

DESIGN STATEMENT
IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED
REAR EXTENSION
TO
12 MANORGATE ROAD KT2 7AL

06.11.23

TIM BRENNAN ARCHITECTS

INTRODUCTION

This design statement is made in support of a proposal for a ground and 1st floor rear extension to a detached house at the above address. This application is in response to a recent refusal for a similar extension, ref 23/02183/HOU, and proposes a revised design to address the reasons for refusal and to provide additional supporting information to justify the proposal.

The reasons for refusal of the first application were:

- 1 *'The proposed extensions by virtue of their size, siting and design would be an incongruous addition creating a dominant and overbearing feature at the rear of the property that would be visually intrusive in the private views of the site from the neighbouring properties and detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.'*
- 2 *'The proposed extensions by virtue of their size, siting and design are likely to give rise to a significant loss of daylight/sunlight and the applicant has not demonstrated that any loss of daylight/sunlight to the neighbouring occupiers would not have an impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers'*

This Statement, in conjunction with the revised application drawings, will demonstrate how the new proposal addresses these concerns.

BUILT CONTEXT

No.12 is a detached Victorian house with a typical stepped form in plan, with a two storey rear outrigger. It has previously been extended into the roof with a rear dormer window but there has been no extension work done at ground or 1st floor level.

No.10 is also a detached house with a small 0.26m gap between it and No.12. It has previously been extended at ground floor and roof levels, and quite possibly at 1st floor level as well. Its rear outrigger at 1st floor level, although there is no planning record of it being extended, is unusually deep for this type of house and is approximately 3.5m deeper than that of No.12 with a three sided bay window on the rear wall.

The ground floor extension on the boundary with No.12 extends approximately 4.3m further out than the rear outrigger to No.12. and has glazed doors in the rear elevation. It also has a loft conversion with a rear dormer window.

No.14 is also a detached house with a 1.16m gap between it and the main flank wall of No.12. It has also previously been extended, apparently at all floor levels. It's rear outrigger is unusually tall at 3 storeys and, although there is no current planning record of it, both the building form and the patterning in the brickwork, which is clearly visible from No.12's garden, strongly suggests that it has been extended to this height in the past. In any case it is now both a storey higher, and approximately 1.8m deeper, than the outrigger of No.12, also with a three sided bay window on the rear wall at 1st floor level.

The ground floor extension is on the boundary with No.12 and extends beyond the outrigger approximately 4.2m further out than the rear outrigger to No.12, more or less flush with the line of No.10's ground floor extension. It also has glazed doors in the rear elevation.

No.14 also has a loft conversion with a rear dormer window.

As a result of these earlier extensions to Nos. 10 and 14, and as is clearly shown in the photographs accompanying this application, the garden to No.12 is flanked by 1, 2 and 3 storey blank brick walls on both boundaries and to a considerably greater depth than No.12 itself. No.12 could therefore be extended within the confines of these walls without any adverse effect on the daylight or amenity of its neighbours.

PLANNING CONTEXT

No.10 Manorgate Road

Single storey rear and side extension Ref. No: 15/12389/HOU Granted 2015

Rear dormer window Ref. No: 14/12622/LDP Granted 2014

No.12 Manorgate Road

2 storey rear extension Ref. No: 23/02183/HOU Refused 2023

Loft conversion with rear dormer Ref. No: 13/13014/LDP Granted Jan 2014

No.14 Manorgate Road

Rear lightwell and rear glazed doors to existing basement level
Ref. No: 17/12077/HOU | Received: Thu 26 Jan 2017 | Validated: Fri 27 Jan 2017 | Status: Granted

Single storey side and rear extension

Ref. No: 16/13108/HOU | Received: Fri 04 Nov 2016 | Validated: Fri 04 Nov 2016 | Status: Granted

Single storey flat roof side and rear extension and basement extension with front lightwell

Ref. No: 14/12967/HOU | Received: Mon 08 Sep 2014 | Validated: Mon 08 Sep 2014 | Status: Granted

Single storey flat roof side and rear extension and basement extension with front lightwell

Ref. No: 14/12156/HOU | Received: Tue 11 Feb 2014 | Validated: Tue 11 Feb 2014 | Status: Refused

Rear dormer roof extension and hip to gable extension

Ref. No: 96/6341/FUL | Received: Thu 19 Sep 1996 | Validated: Thu 10 Oct 1996 | Status: Granted

THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is to construct a side and rear wrap around ground floor extension to the full width of the main house leaving the existing side alley open, and a 1st floor extension above that to the same width as the existing outrigger.

