

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 24/2898/HOT

**Address:** 10 Atwood Avenue Kew Richmond TW9 4HG

**Proposal:** Part single storey, part 2 storey side and rear extension

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mr. Mr and Mrs Richard Denman

**Address:** 12 Atwood Avenue Kew Richmond TW9 4HG

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Object to the proposal

**Comment:** In addition to our previously submitted objection, we would like to submit an additional objection to the proposed planning permission

Application: 24/2898/HOT

Address: 10 Atwood Avenue Kew Richmond TW9 4HG

Proposal: Part single storey, part 2 storey side and rear extension on the following grounds.

We also want to highlighting the differences between the existing extensions to properties in Atwood Avenue and the proposal for No10.

Layout and Density of buildings / Visual Amenity

Even though the two-storey portion of the proposed side extension at No10. is set back from the front elevation line, the bulk of the proposed two-story side extension to the boundary and its depth behind the original rear elevation line, will impact the semi-detached nature of No 10, whilst blocking light into No12 kitchen window.

It would also set a precedence for a mirror extension at No.12 which would result in a continuous run of building both to boundary and to a two-storey level filling in the existing gap between the side elevations of No.10 & No.12. thereby spoiling the semidetached nature of the properties as viewed from the road.

Currently with the exception of No14 the row of semi-detached properties on the north side of Atwood Avenue between Nos 4 and 14 have maintained their semi-detached nature by which we mean no side extensions to the boundary between the original front and rear elevation lines of the properties, and no extensions behind the property's original rear elevation line of over one story. Please see comments below about the No.14 side extension.

Differences between existing and proposed development on the street

In the submitted "design statement" a claim is made that several properties on the street have built similar 2 story side extensions, but we believe either the situation is different, or there are key differences to the proposed 2 story side extension at No10.

Re: No 14 (LBRT Ref 00/1458) – yes this property was extended to the boundary to a two storey level and extended behind the original rear elevation line of no14, but the adjacent property at No 16 has no adjacent ground floor windows to be obscured by the extension. Consequently, there was no risk of loss of light for No16 in key ground floor rooms such as a kitchen. As a consequence, the situation was different. Also as a difference No16 is a detached property with a pathway between the side elevation of no 16 and No 16's boundary hence maintaining a gap between the side elevations of No14 and 16, so there was no precedent to close a gap between semidetached properties to a two-storey level.

No 2 (Described incorrectly as no 4 in the design statement) extended to boundary – yes the detached property extends at a two-storey level to the boundary at but there is no extension behind the line of the original rear elevation of the property to the boundary, hence keeping un-obscured access to light to the neighbouring ground floor kitchen window at No4 from an approximate North Westerly direction (equivalent to the ground floor kitchen window at no 12).

Consequently, the side extension is different. No2. Is also a detached property, so is not relevant to look of the run of

3x2=6 semi detached properties from No4 to no 14 to the North of Atwood Avenue.

No 9 & 11 – yes a two story side extension has been built to the boundary at the front of the existing property, but the side extensions are reduced to one story and / or are stepped back from the boundary before they go back behind the line of the original rear elevation of the properties, which among other things allows light into the equivalent of our kitchen window at No 13 (from approx. South Westerly direction). By stepping the side extension down to one story before they extend behind the line of the original rear elevation of properties means that when walking along the pavement outside the front elevation of Nos13 & 11, and Nos 9 and 7 one can see daylight between the buildings at the rear.