

Application reference: 24/2316/HOT TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
16.09.2024	30.09.2024	25.11.2024	25.11.2024

Site:

9 Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HN,

Proposal:

New single storey full width front extension and rear extension.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Jez Byrne
9 Cambridge Road
Twickenham
TW1 2HN

AGENT NAME

Mr Jonathan Norris
5 Roman Close
Acton
London
W3 8HE

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

10 Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HL, - 01.10.2024
8A Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HL, - 01.10.2024
8 Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HL, - 01.10.2024
12 Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HL, - 01.10.2024
10A Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HL, - 01.10.2024
12 Clevedon Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HU, - 01.10.2024
14 Clevedon Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HU, - 01.10.2024
13 Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HN, - 01.10.2024
7 Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HN, -
11 Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HN, -

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

Development Management

Status: PDE

Application: 24/2316/HOT

Date:

New single storey full width front extension and rear extension.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 28.07.2011

Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 11/FEN02738/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 28.07.2011

Circuit alteration or addition in a kitchen/special location

Reference: 11/ELE00840/ELECSA

Application Number	24/2316/HOT
Address	9 Cambridge Road, Twickenham, TW1 2HN
Proposal	New single storey full width front extension and rear extension.
Contact Officer	Kerry McLaughlin

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 proposal property is a two-storey, terrace dwelling, located on the eastern side of Cambridge Road.

The application site is subject to the following planning constraints:

Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency	Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 50% <75% - SSA Pool ID: 310
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Floodzone 2	Fluvial / Tidal Models
Floodzone 3	Tidal Models
SFRA Zone 3a High Probability	Flood Zone 3
Village	St Margarets and East Twickenham Village
Village Character Area	South of Richmond Bridge - Area 5 (PART 1) East Twickenham Village Planning Guidance Page 24 CHARAREA08/05/01
Ward	Twickenham Riverside Ward

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

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

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.

6 letters of objection have been received, from 3 interested parties. These comments are summarised as follows:

- Loss of light and overshadowing.
- Layout and density of the building.
- Design, appearance and materials.
- Visually intrusive.
- The new roof structures, both front and back, are disproportionately large.
- Sense of enclosure.
- The proposed design fails to take into account the character layout and scale of the original house and adjoining properties.
- Noise and disturbance resulting from use.

Neighbour amenity considerations are assessed under Section 7 in the report below.

5. AMENDMENTS

Prior to officer assessment the applicant submitted the following amendments:

- Drawing 24/B/17/A - Sections with the end parapets lowered to accord with the previously submitted elevations.
- Drawing 24/B/15/A - Front and rear elevations showing more fully the elevations of the existing extensions to either side which were previously only indicated with an outline. The height of the proposed extensions has not been changed. The drawing also clarifies that the proposed extensions do not cross the party line. Sections of brick on the extensions have been changed to painted render (to match the neighbouring extensions).
- Drawing 24/B/12/A - Ground and first floor plans with the front extension shown stopping precisely on the party line. This was already the case at the rear, but the exact positions of the neighbouring extensions have been adjusted slightly following additional site measurements.

Neighbours were not re-consulted given no material amendment to the original scheme.

6. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4 - Decision-making
- 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

These policies can be found at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65819679fc07f3000d8d4495/NPPF_December_2023.pdf

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 - Delivering good design
- D12 - Fire Safety
- SI12 - Flood risk management

These policies can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/london-plan-2021>

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
Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
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.

Where relevant to the application under consideration, this is addressed in more detail in the assessment below.

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Local Character and Design Quality	LP28	Yes	No
Amenity and Living Conditions	LP46	Yes	No
Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP8	Yes	No

These policies can be found at https://www.richmond.gov.uk/draft_local_plan_publication_version

Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations
St Margarets and East Twickenham Village Plan

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:

- i Design/Visual Amenity
- ii Neighbour Amenity
- iii Flood Risk
- iv Biodiversity

Issue i - Design/Visual Amenity

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 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.

Front Extension

Council guidance contained in the SPD 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) encourages the retention of the original form of the host property and any alterations should enhance the quality of the building and 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 document requires extensions to be subservient to the host building and compatible with its design and scale.

The same document further argues that "where the extension is to be subordinate to the existing house it is usually desirable to set back the extension by at least 1m behind the front elevation."

In light of the above statement, the proposed single-storey front extension would not comply with the SPD 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) in terms of its siting beyond the front elevation of the original building. However, front extensions of various designs have been approved to the front elevations of the properties within the terrace row and now form a part of the character of the area. The specific circumstances here with the front elevation being set considerably back from the street frontage and behind tall front boundary treatments is such that the extension would not appear visually intrusive or incongruous within the streetscene. The single-storey front extension is therefore considered acceptable in this instance. This also confirms that the proposal would not result in an incongruous addition to host dwelling or wider locality.

The extension would be of a modest depth of 2.5m, and would be no higher than the neighbouring front

extensions at No's 7 & 11 Cambridge Road.

The exterior materials comprise cream brick and render to match that of the existing, with grey GRP flat roof. The proposed style of the windows/door opening, and overall appearance of the extension would be in keeping with the appearance of the host dwelling, as well as the extensions found along the wider terrace row.

Rear Extension

The proposal seeks to erect a full-width, single-storey rear extension. The extension comprises a flat roof, incorporating 2x skylights within. The height of the extension will be sited comfortably below the cill of the first-floor level fenestration, as required under SPD. Given the proposed dimensions in comparison to the existing built form, the rear extension will not appear overly dominant and will appear subordinate to the original building.

