



Application reference: 24/2310/HOT
 HEATHFIELD WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
13.09.2024	20.09.2024	15.11.2024	15.11.2024

Site:
 435 Hanworth Road, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5LQ

Proposal:
 Proposed two storey side extension, with part two storey rear and part 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 Pargat Chhina
 435 Hanworth Road
 Whitton
 Richmond Upon Thames
 TW4 5LQ

AGENT NAME
 Mr Sunny Bahia
 54 Keith Road
 Hayes
 UB3 4HP
 United Kingdom

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

Consultations:
Internal/External:
Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

- 32 Wyndham Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5HZ, - 20.09.2024
- 26 Wyndham Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5HZ, -
- 28 Wyndham Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5HZ, - 20.09.2024
- 24 Wyndham Crescent, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5HZ, - 20.09.2024
- 512 Hanworth Road, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5LH, - 20.09.2024
- 437 Hanworth Road, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5LQ, - 20.09.2024
- 433 Hanworth Road, Whitton, Hounslow, TW4 5LQ, - 20.09.2024

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

Development Management

Status: CEGPD Application: 24/0362/PDE
 Date: 19/03/2024 single storey rear extension (6.00m depth, 2.90 m eaves height, 3.40m overall height)

Development Management

Status: REF Application: 24/1697/HOT
 Date: 02/09/2024 Part one, part two storey side and rear extension to roof level. Alterations to side elevation windows at ground and first floor level.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:24/2310/HOT
Date: Proposed two storey side extension, with part two storey rear and part single
storey rear extension
Building Control
Deposit Date: 20.06.2007 BRECECA: Heating (central heating/ room heating/ hot water/ boiler/
controls) Dwelling house Main/ supplementary equipotential bonding
Dwelling house
Reference: 07/BRE00029/BRECECA
Building Control
Deposit Date: 05.09.2008 Remodelling of bathroom and WC to provide level access showering
facilities
Reference: 08/1829/FP
Building Control
Deposit Date: 04.12.2010 One or more new circuits
Reference: 11/ELE00411/ELECSA
Building Control
Deposit Date: 29.11.2010 1 Window 1 Door
Reference: 11/FEN00294/FENSA
Building Control
Deposit Date: 07.04.2014 1 Window 1 Door
Reference: 14/FEN00952/FENSA
Building Control
Deposit Date: 30.04.2024 Single storey rear extension, loft conversion, and all associated
works to a two storey dwelling house
Reference: 24/0521/IN

Application Number	24/2310/HOT
Address	435 Hanworth Road Whitton
Proposal	Proposed two storey side extension, with part two storey rear and part single storey rear extension
Contact Officer	ECO
Target Determination Date	15.11.2024

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 subject site is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the western side of Hanworth Road. It is not located within a conservation area.

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

- Area Proposed for Tree Planting (Site: 16/1/97)
- Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 400)
- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018) • Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Low)
- Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater (GLA Drain London) • Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000-year chance - SSA Pool ID: 46333)
- Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency
- Village (Whitton and Heathfield Village)
- Village Character Area (Argyle Avenue and surrounds - Area 7 Whitton & Heathfield Village Planning Guidance Page 35 CHARAREA01/07/03)
- Ward (Heathfield Ward)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises a two-storey side extension, with part two storey rear and part single storey rear extension as well as also involving alterations to southern side elevation windows at ground and first floor. Materials proposed are render/brick to match, tiles to match, doors and windows to match existing.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above however the most relevant planning history is as follows:

Development Management

Status: CEGPD
Date: 19/03/2024

Application: 24/0362/PDE
Single storey rear extension (6.00m depth, 2.90 m eaves height, 3.40m overall height)

Development Management

Status: Refusal
Date: 10/07/2204

Application: 24/1697/HOT
Part one, part two storey side and rear extension to roof level.
Alterations to side elevation windows at ground and first floor level.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

Three objections were received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of sunlight in neighbouring gardens
- Loss of privacy
- Create a sense of enclosure
- Exacerbate existing street parking issues
- Increased noise pollution
- Set a harmful precedent for future developments
- Overdevelopment of property

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
- D6 Housing quality and standards
- 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
Parking	47, 48	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

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

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:

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

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 House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out general guiding design principles for householder extensions. Key principles applicable to this proposal are noted below:

- *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.*
- *Avoid side extensions that project beyond the existing front elevation – Where the extension is to be subordinate to the existing house it is usually desirable to set back the extension by at least 1 metre behind the front elevation.*
- *Infilling of gaps – Development, which would result in the significant reduction of an existing important space or gap between neighbouring houses, is not normally acceptable. In conjunction with existing extensions to neighbouring buildings this can have a terracing effect on the street. Consequently, two storey side extensions should be sited 1m from the side boundary.*

Since the previous refusal (24/1697/HOT) it is recognised that the proposal has been amended to reduce the overall massing of the double storey extension, as well as remove the roof extension. The proposed height of the roof is supported, noting that it sits below the existing roof ridgeline as per the guidance in the SPD.

