

Application reference: 04/2929/HOT/HOT
ST MARGARETS, NORTH TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
10.09.2004	24.09.2004		19.11.2004

Site:

84 Heathfield South, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 7SS

Proposal:

Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension.

Present use:

SFD

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Gary Monk
84 Heathfield South
Twickenham
Richmond Upon Thames
TW2 7SS

AGENT NAME

Englishhaus Architects
30 Lawrence Road
Hampton
TW12 2RJ

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Neighbours:

86 Heathfield South, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 7SS, - 01.10.2004
90 Court Way, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 7SW, - 01.10.2004
82 Heathfield South, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 7SS, - 01.10.2004

History:

04/2929/HOT Proposed Single Storey Rear Extension.

Constraints:

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / NO

YES / NO

I therefore recommend the following:

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

Case Officer (Initials): ...ASP...

Dated: ...17 Nov 04...

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

[Handwritten signature]

Dated: ...19/11/04...

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:

REASONS:
<i>[Handwritten signature]</i>
CONDITIONS: AC01 & BD08
INFORMATIVES: 1K12, 1E05A, 1H08A, 1K10 & 1K16 H.
UDP POLICIES: Adopted UDP 96 policies ENV 19, 23 & 14. Emerging UDP 96, 1st review policies BLT, 11, 15 & 16
OTHER POLICIES: <i>[Handwritten signature]</i>

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

CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:

File Reference: 04/2929/HOT

Address: 84 Heathfield South, Twickenham, TW2 7SS.

Site/Surroundings:

The subject site is located on the southern side of Heathfield South. A two-storey mid-terraced property occupies the site, sites are relatively small in size and the general level of amenity is high. The property is not located within a conservation area and is not a listed building. To the rear of the site is an access road that serves rear garages.

Relevant history:

Planning history shows an unknown development in 1947 under reference 7505/47. A site visit revealed that a single storey rear extension exists.

Proposal:

The application seeks planning permission for a replacement single storey rear extension. The extension will span the width of the property and will have a depth of 3.5m to the east and a depth of 3m to the west. The height to the extensions eaves is 2.7m and 3.9m to the abutment of the property. A mono pitched roof is proposed.

Dimensions showing the height of the existing extension along the eastern boundary proved to be incorrect, a site visit showed that the height to the extensions eaves is 2.5m rising to 2.85m at the abutment of the property.

Amendments:

The extension has changed from a mono-pitched roof with parapets to a hipped roof without parapets. The height would now be 2.5 to the eaves and 3.7 to the apex of the roof.

Public and other representations

No representations.

Professional Comments

Residential Amenity:

The existing single storey rear extension has a depth of 3.5m along the eastern boundary. The proposed depth along this boundary exceeds the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance for house extensions by 500mm. However, as the existing depth of the current extension is 3.5m and the proposed extensions height on the boundary is relatively low at 2.5m, the development would not appear overly intrusive or overbearing for the neighbouring residential occupiers.

The proposed depth along the western boundary is 3m which is compliant with the Council's SPG, and as No. 86 has an existing glass house the extension will not overtly cause a loss of residential amenity. In terms of overlooking and privacy, the proposed ground floor windows and doors will not result in any significant loss of privacy to properties in Court Way.

There are no privacy issues in regard to adjacent properties as no side windows are proposed. The proposed extension will comply with the Building Research Establishment's guidelines for daylighting and sunlighting when applied in relation to No. 82 and No. 86 Heathfield South.

Character and Design.

It is considered that the proposal is in keeping with the existing property and is not unduly dominant in relation to the host property. The rear extension by reason of its design is typical of many extensions to such a property.

Conclusion

There will be no significant erosion of residential of local visual amenity.
A condition is suggested to ensure that construction materials match the existing dwelling.

Recommendation

Approval.