

## Application reference: 07/1770/HOT SOUTH TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
21.05.2007	07.06.2007	02.08.2007	02.08.2007

**Site:**

40 Holmes Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4RE

**Proposal:**

Loft Conversion At Side And Rear.

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr And Mrs Pryer  
40 Holmes Road  
Twickenham  
Middlesex  
TW1 4RE

**AGENT NAME**

Englishaus Ltd  
30 Lawrence Road  
Hampton  
Middlesex  
TW12 2RJ

---

**DC Site Notice:** printed on

**Consultations:**

*Internal/External:*

**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

33 Holmes Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4RF, - 08.06.2007  
38 Holmes Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4RE, - 08.06.2007  
66 Popes Grove, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4JX, - 08.06.2007  
68 Popes Grove, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4JX, - 08.06.2007  
70 Popes Grove, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4JX, - 08.06.2007  
35 Holmes Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4RF, - 08.06.2007  
37 Holmes Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4RF, - 08.06.2007  
39 Holmes Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4RF, - 08.06.2007  
42 Holmes Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW1 4RE, - 08.06.2007

**History:**

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
07/1770/HOT	• Loft Conversion At Side And Rear.	PCO	

**Constraints:**

Application Ref: 07/1770/HOT  
40 Holmes Road  
Twickenham

**Site, History and Proposal:**

The property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The main roof of the property has a side-facing gable and there is a large two-storey outrigger to the rear of the property. The site is not located within a Conservation Area nor is the property a Listed Building or Building of Townscape Merit. There is no planning history for the property. The application proposes a 'roof extension', continuing the side facing gable and terminating at a 60-degree mansard to the rear of the outrigger. The proposal would involve replacing the entirety of the rear facing roof slope.

**Representations/Consultations:** None.

**Professional Comments**

The main issues for consideration are the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring properties, the existing dwelling and street scene.

The extension would add significantly to the massing of the building would have some effect on the adjacent property. However, given its location on the roof of the property it is not considered that this alone would warrant refusal of the proposal. Given the presence of first and second floor windows on both adjacent properties it is not considered that the proposal would compromise the privacy of these properties to the extent that would warrant refusal of the application.

Policy BLT 11 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan seeks to promote a high standard of design, ensuring (*Inter alia*) that schemes are compatible with the scale and character of the existing development. More specific advice on design is contained within the Council's *Design Guidelines for House Extensions and External Alterations*, which has been adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance. The Design Guidelines recommend that roof extensions should be in scale with the existing structure and a significant area of the original roof should be retained beneath and to either side of dormer windows - it contains a general presumption against overly dominant roof extensions.

The proposed roof extension would clearly dominate the existing roof and it is considered to be out of proportion with the property. It is therefore contrary to Policy BLT 11 and the Council's Design Guidelines. The adjacent property (no. 38) has a large roof extension, although this does not benefit from planning permission (Council records indicate that building work was completed in 2000 - BC 00/0832/BN). Number 44 Holmes Road has a large Mansard roof extension similar to the current proposal - this also does not benefit from planning permission and it is noted that there is an enforcement case pending on this property (EC 06/0558/EN/UWB).

The proposed roof extension by reason of its design, mass and prominent position would result in an overly dominant addition to the main roof, visually intrusive and detrimental to the character of the house in particular, and the appearance of the locality of which it forms a part. It would therefore be contrary to policy BLT 11 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan - First Review 2005 and the Council's Design Guidelines for House Extensions and External Alterations, which has been adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

**Recommendation:** I therefore recommend Refusal.

- no longer able to distinguish the original/symmetry to the shared rear outrigger of this pair of semi's which is considered the principle design feature to the rear elevation. harmful to appearance + character of existing property