The proposal has been set in 1 metre from the front elevation in accordance with the SPD guidance. However, it is noted that the side extension would be located 150mm from the boundary. The neighbouring property, No. 437, has an existing flat roofed ground floor side extension. Therefore, the development, if permitted, has the potential to create a terracing affect between the application site and the neighbouring property if similarly extended, which is contrary to the SPD.

The SPD states that double storey side extensions should setback at least 1 metre from the shared boundary. Due to the type of the properties located in this area, that is large semi-detached properties, it is considered that the prevention of a terracing affect is important, as it would be out of character with the local area. This current proposed boundary arrangement is therefore not supported.

SPD guidance states 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 home study on the first floor will be greater than half the width of the original building. In this regard, it is over scaled and is therefore not supported.

There are no objections to the proposed side windows 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 3.5m in depth for a semi-detached 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.

433 Hanworth Road

The existing dwellinghouse is built to the shared boundary with 433 Hanworth Road. It is noted that 433 Hanworth Road has an existing extension of approximately 3.75 metres. The recent single storey rear extension approved under 24/0362/PDE at the subject site sits approximately 2.3 metres in front of this extension.

Due to the siting of the proposed extension, it would not be visible at all times from the neighbouring property, as it would be seen from a side view. The 45-degree clear angle test has been applied which illustrates that the proposal would not have an undue impact on daylight or overshadowing.

No windows are proposed to face No.433, therefore acceptable privacy can be maintained.

437 Hanworth Road

The proposed side extension, whilst setback 0.10m from the shared boundary, adjoins the neighbouring side elevation. It extends beyond the neighbouring rear elevation by no more than 1m. This is considered an acceptable depth, as set out in the SPD, to retain reasonable levels of neighbouring amenity.

The 45-degree clear angle test has been applied which illustrates that the proposal would not have an undue impact on daylight or overshadowing.

The proposed side facing windows are obscure glazed and with the top-opening only 1.8m, therefore acceptable privacy can be maintained.

Properties at Wyndham Crescent

Properties located on Wyndham Crescent are sufficiently setback from the proposed extension, being at least 14m from the site.

Additional rear windows are proposed on the ground and first floor. These windows are considered acceptable given the horizontal distance between the proposed development and neighbouring properties is well over 10m. This separation distance is sufficient and would have a negligible impact on the properties at Wyndham Crescent.

Similarly, given the large rear garden and separation distance, it is considered that the proposed dominance and shading effects will be negated when viewed from these neighbouring properties.

iii Flood Risk

Policy LP21 states that all developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, taking into account climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) are required in all proposals.

The site is designated by the Environment Agency as a site subject to groundwater and surface water 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.

v Parking

LP 45 Parking Standards and Servicing sets out that “the Council will require new development to make provision for the accommodation of vehicles in order to provide for the needs of the development while minimising the impact of car based travel including on the operation of the road network and local environment.” The Transport Supplementary Guidance 2020 outlines that

“dimensions for new or re-built garages are 3.0 x 6.0m. The measurements are clear internal dimensions and will allow most vehicles to park and the doors to open sufficiently for passengers to alight.”

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/zakdxqdr/richmond_transport_spd.pdf

The existing garage is approximately 2.4m in width and is no longer fit for purpose. The garage is no longer used to park a vehicle, similar with numerous other properties within the street. Whilst it may be desirable for parked vehicles to be hidden from the streetscape, there are no provision in the Local Plan which control where vehicles can be parked on a site. Regardless of whether the garage is utilised for its intended use, the proposal retains enough space for one parked car within the existing driveway. In this respect, the conversion of the garage is unlikely to result in any noticeable changes to parking arrangements on the site.

Similarly, any increase in risk to pedestrian safety will be negligible compared to existing, with no changes proposed to the access and manoeuvring arrangements.

The scheme is therefore compliant with policy LP45 of the Local 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 scheme, by reason of its siting, scale, bulk, and massing, would constitute an unsatisfactory design and a dominant addition to the existing dwellinghouse, creating a visually overbearing effect on the adjacent neighbouring properties and a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the streetscene in general. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Chapter 12 of the NPPF, policy D4 of the London Plan, policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018), and the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015).

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
 in Uniform) (*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring

This application has representations online YES NO
 (which are not on the file)

This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): ECO Dated: 16/10/2024

I agree the recommendation: CTA

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:08/11/2024.....

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: