

Application reference: 24/2460/HOT HEATHFIELD WARD

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

Site:

68 Ryecroft Avenue, Twickenham, TW2 6HR,

Proposal:

single storey 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 Eamon McConigley
68 Ryecroft Avenue
Twickenham
Richmond Upon Thames
TW2 6HR

AGENT NAME

Mr Nigel Fallon
164 Japonica Lane
Willen Park
Milton Keynes
MK15 9EE

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:
Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

66 Ryecroft Avenue, Whitton, Twickenham, TW2 6HR - 03.10.2024
70 Ryecroft Avenue, Twickenham, TW2 6HR, - 03.10.2024
66 Ryecroft Avenue, Twickenham, TW2 6HR, - 03.10.2024

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

Development Management

Status: REF Application:24/1952/HOT
Date:24/09/2024 single storey rear extension

Development Management

Status: PDE Application:24/2460/HOT
Date: single storey rear extension

Building Control

Deposit Date: 12.09.2009 13 Windows
Reference: 09/FEN02115/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 24.04.2019 Install a gas-fired boiler
Reference: 19/FEN01515/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 20.09.2024 Single storey rear extension and formation of shower room and utility room
Reference: 24/1194/FP

Building Control

Deposit Date: 05.11.2024 Single storey rear extension and formation of shower room and utility room
Reference: 24/1194/FP/1

Application Number	24/2460/HOT
Address	68 Ryecroft Avenue, Twickenham TW2 6HR
Proposal	Single storey rear extension
Contact Officer	Phil Shipton
Target Determination Date	25/11/2024

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 consists of a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse, located on the western side of Ryecroft Avenue, backing onto the Twickenham Cemetery. The existing dwellinghouse consists of a rear conservatory, that projects approximately 2.0m from the dwellinghouse proper and has a height of 2.6m.

Ryecroft Avenue is characterised by two-storey duplex (semi-detached) dwellinghouses, with narrow shared driveways which provide access to old, conjoined garages to the rear. Some garages have been brought forward to the site frontage and often accompanied by two-storey side extensions; however, these are not common. The dwellinghouses all consists of rear conservatories or other extension of relatively shallow depth, and with a lean-to roof. Where modern flat roof extensions have been constructed, these are kept at the roof height akin to that of neighbouring rear conservatories.

The application site is situated within the Percy Road, Ryecroft Road and Surrounds - Area 9 of the Whitton & Heathfield Village Character Area and is designated as:

- Area Poorly Provided With Public Open Space
- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency
- Article 4 Direction Basements
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band - Low
- Land Use Past Industrial - HOSPITAL BRIDGE ROAD Start: 1920 End: 1929
- Main Centre Buffer Zone
- Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency
- Take Away Management Zone

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises a single storey rear extension, with a depth of 3.5m, width of 6.47m, and height of 3.0m. The proposal will include a folding/sliding glass door across the majority of the rear facade, and a roof lantern located in the centre of the extension. The side walls will be rendered to match the existing side wall finish.

The applicant has confirmed that the existing garage is to be demolished as part of the proposal.

An application for a similar proposal was refused the 24th September 2024 under ref. 24/1952/HOT due to the rear extension, by reason of its siting, scale, bulk, and massing, would constitute poor design and a visually incongruous and dominant addition to the dwellinghouse, creating a visually overbearing effect on the adjacent neighbouring properties with adverse daylight/sunlight implications.

The key difference between the current and previously refused application is a reduction in rear extension depth of 0.5m and reduction in height of 0.3m.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters 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
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

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
- D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- 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	
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
Village Plan - Whitton & Heathfield

These policies can be found at:

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

Other Local Strategies or Publications

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2021

Biodiversity Net Gain

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 it is a householder application.

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

i Design and impact on local character

Chapter 12 of the NPPF advises that *poorly designed developments should be refused, especially where designs do not reflect local design policies, guidance and supplementary planning documents. It also says that significant weight should be given to designs which reflect local character, or to ones which are innovative designs in achieving high levels of sustainability, or which help improve the general standard of design in an area and fit in with the 'overall form and layout of their surroundings.*

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 Council's SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations (the 'SPD') 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 proposal includes a ground floor rear extension to a depth of 2.0m beyond the existing conservatory, and 3.5m when measured from the existing building proper. The extension is proposed for the full width of the dwellinghouse. The SPD specifies that 3.5m is generally a maximum depth anticipated for a semi-detached dwellinghouse.

The proposed extension will appear as a not insignificant addition to the rear of the dwellinghouse, largely owing to the increased height of the extension being a maximum height of 3.0m and approximately 0.5m above that of the existing conservatory, despite only extending 2.0m beyond the conservatory to the rear. As such, the height of the extension will sit slightly above that of the adjoining extension at No.70.

The material difference is most notable on the northern side elevation, where partial glazed facade is to be

replaced with a solid wall. Similarly, the proposal will introduce a solid wall to the southern boundary. The rear elevation, however, maintains a large proportion of glazing.

The subject site will retain a significant back yard area, and benefits from additional separation from the property at No. 66 owing to the shared driveway area, separating the buildings by approximately 3.1m. The removal of the garage will also open the rear garden and act to re-balance the built-open space relationship on site.

The extension is considered to harmonise with the existing dwellinghouse and be generally in-keeping with the form and architectural design of rear extensions found within Ryecroft Avenue.

The bulk of the proposed extension would not over-dominate the neighbouring properties. In light of the previously refused application, the current proposal seeks a scale that is more proportionate and respecting of the neighbouring properties.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with Policy LP1 of the Local Plan, Policy 28 of the Publication Local Plan, as well as the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.

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.

It is stated in the SPD that extensions that create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted. This could be due to the height, footprint or proximity of the proposals to the surrounding area.

The SPD notes that 'residential development should create good living conditions and should not cause any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms or gardens in neighbouring properties. When assessing such, the Council will be guided by the Building Research Establishment (BRE).'

The subject site has one directly adjoining property, no.70 to the south, and a neighbouring property No.66 to the north separated by a shared access.

No.70

The proposed extension will protrude 1.5m beyond the rear of the property at No.70, at a height of approximately 3.0m.

A BRE 45-degree test is shown on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan. This shows the proposed extension would meet the 45-degree test at the mid-point of the nearest living space window at No.70, as required by 3.3 of the SPD. It is considered No.70 is less affected by potential loss of daylight/sunlight due to the orientation of the sun path favouring No.70.

No windows or other openings are proposed for the southern facade, and therefore no overlooking/privacy issues are of concern.

No. 66

The proposed extension will protrude 3.5m beyond the rear of the property at No.66, at a height of approximately 3.0m. No.66 benefits from additional separation by the shared access, meaning the proposal would not be overbearing.

The sunlight/daylight plan shows the proposed extension would meet the 45-degree test at the mid-point of the nearest window at No.66.

No windows or other openings are proposed for the northern facade, and therefore no overlooking/privacy issues are of concern.

Under the previously refused application 24/1952/HOT, the residents at No.66 raised observation to the form of a new boundary fence in replacement of the demolished garage on the subject site. Any new fencing must enable vehicle access to the garage of number 66 to be maintained. It should be noted that these garage doors are hinged and need to be able to be opened beyond 90 degrees in order to give vehicle access.

The drainage located within the shared access will also be retained and protected during construction. As annotated on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan, a minimum clearance of 500mm is proposed between the closest edge of the manhole and the new foundations/wall.

Summary

In view of the above, the proposal complies with Policy LP8 of the Local Plan, Policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan, as well as the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.

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.*

The site is designated by the Environment Agency as a site subject to groundwater flooding and surface water flooding (area less susceptible to).

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 submitted with the application. A condition will be included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis.

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. 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): PSH

Dated: 07/11/2024

I agree the recommendation: SGS

Senior Planner

Dated:22/11/24.....

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:

REASONS:
CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:
UDP POLICIES:
OTHER POLICIES:

The following table will populate as a quick check by running the template once items have been entered into Uniform

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

CONDITIONS

INFORMATIVES

U0095601	Composite Informative
U0095603	Boundary Fencing
U0095602	NPPF APPROVAL - Para 38-42
BNG02	Biodiversity Gain Plan No Pre-Approval