

**Application reference: 09/1793/HOT**  
**ST MARGARETS, NORTH TWICKENHAM WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
17.07.2009	20.07.2009	14.09.2009	14.09.2009

**Site:**

84 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB,

**Proposal:**

Proposed Rear Dormer Roof Extension ~~And Creation Of A Roof Terrace.~~

*+ installation of Green Roof*

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr Paul Kreagh  
84 Winchester Road  
St Margarets  
TW1 1LB  
UK

**AGENT NAME**

Grainne O'Keefe  
Atrium  
36 Broad Lane  
Hampton  
Middx  
TW12 3AZ  
United Kingdom

**DC Site Notice:** printed on and posted on and due to expire on

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**  
**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

- 1 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, - 30.07.2009
- 3 Godstone Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JY, - 30.07.2009
- 6 Kenley Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JU, - 30.07.2009
- 8 Kenley Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JU, - 30.07.2009
- 4 Kenley Road, Twickenham, TW1 1JU, - 30.07.2009
- 86 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB, - 30.07.2009
- 88 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB, - 30.07.2009
- 80 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB, - 30.07.2009
- 82 Winchester Road, Twickenham, TW1 1LB, - 30.07.2009

*2 ✓  
90 ✓*

**History:**

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
07/2452/HOT	• Loft roof extension and roof terrace.	REF	03/09/2007
09/1793/HOT	• Proposed Rear Dormer Roof Extension And Creation Of A Roof Terrace.	PCO	

**Constraints:**

Professional Comments:

R



**09/1793/HOT**  
**84 Winchester Road**

**Site, history and proposal**

The application site is a mid terrace, first floor maisonette located on the west side of Winchester Road. The application site is not within a conservation area.

Planning history

07/2452/HOT Loft extension and roof terrace. Permission refused on the following grounds:

*The proposed roof terrace by reason of its siting, depth and close proximity to the boundaries of the site would result in an unneighbourly form of development giving rise to undue overlooking of neighbouring residential properties and hence would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers thereof. It would thereby be contrary to policies BLT 11 and 16 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan - First Review 2005.*

*The proposed roof extensions by reason of their siting, scale and design would result in a visually obtrusive form of development detrimental to the appearance and character of the application property and the area in general. It would thereby be contrary to policies BLT 11 and 16 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan - First Review 2005.*

The application seeks full planning permission for a rear dormer roof extension. + green roof  
across outtrigger.

Amendments were made to the application and the proposed terrace area was omitted from the scheme. A glass balustrade restricting access to the flat roof was proposed.

**Representations**

No representations received.

**Professional comments**

The main issues to consider are the impact of the proposal upon visual and neighbouring amenity.

Visual amenity

The SPG on House Extensions asks that roof extensions must not dominate the original roof and roof extensions should be in scale with the existing structure. The dormer has been set in from the side and will be located behind the two storey rear wing. The dormer would also be set up from the eaves. It is considered that the two storey rear wing will partially screen the dormer from view.

The roof extension has been reduced in size from the previously refused scheme, has been set up from the eaves and the roof terrace has been omitted.

The roof extension is considered appropriate in terms of scale and design. The roof extension complies with the guidance set out in the SPG and does not dominate the roof slope. Materials and fenestration are considered acceptable.

Neighbouring amenity

Due to the presence of the two storey rear wing, it is considered that overlooking from the dormer would not be significant in regards to the properties to the rear. A condition will ensure that no new access will be formed and the flat roof of the two

storey rear wing will not be used as a terrace. This is in order to further protect neighbouring amenity.

A glass balustrade is proposed which will restrict access onto the flat roof area and will be conditioned to be maintained in situ.

#### Conclusion

The proposed roof extension is considered acceptable in terms of visual and neighbouring amenity and complies with the guidance set out in the SPG 'House Extensions and External Alterations.' The proposal also overcomes the previous reasons for refusal and is accordingly considered acceptable.

**Recommendation APPROVE**

**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): C.M.

Dated: 10.09.09

**I agree the recommendation:**

Team Leader/~~Development Control Manager~~

Dated: 10/11/09

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.

Development Control Manager: .....

Dated: .....

<b>REASONS:</b>
<b>CONDITIONS:</b>
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b>
<b>UDP POLICIES:</b>
<b>OTHER POLICIES:</b>

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

**SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES**

<b>CONDITIONS:</b>	
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b>	

**ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:**