The ground floor extension would be to the same depth as the neighbouring extension to No.10, and approximately the same as No.14, and so would extend approximately 4.3m beyond the rear wall of the existing outrigger. It would also extend to the side of the outrigger to the full width of the house. The extension would have a flat roof with a brick parapet at a height of 3.185m above external ground level which is within the guidelines of Kingston's Residential Design SPD. This would make it approx. 0.52m higher than the eaves of No.10's extension but 0.37m lower than the parapet to No. 14's extension. It therefore mediates in height between the two neighbouring extensions and extends no further than either of them.

As such it can have no effect on the daylight, amenity or view of Nos.10 and 14.

The 1st floor element of the extension is an extrusion of the existing outrigger, much the same as both Nos.10 and 14 appear to have done, with a double pitched roof and extends to the same depth as No.10's outrigger. It therefore matches No.10's extension in height, profile and depth, although No.10's bay window and roof extend slightly further. It will therefore be harmonious in appearance with Nos.10 and 14 and can have no effect on their daylight, amenity or view.

This extension would be slightly deeper than that of No.14 but, as the extensions are 3.7m apart, and No.12's is a storey lower, it will have no impact on No.14.

DAYLIGHT

As the floor plan drawing, 12MR:P2.01A, shows the proposed extensions do not impinge on a 45 degree line drawn in plan from the nearest windows in the rear elevations of Nos.10 and 14 at either floor level.

As the elevation drawing, 12MR:P2.03A, shows the proposed ground floor extension doesn't impinge on a 45 degree line drawn in elevation from the nearest windows in the rear elevations of Nos.10 and 14 at either floor level, and the proposed 1st floor extension, which is set back from the line of the ground floor extension, doesn't impinge on a 45 degree line drawn from the 1st floor windows of Nos.10 and 14 at 1st floor level .

Although the depth of the proposed extension exceeds the recommendations in the Kingston Residential Design SPD, the presence of the existing neighbouring extensions to Nos.10 and 14 means that there will be no negative effect on the outlook, daylight or amenity of either of these houses.

The depth of No.12's garden is approximately 27.35m from rear face of proposed extension to the boundary. There is then a shared access road between the rear gardens of Manorgate Road and those of Coombe Road. This means that the nearest rear elevation of the houses on Coombe Road, facing No.12, is approximately 63m away. The proposed extensions will, therefore, easily comply with the 25 degree rule and there will be no effect on the outlook, daylight or amenity of those houses.

The depth, height and form of the proposed extension has therefore been carefully considered to ensure that there is no detrimental effect on the neighbouring houses or adjoining area.

BUILT FORM

The overall height and form of the proposed extensions will also not dominate the existing house. Ground floor extensions are generally considered not to be detrimental to the appearance of the original house, and the proposed 1st floor extension follows the line of the existing outrigger and will not extend across the width of the house. The original form, appearance and rear wall line of the original house can therefore still be clearly perceived.

MATERIALS

The extension would be constructed in materials to match or complement the existing house. The external walls will be in 2nd hand yellow stock brickwork, the flat roof in a grey single layer roofing membrane, the pitched roof in plain grey tiles or slate to match the existing roofs and the upper floor sash windows in white painted timber frames. The glazed rear doors at ground floor level will have powder coated aluminium frames.

The large glazed doors will increase daylighting levels inside the house, with consequent improvements to the health and wellbeing of the occupants, and will also greatly improve access to the garden.

FLOOD RISK

The Environment Agency states that the flood risks are:

Surface Water : Very low risk

Rivers and the sea: Very low risk

Groundwater: Unlikely in this area.

Reservoirs: Unlikely in this area.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion the proposed revised design will:

- By it's depth, height and form will have no impact on the outlook, daylight or amenity of the neighbouring houses.
- By it's depth, height and form conform to the 45 degree rule in plan and elevation in relation to the neighbouring properties and so not affect their daylight or sunlight.
- Harmonise with the appearance of the house and the area in general.
- Not be overbearing on, or out of scale with, the original house
- Improve daylighting levels in the rear of the house and access to the garden without any detrimental effect on the neighbouring houses.
- Improve and increase the accommodation within the house
- Have no effect on the streetscape

We therefore respectfully request the proposed revision to the design be approved.