

**Application reference: 04/3920/HOT/HOT**  
**SOUTH RICHMOND WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
13.12.2004	13.12.2004		07.02.2005

**Site:**

73 Queens Road, Richmond, Richmond Upon Thames, TW10 6HJ

**Proposal:**

Single storey rear extension.

**Present use:**

**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 G Bates  
73 Queens Road  
Richmond  
Richmond Upon Thames  
TW10 6HJ

**AGENT NAME**

Englishaus Architects  
30 Lawrence Road  
Hampton  
Middx  
TW12 2RJ

---

**Consultations:**

*Internal/External:*

**Neighbours:**

5 Queens Rise, Richmond, Richmond Upon Thames, TW10 6HL, - 15.12.2004  
75 Queens Road, Richmond, Richmond Upon Thames, TW10 6HJ, - 15.12.2004  
6 Queens Rise, Richmond, Richmond Upon Thames, TW10 6HL, - 15.12.2004  
71 Queens Road, Richmond, Richmond Upon Thames, TW10 6HJ, - 15.12.2004

**History:**

04/3920/HOT Single storey rear extension.

**Constraints:**

73 QUEENS RD, RICHMOND  
SOUTH RICHMOND WARD  
04/3920/HOT  
Contact Officer: AMS

---

**Site, history and proposal:**

This is a three-storey, rendered, detached dwelling located on the north-western side of Queens Rd. A single storey side and rear extension as well as a new front porch are proposed. The side extension would replace the existing storage room and would also encompass a new bike shed. It would extend 6.5m from the rear wall of the dwelling along the south-western boundary, towards the road. The conservatory roof would slope down from the side wall of the dwelling to a height of 2.4m. There would be a parapet running the length of the proposed conservatory and bike shed, with a height of 2.84m. The rear extension would extend from the rear wall of the dwelling by 2.6m. The new extensions would be used as a library/ study area. There would be an area between the side extension and porch, which would remain open.

The site is not within a Conservation Area, is not a BTM or a Listed Building and does not have any TPO's. No other history.

**Public Representations:**

None

**Professional comments:**

Design and Neighbour Amenity:

The SPG for side and rear extensions states that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. With respect to side extensions, they should not project beyond the existing front elevation.

The side extension (conservatory) would meet SPG as it does not dominate the existing dwelling, being single storey and glazed, and would not appear overbearing to No. 71 as it is 2.84m in height. There is a small window at the ground floor of No. 71, which serves as a secondary light source to the dining room however; this would be in between the bike shed and the porch, in the open space between the two. In this way, there would be insignificant light loss to this window. It is also located approximately 1.2m away from the shared boundary.

The proposed bike shed would be in approximately the same area as the existing storage shed. This would not affect No. 71.

The rear extension would meet SPG (4m for detached dwellings), as it would have a depth of 2.6m from the rear wall of the existing dwelling. There would be no significant effect on daylight or sunlight loss to No. 71 as it is located further towards the rear boundary (approximately 1.5m) than the host property.

The proposed porch at the front of the dwelling would replace the existing small monopitch roofed porch. This would be located 2.85m behind the bay windows at the front of the dwelling, so would not be visually prominent from the road. The proposed porch would be built to the boundary with No. 71 but the pitched roof sloping down towards the boundary and the small size of the porch would serve to reduce the bulk on this part of the boundary. There are no side openings at this point at No.71, so there would be no affect on this property.

Approval is recommended.

**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): AMS

Dated: 28/1/05

**I agree the recommendation:**

Team Leader/Development Control Manager [Signature]

Dated: 02/02/05

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> ACO1, BDD 8
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b> 1EGSA, 1H06A, 1U10, 1U12, 1U16.
<b>UDP POLICIES:</b> ENV - 19, 23, 24 BLT - 11, 15, 16.
<b>OTHER POLICIES:</b>

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

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

**ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:**

