Twickenham, TW1 1HR, - 11.10.2024
12 Lancaster Place, Twickenham, TW1 1HR, - 11.10.2024

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 95/2657/S192
Date: 05/09/1995 Erection Of Rear Conservatory

Development Management

Status: PCO Application: 24/2547/PDE
Date: Single storey rear extension (4.00m depth, 2.47m eaves height, 3.78m overall height).

Building Control

Deposit Date: 02.03.1995 Move kitchen to front of house
Reference: 95/0243/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 23.08.1995 Alterations to drainage works
Reference: 95/1056/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 19.04.2022 Install replacement windows in a dwelling
Reference: 24/FEN00286/FENSA

Application Number	24/2547/PDE
Address	13 Lancaster Place, Twickenham TW1 1HR
Proposal	Single storey rear extension (4.00m depth, 2.47m eaves height, 3.78m overall height).
Contact Officer	TWL
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.

By indicating that the development proposal complies with the relevant provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) ('GPDO') the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application and any previous relevant applications.

No information has been discovered revealing removal of permitted development rights, it is therefore understood that the property's permitted development rights are intact and there are no restrictive conditions or outstanding Enforcement notices covering the property

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The site is located at 13 Lancaster Place, Twickenham and contains a two-storey terraced dwelling. An existing conservatory is located to the rear of the dwelling that will be replaced by the proposed extension.

The application site is situated within Twickenham Village and is designated as:

- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency
- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Bank Top Planning App Tool - Environment Agency ()
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Higher)
- Flood Defence - Environment Agency - Buffered By LBR 20metre ()
- Floodzone 2 (Fluvial Models)
- Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater (GLA Drain London)
- Main Centre Buffer Zone (Twickenham Town Centre Boundary Buffer Zone
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 31989)
- Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency
- Take Away Management Zone (Take Away Management Zone)
- TPO Wood Group Area (REF: T0012AA - G6 Robinia - Robinia pseudoacacia)
- Village (Twickenham Village)
- Ward (St. Margarets and North Twickenham Ward)

The site is not located on Article 2(3) land.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension measuring 4m deep, 2.47m eaves height, and 3.78m overall height.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above. There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

4. ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE GPDO CRITERIA

This application is for determination as to whether prior approval of a larger home extension is required. The determination is made in relation to the provisions of Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order.

A.1 Development is not permitted by Class A if:

		Complies	
A	Permission to use the dwellinghouse as a dwellinghouse has been granted only by virtue of Class M, N, P, PA or Q of Part 3 of this Schedule (changes of use);	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
B	As a result of the works, the total area of ground covered by buildings within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse (other than the original dwellinghouse) would exceed 50% of the total area of the curtilage (excluding the ground area of the original dwellinghouse);	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
C	The height of the part of the dwellinghouse enlarged, improved or altered would exceed the height of the highest part of the roof of the existing dwellinghouse	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
D	The height of the eaves of the part of the dwellinghouse enlarged, improved or altered would exceed the height of the eaves of the existing dwellinghouse	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
E	The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall which- Forms the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse; or Fronts a highway and forms a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse;	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
F	Subject to paragraph (g), The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would have a single storey and- Extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by more than 4 metres in the case of a detached dwellinghouse, or 3 metres in the case of any other dwellinghouse, Exceed 4 metres in height	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - refer to G below
G	For a dwellinghouse not on article 2(3) land nor on a site of special scientific interest, the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would have a single storey and - Extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by more than 8 metres in the case of a detached dwellinghouse, or 6 metres in the case of any other dwellinghouse, or Exceed 4 metres in height	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
H	The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would have more than a single storey and- (i) Extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by more than 3 meters, or (ii) Be within 7 meters of any boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse being enlarged which is opposite the rear wall of that dwellinghouse	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
I	The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would be within 2 meters of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, and the height of the eaves of the enlarged part would exceed 3 meters	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
J	The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, and would- Exceed 4 meters in height, Have more than a single storey, or Have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse;	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
JA	Any total enlargement (being the enlarged part together with any existing enlargement of the original dwellinghouse to which it will be joined) exceeds or would exceed the limits set out in sub-paragraphs (e) to (j);	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
K	It would consist of or include--- (i) The construction or provision of a verandah, balcony or raised platform, (ii) The installation, alteration or replacement of a microwave antenna, (iii) The installation, alteration or replacement of a chimney, flue or soil and vent pipe, or (iv) An alteration to any part of the roof of the dwellinghouse.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
L	The dwellinghouse is built under Part 20 of this Schedule (construction of new dwellinghouses).	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

A.3 Development is permitted by Class A subject to the following conditions-

		Complies		
A	The materials used in any exterior work (other than materials used in the construction of a conservatory) must be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B	Any upper-floor window located in a wall or roof slope forming a side elevation of the dwellinghouse must be obscure-glazed, and non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed; and	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C	Where the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse has more than a single storey, or forms an upper storey on an existing enlargements of the original dwellinghouse, the roof pitch of the enlarged part must, so far as practicable, be the same as the roof pitch of the original dwellinghouse	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A <input type="checkbox"/>

5. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Adjoining neighbours have been consulted on the application, two objections have been received from 12 and 10 Lancaster Place, and one observation from 14 Lancaster Place. The comments from 12 and 14 Lancaster Place are represented by Ms Alice Cook (PA Planning). The following summarises the comments received from all three objections:

