

DRAFT REPORT/DELEGATED DECISION SHEET

1/2

Ref: 03/3007/HOT

PLANNING PERMISSION/LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT

Contact: Mr C J Bennett

Extn.: 4581

Ward:
App Rec'd: 29/09/2003

APPLICANT: S LEVER

AGENT: ENGLISHAUS ARCHITECTS
Site: 1 GLOUCESTER ROAD
HAMPTON



Proposal: ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH GARAGE AND
WORKSHOP TO FRONT AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY LINK
EXTENSION TO REAR

* EH may direct		Full Planning	
Decision by R.U.T.		Outline	
Listed Building Consent		Other	
C.A. Consent		Council	Committee
RECOMMENDATION:	APPROVE/ CONSENT	REFUSE	OTHER ENFORCEMENT/ COURT ACTION
Prepared by <i>CJ Bennett</i>	Submitted for decision by		
Date: 24/11/03	PLANNING AND TRNSPT COMMITTEE	PLANNING SUB-CTTEE	DELEGATED POWERS
TEAM LEADER Agreed	Date:	Date:	Date:
PPO Agreed	Application dealt with under delegated authority by <i>[Signature]</i>		
Date:	on: 24/11/03		

Visit neighbouring property · YES / NO DATE:

CONTINUED ...

THE FOLLOING PROPERTIES WERE CONSULTED ON 14th October, 2003

The Occupier, 1a Gloucester Road, Hampton, TW12,
The Occupier, Gloucester Road, Hampton, TW12, Local Amenity groups
The Occupier, 12 Gloucester Road, Hampton, TW12
The Occupier, 38 Wensleydale Road, Hampton, TW12
The Occupier, 40 Wensleydale Road, Hampton, TW12,

THE FOLLOWING PROPERTIES WERE CONSULTED AT APPEAL STAGE

STANDARD CONSULTATIONS WHERE APPLICABLE CAN BE SEEN AT THE END OF THIS REPORT

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

UDP 8 22
ENV 10, 23 & 24
BLT 11, 14, 15 & 16 ENV 9 Specify

Supplementary Planning Guidance _____
Conservation Area Study/Proposal _____
Conservation Area Description: _____
Conservation Area Number: [] _____
Listed Building Grade: [] _____
Conflict with Development Plan: _____
Building of Townscape Merit: _____ Tick
Tree Preservation Order No.: 525 T-1 Yew
Advertised: [] _____
Site Notice: [] _____
CAAG: [] _____
Metropolitan Open Land: _____
Area of Mixed Use: _____
Key Shopping Frontage: _____ Tick
Secondary Shopping Frontage: _____ &
Archaeological Priority Zone: _____ Specify
Other

PRESENT USE (If vacant previous use if commercial give name)

SFD

Site History & Proposal 2 storey detached
house already under extension with:-
- Part single part 2 storey rear extension of 98/0253
- Demolition of existing garage & erection of new garage
of 98/0254
- Erection of detached sunroom house of 99/1698

A planning application ref 03/1342/HOT for
a 2 storey side extension with garage and workshop
and a single storey link extension at the rear was
withdrawn in June following advice from
the case officer (CJB) that the proposal
was unacceptable because it would prejudice
visibility of a yellow tree the subject of a TPO
and have a detrimental and overbearing impact
upon the adjoining properties. The applicant's
agent was advised that the extension should be
reduced in width by omitting the garage
and setting the extension back 7.5m from the main
front wall of the existing house.

The architect subsequently involved social
services and Occupational Therapy in their
proposals as there was the suggestion that part
of the proposed facilities were required to
serve the needs of a disabled child.

The latest application has largely ignored
the advice given by CJB and the proposed
extension is still virtually the same size.
Although the plans are titled as 'Option 4 Disabled
Access to ground & 1st floor plans' no supporting
statement has been submitted and the plans only offer
reference is to a future disabled ramp ~~from~~
within a proposed lobby room/store into a proposed
playroom/family area.

- (i) Stat./Official bodies
- (ii) C.A.A.C
- (iii) Councillors
- (iv) Adj. residents

Professional comments
Background Papers

The proposed side extension would be 7.75m wide
7.6m deep in part reducing to 6.5m. The
depth of the 2 side elements would be 4m wide
and set back 0.745m from the front wall of
the house ~~with a~~ 5.8m high to eaves and
a hipped roof over with ridge height of 7.6m
0.5m below the ridge of the main house.
The other 2 storey element would be 3.75m wide
set back a ~~few~~ ~~metre~~ ~~behind~~ the 1.745m
behind the front wall of the house. It would be
3.88m high to eaves with a hipped roof over
with a ridge height of 6.7m and a front and
a rear gable roof dormer 1.2m wide to front
and rear projecting a nose of 2.15m from the
relevant roof slopes.

The main extension would provide a playroom
family area and garden store at ground level and
2 bedrooms at 1st floor. The smaller extension
a lobby room/store with double garage doors
to the front and 2 ensuite bathrooms at
1st floor.

The single storey rear extension would replace
a covered way which links the main house to
the summer house. The proposed extension would be
5.03m long 3.03m wide 3.1m high to top of
flat roof with a ~~slight~~ ~~p~~ an upstand ~~page~~
skylight rising to 3.9m set in 0.6m from the
sides of the building.

Public & Other Reqs

None rec'd.

Professional Comments

There is no objection to the 55 year extension.
The ^{front wall of the} adjoining house No 3 is about 4.5m away from the side boundary and has a side facing window to a kitchen. The existing side boundary has dense vegetation and the proposed extension set about 0.4m off the boundary would not be any more obtrusive than the existing roofed canopy which is higher adjacent to the rear of the house.

The 2 story side extension however is not acceptable. Its size and siting would adversely affect the TPO'd tree free in the front garden. Moreover ~~it~~ it would ~~be~~ be overbearing and unacceptably bulky in relation to No 1a Gloucester Rd. ~~which~~ That property has a side facing kitchen window and a rear garden of only 5m depth. The proposed extension would project 3m beyond the rear of the property and would be sited only 1m from the boundary. Although it would not reduce daylight below BRE recommended levels the building would ~~be~~ dominate the small rear garden area and the outlook from the kitchen of No 1a as well as appearing cramped in the street scene.

Therefore recommended refusal

An extension set back 1.5m from the front main wall of the property and restricted to 4m in height would safeguard the tree and the amenities of the adjoining property and the street scene and this advice was given to the applicant's agent before the submission of this application.