

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 25/0065/HOT

Address: 38 Warren Road Twickenham TW2 7DL

Proposal: First floor rear extension

Comments Made By

Name: Mr. Roger Cummins

Address: 47 Warren Road Twickenham TW2 7DH

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: The owner of property lives at number 36A however application shows he resides at 38 Warren Road not sure if relevant.

The proposed **first-floor rear extension**, by virtue of its cumulative impact, siting, design, scale, width, and height, would fail to remain proportionate or subordinate to the host property. Instead, it would introduce an overbearing and incongruous addition that is wholly uncharacteristic of the surrounding area. The development would significantly disrupt the visual harmony of the locality, appearing excessively dominant and intrusive when viewed from neighbouring properties and, notably, from the rear street perspective.

Furthermore, the proposed extension would result in a detrimental impact on the **character and appearance** of the area, failing to respect the established architectural rhythm and spatial qualities of the surroundings. Its bulk and massing would create an imposing and oppressive presence, leading to an unacceptable sense of enclosure and loss of openness for adjacent residents.

The proposal is therefore in direct conflict with Policy CP7 of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), which seeks to protect local character as well as Policies DM DC1 and DM DC5 of the adopted Development Management Plan (2011), which emphasise the importance of good design and safeguarding residential amenities. Additionally, the proposal fails to adhere to the principles outlined in the House Extensions & External Alterations SPD, which seeks to ensure that extensions remain sympathetic and proportionate to their host buildings.

Moreover, the proposal is contrary to Policy LP1 (Local Character and Design Quality) and **Policy LP8 (Amenity and Living Conditions)** of the adopted Local Plan, which aim to **preserve the character and amenity** of local areas by preventing **inappropriate development** that may result in adverse visual and residential impacts.

In conclusion, the proposed extension represents an unacceptable form of development that would harm both the character of the host property and the **wider area**, warranting refusal on the grounds of design, scale, and impact on neighbouring amenity.