- The height, design and proximity of the development may result in unreasonable overshadowing and thus a loss of sunlight and daylight.
- Alterations that modify the exterior appearance or footprint of properties here may diminish the charm and heritage value of Lancaster Place as a cohesive Neo-Georgian development, detracting from the area's visual appeal.
- No.12 Lancaster Place is already between two existing conservatories, which can lead to an enclosed and 'tunnelled' in appearance at the rear of the property. This would be exacerbated by the proposed rear extension at No. 13, which is larger and more incongruous than the existing conservatory. The tunnelling effect would compromise the purpose of having the large rear glazed doors to maximise the light coming into the room at the rear of No. 12. By diminishing daylight and creating a sense of enclosure.
- The extension's disproportionate scale would undermine the harmony between terrace properties, leading to a visual imbalance that would harm the overall character of the area.
- The proposed extension would detrimentally impact the living conditions, and the sense of enjoyment from their property at No. 12.
- The proposed rear extension would project 4m into the rear garden, which is beyond the accepted 3m in the house extensions and external alterations SPD. The impact of the proposed extension would be further exacerbated by the limited space available within the terraced layout, where such developments are especially impactful on neighbouring views and open space.
- The large scale and size (4m depth by 3.78m height) of the proposed extension is not in keeping with the other neighbouring properties. The proposed development is a direct contravention of Policy 4.19. It does not respect local context and street pattern or the scale and proportions of surrounding buildings and would be entirely out of the character of the area, to the detriment of the local environment.

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), under Class A.4(1), paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 10 state that:

- 7) *Where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, the prior approval of the local planning authority is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises.*
- 8) *The local planning authority may require the developer to submit such further information regarding the proposed development as the authority may reasonably require in order to determine the application.*
- 9) *The local planning authority must, when considering the impact referred to in sub-paragraph (7)—*
 - (a) *take into account any representations made as a result of the notice given under sub-paragraph (5); and*
 - (b) *consider the amenity of all adjoining premises, not just adjoining premises which are the subject of representations.*
- 10) *The development must not begin before the occurrence of one of the following—*
 - (a) *the receipt by the developer from the local planning authority of a written notice that their prior approval is not required;*

- (b) *the receipt by the developer from the local planning authority of a written notice giving their prior approval; or*
- (c) *the expiry of 42 days following the date on which the information referred to in sub-paragraph (2) was received by the local planning authority without the local planning authority notifying the developer as to whether prior approval is given or refused.*

Having regard to the above provisions, the following provides an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the adjoining premises, taking into account the representations that have been received on behalf of 12 and 14 Lancaster Place.

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. 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.

10 Lancaster Place

This property is two doors down from the subject site. The objections raised by the owner of No.10 relate more generally to impacts on the character of the area, whilst also raising concerns with the visual impact of the proposal. In terms of residential amenity impacts such as sense of enclosure or overbearing, given the scale of the proposal and the location of No.10, it is not considered that these would result in unacceptable impacts to the enjoyment of No.10.

12 Lancaster Place

12 Lancaster Place forms a terraced dwelling adjoining the host dwelling. The dwelling is two stories with no rear extension or development to the rear of the property.

The proposed rear extension at the host dwelling is 4m deep which would extend beyond the existing conservatory by approximately 0.5m. The height to the eaves of the extension is 2.4m, therefore is not in compliance with the SPD.

Based on the representation letter provided on behalf of the owner of No.12 Lancaster Place, access to daylight and sunlight from the rear dining room (habitable) within this dwelling is via bifold doors. It is estimated the proposed rear extension could possibly satisfy the 45-degree BRE test in elevation, however, is likely to still result in overshadowing due to the overall height of the extension (3.8m) and height at the boundary. A single window is proposed on the side roof slope; therefore, no adverse overlooking or privacy impacts are anticipated.

14 Lancaster Place

14 Lancaster Place forms a terraced dwelling adjoining the host dwelling. The dwelling is two stories with no rear extension or other development to the rear of the property.

As above, the proposed rear extension at the host dwelling is 4m deep which would extend beyond the existing conservatory by approximately 0.5m. The representation letter received from Ms Cook provides details in relation to daylight and overshadowing and provides an assessment of the BRE Preliminary Test, concluding that the proposed extension would not satisfy the 45-degree test. No information is provided by the applicant to confirm compliance with a BRE test. Nevertheless, it is considered that the proposed extension would adversely impact daylight and result in overshadowing to No.14 Lancaster Place.

A single window is proposed on the side roof slope; therefore, no adverse overlooking or privacy impacts are anticipated.

As identified above, the proposed development has been subject to objections from both adjoining neighbours. The proposal therefore has been assessed in terms of residential amenity impacts. The proposal does not comply with The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations, and it is considered to not be consistent with policy LP8 of the Local Plan.

6. RECOMMENDATION

The prior approval of the Council is required and refused.

The prior approval of the Council is refused for the development

Reason for Refusal:

Objections were received from neighbouring occupiers at 10, 12 and 14 Lancaster Place. As required by Part A.4, the Local Planning Authority is required to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises. On assessment, the proposed extension by reason of its combined depth, height, and siting would result in an unduly overbearing and visually obtrusive form of development with unacceptable sunlight/daylight impacts to the detriment of the residential and visual amenities of the adjacent occupants. The proposal is thereby contrary to the NPPF, Local Plan, in particular, Policy LP 8, and the 'House Extensions and External Alterations' 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): TWL

Dated: 07/11/2024

I agree the recommendation: SGS

Senior Planner

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

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: