

DLm Case -

PLANNING REPORT

Printed Date: 23 September 2004

**Application reference: 04/2586/HOT/HOT
HEATHFIELD WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
06.08.2004	06.08.2004		01.10.2004

Site:

1 Blandford Avenue, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6HS

Proposal:

Erection Of First Floor Side Extension.

Present use: *SFD*

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Vaseem Usmani
1 Blandford Avenue
Twickenham
Richmond Upon Thames
TW2 6HS

AGENT NAME

Mr D O'Hara - Englishhaus LTD
30 Lawrence Road
Hampton
TW12 2RJ

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Neighbours:

2 Blandford Avenue,Whitton,TW2 6HS,, - 16.08.2004
4 Blandford Avenue,Whitton,TW2 6HS,, - 16.08.2004
3 Blandford Avenue,Whitton,TW2 6HS,, - 16.08.2004
24 Strathearn Avenue,Whitton,TW2 6JX,, - 16.08.2004
26 Strathearn Avenue,Whitton,TW2 6JX,, - 16.08.2004
28 Strathearn Avenue,Whitton,TW2 6JX,, - 16.08.2004
2 Fairfield Avenue,Whitton,TW2,, - 16.08.2004
6 Blandford Avenue,Twickenham,Richmond Upon Thames,TW2 6HS, - 16.08.2004
2 Fairfield Avenue,Twickenham,Richmond Upon Thames,TW2 6JY, - 16.08.2004
30 Strathearn Avenue,Twickenham,Richmond Upon Thames,TW2 6JX, - 16.08.2004

expire 06.09.04

History:

02/2808 Erection Of First Floor Side Extension
03/0560 Erection Of First Floor Side Extension
04/2586/HOT Erection Of First Floor Side Extension.

Constraints:

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

Case Officer (Initials): *JSP*

Dated: *23/09/04*

OT
24/9/04

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated:

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Development Control Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

A Development Control Manager: *Rejsumes*
Dated: *24/9/04*

REASONS:
CONDITIONS: <i>AC01, KD14 & obscure glazing.</i>
INFORMATIVES: <i>IC05A, IH06A, IL10, IL16 & Approved drawing NO'S.</i>
UDP POLICIES: <i>Adopted UDP ENV 19, 23 & 24 Emerging UDP BKT, 11, 15 & 19</i>
OTHER POLICIES: <i>P</i>

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

CONDITIONS:	
INFORMATIVES:	
IE05A NOISE CONTROL - BUILDING SITES	IL16H RELEVANT POLICIES AND PROPOSALS - HOT
IH06A DAMAGE TO PUBLIC HIGHWAY	U02311
IL10 BUILDING REGULATIONS REQUIRED	

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:

File Reference: 04/2586/HOT

Address: 1 Blandford Avenue , Twickenham, TW2 6NS

Site, history and proposal

The property is a two-storey semi-detached single-family dwelling house, located on the southern side of Blandford Avenue. The property is not a listed building or a BTM, and is not in a conservation area. The locality is characterised by predominantly semi-detached dwellings of traditional design, with wide frontages and spacious rear gardens. The host property is at the end of Blandford Avenue that adjoins Strathearn Avenue.

Planning permission was granted in 1986 for a single storey side and rear extension (ref: 86/377) which has been erected.

Planning permission was refused under delegated powers in September 2002 for the erection of a first floor side extension (ref 03/2808). Planning permission was also refused for a first floor side extension (ref 03/0560) in February 2003. Reasons for refusal for the latter proposal centred on the proposal being unduly dominant, visually intrusive, having a poor relationship with the host property and detrimental to the surrounding street scene

The proposal is for a first storey side extension to the North elevation.

The new application proposes to follow the original application but seeks to address the refusal. The main differences between the two schemes are as follows:

1. The first floor side extension ~~will be~~ ^{is} set back from the front elevation by 1000mm, the previous proposal as refused was not set back. *was initially*
2. The overall width of the side extension ~~will be~~ reduced from 5500mm at the front elevation to 4700mm. ^{is}
3. The depth of the side extension ~~will be~~ reduced from 6m to 5.2m.

Public and other representations.

Four letters from residents have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Loss of light and shadowing.
- Visual amenity/overbearing.
- Character and appearance.
- No request for committee.

Amendments

- Width of extension ^{further} reduced to 2.45 metres

As letter's of objection have been received regarding the proposal, the application will be reviewed by the Development Control manager.

Drafting Errors: Amended drawings received on 9 September proved to be incorrect in terms of the existing roof profile. Corrected drawings were received on the 23rd September 2004.

Professional Comments

Residential Amenity:

The proposed extension would sit inside the side boundary from 24 Strathearn Avenue for a distance of over 20m, and will be over 30 metres from the rear elevation of 2 Fairfield Avenue. These dimensions mean that the proposed extension would not unduly affect light availability to, or outlook from, rear facing windows at the

adjoining properties in Strathearn Avenue. It is considered that there are no privacy issues, as the extension has no side facing windows, rear facing windows will be of obscured glaze.

The proposal will not be significantly overbearing or effect neighbour amenity in regard to the properties adjacent to the site, since these properties enjoy spacious rear gardens. No.24 and 26 Strathearn Avenue has tree screen along the rear garden boundary, to further detract from the proposal.

Character/Design/Streetscape.

The proposal will be set back by 1000mm, which is in accordance with the Councils SPG. The proposal will not continue on the same roof ridge and will not fully extend to the side boundary, therefore the extension will appear subordinate to the original property. As the host property is over 20m from the rear elevation of 24 Strathearn Avenue, the proposed extension will not result in a loss of spaciousness that will not detract from the character of the existing development and its setting.

Conclusion.

The proposal is compliant with general supplementary planning guidance for house extensions, and there will be no significant detriment to the residential or local visual amenity.

A condition is suggested to ensure that construction materials match the existing dwelling, and a condition is suggested to include obscured glaze to rear facing windows.

Recommendation:

Approval