The proposed exterior materials comprise cream brick and render to match that of the existing, with grey GRP flat roof, this ensures the development will integrate satisfactorily with the original dwellinghouse. With regard to fenestration, the scheme proposes largely glazed windows/doors to the rear elevation. The proposed fenestration retains window hierarchy, as outlined in the 'House Extensions and External Alterations' SPD. The contemporary glazing assists in reducing the visual bulk and contributes to helping the extension appear an obvious addition to the main dwellinghouse. No objections are raised with regard to materials.

The amenity space in the rear garden would be reduced as a result of the proposal. However, the reduction will not be significant, when compared to the rear garden area and does not harm local character.

When viewed in the context of the neighbouring additions, it is considered that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Due to the siting, this element of the works will not form views from the front of the dwelling/street scene, having a neutral impact on the public realm.

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable in terms of design/visual amenity. The proposal is not considered to detrimentally impact the character of the wider area or host building and therefore, is in line with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018), these policy objectives are taken forward in publication local plan policy LP28, and relevant supplementary planning documents.

Issue ii - 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. 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.

Front Extension

Planning history 18/1476/HOT indicates that the front extension at No.7 protrudes ~2.4m in depth, and 07/2685/HOT indicates that the front extension at No.11 protrudes 2.5m.

The proposal is not considered to unduly impact the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Based on the SPD for 'House Extensions and External Alterations' the effect of a single-storey extension on daylight and sunlight is usually considered acceptable if the projection is no further than 3m in the case of a terraced dwellinghouse. As the projection is 2.5m, and will sit adjacent to similar extensions measuring a similar depth, the proposal is not foreseen to cause significant impact to the adjacent properties in terms of loss of light. The proposal also passes the Building Research Establishment. Given the extension will only project by 2.5m, and the existing onsite situation at the neighbouring sites, the scheme is not considered to be visually overbearing when seen from the gardens or rooms of adjoining houses and is thereby considered satisfactory in terms of amenity.

Impact on other properties along Cambridge Road

Considering the scale, design, location, siting, depth and materials of the proposed front extension, the proposal would have no adverse impact on the surrounding occupiers in daylight/sunlight, overbearing, visual intrusion and loss of privacy terms.

Rear Extension

Both neighbouring property numbers 7 & 11 Cambridge Road comprise single-storey rear extensions, abutting the shared boundary line. The proposed extension would project no more than 3m beyond the rear elevation of these extensions, this is considered an acceptable projection which would satisfy the guidelines set out in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD. It is considered that the proposed rear extension will not result in any undue overbearing, loss of light, visual intrusion or create a sense of enclosure to either of these properties.

As this proposal is at ground level only the proposal does not raise any issues in terms of loss of privacy.

The proposal would not cause an unreasonable loss of outdoor amenity space, as required under SPD.

The property would remain solely in residential use as a result of the proposal. An undue increase in noise or pollution would not occur as a result of the proposal.

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity. The proposal is not considered to detrimentally impact the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers and therefore, is in line with policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018), these policy objectives are taken forward in publication local plan policy LP46, and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance.

Issue iii - Flood Risk

Policy LP21 of the Local Plan states '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 application site is situated within a flood risk zones 2, 3 and SFRA 3a.

The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment which states "the Design Flood Level is 6.35m AOD. This is the highest level and corresponds to the river/sea flood level.

The National Planning Guidance standing advice and Environment Agency recommends the development finished floor level 600mm above the design flood level. However, this level can be reduced if there is a high level of certainty about the estimated flood level. For this site the estimated free board level has been determined to be 0.6m above the design flood level. The finished floor level should be 6.95m AOD. It would involve a height differential of 0.65m. It is not possible to achieve this FFL due to access and site constraints. A level of 6.4m AOD is achieved. This level is as per the FFL of the existing building. Therefore, flood mitigation interventions have been proposed.

Subject to condition ensuring the development is undertaken in accordance with the submitted 'Flood Risk Assessment, by RIDA, ref: R0727 FRA-V1, dated Sep-24' the proposals can be undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF (2023) and Local Plan (2018) policy LP21, these policy objectives are taken forward in publication local plan policy LP8.

Issue iv - Biodiversity

Biodiversity net gain became mandatory for minor developments on applications made from 2nd April 2024. This application is exempt from mandatory biodiversity net gain on the grounds that is a householder application.

Other Matters

Fire Safety

The applicant has submitted a 'Planning Fire Safety Strategy' as required under policy D12 of the London Plan (2021), confirming compliance with the following requirements:

- 1) *identify suitably positioned unobstructed outside space: a) for fire appliances to be positioned on b) appropriate for use as an evacuation assembly point*
- 2) *are designed to incorporate appropriate features which reduce the risk to life and the risk of serious injury in the event of a fire; including appropriate fire alarm systems and passive and active fire safety measures*
- 3) *are constructed in an appropriate way to minimise the risk of fire spread*
- 4) *provide suitable and convenient means of escape, and associated evacuation strategy for all building users*
- 5) *develop a robust strategy for evacuation which can be periodically updated and published, and which all building users can have confidence in*
- 6) *provide suitable access and equipment for firefighting which is appropriate for the size and use of the development.*

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.

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

Although some aspects of the scheme are not in strict conformity with the technical standards set out in the SPD, there are mitigating circumstances (established character of the area) to ensure that the scheme would not compromise the aims of adopted policy or cause demonstrable harm. Therefore, in this case, there are circumstances to justify an exception to the strict application of guidance and policy.

Grant planning permission with conditions

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): KM

Dated: 14/11/2024

I agree the recommendation:

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Head of Development Management / South Area Team Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

South Area Team Manager:ND.....

Dated:14.11.2024.....