

## Application reference: 09/1983/FUL TEDDINGTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
24.07.2009	24.07.2009	18.09.2009	18.09.2009

**Site:**

22 The Causeway, Teddington, TW11 0HF,

**Proposal:**

Demolition of three storey office building and replacement with part three, part four storey building with ground floor offices (A2 and B1) and residential flats to upper floors.

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Home Counties Property Centres Ltd  
22 The Causeway  
Teddington  
TW22 0HF

**AGENT NAME**

HTP Architects LLP  
2 Richmond Hill  
Richmond  
TW10 6QX

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 06.08.2009 and posted on 14.08.2009 and due to expire on 04.09.2009

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

LBRUT Environment Policy And Design  
LBRUT Transport

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

Causeway House 13 Second Floor East Wing, The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA - 06.08.2009  
Causeway House 13 First Floor East Wing, The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA - 06.08.2009  
Causeway House 13 First Floor West Wing, The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA - 06.08.2009  
16 - 20 First Floor, The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE - 06.08.2009  
Causeway House 13 Third Floor, The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA - 06.08.2009  
Causeway House 13 Second Floor West Wing, The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA - 06.08.2009  
16 - 20 Second Floor, The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE - 06.08.2009  
Flat 1,2 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
Flat 2,2 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
Flat 3,2 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
Flat 4,2 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
Flat 5,2 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
Flat 6,2 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
Flat 7,2 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
2 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
26 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE, - 06.08.2009  
Flat 1,8 Park Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW11 0AA, - 06.08.2009  
Flat 1,8 Park Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW1 0AA, - 06.08.2009  
8 Park Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW1 0AA, - 06.08.2009  
Third Floor, 16 - 20 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE - 06.08.2009  
9 - 11 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA - 06.08.2009  
2 - 6 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE - 06.08.2009  
28 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE - 06.08.2009  
9 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA, - 06.08.2009  
11 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA, - 06.08.2009  
3 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA, - 06.08.2009

8-10 Park Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0AA, - 06.08.2009  
 The Bungalow, Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 24 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HD, - 06.08.2009  
 14 Park Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0AG, - 06.08.2009  
 7 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA, - 06.08.2009  
 14C The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE, - 06.08.2009  
 Causeway House, 13 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0JR, - 06.08.2009  
 14 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE, - 06.08.2009  
 5 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HA, - 06.08.2009  
 16-20 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE, - 06.08.2009  
 14B The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE, - 06.08.2009  
 14A The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HE, - 06.08.2009  
 16 Park Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0AG, - 06.08.2009  
 22 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 20 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 18 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 16 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 14 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 12 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 10 Middle Lane, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 Cozens, Moxon And Harts, 24 The Causeway, Teddington, TW11 0HD, Your Ref: GW/H.H.9.(d)/CM\_H -  
 06.08.2009  
 24 Middle Lane, Teddington, TW11 0HQ, - 06.08.2009  
 The Bungalow, 1a Middle Lane, Teddington, TW11 0HQ - 06.08.2009  
 M Foss, Teddington Society, 21 Teddington Park, Teddington TW11 - 06.08.2009

**History:**

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
09/0104/FUL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolition of three storey office building and replacement with part three, part four storey building with ground floor offices and residential flats to upper floors.</li> </ul>	REF	27/04/2009
09/1983/FUL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolition of three storey office building and replacement with part three, part four storey building with ground floor offices (A2 and B1) and residential flats to upper floors.</li> </ul>	PCO	

**Constraints:**

09/1983/FUL  
22 The Causeway  
Teddington

TEDDINGTON WARD  
Contact Officer:  
S Graham-Smith x 7300

**Proposal:** Demolition of three storey office building and replacement with part three, part four storey building with ground floor offices (A2 and B1) and residential flats to upper floors.

**Applicant:** HTP Architects for Home Counties Property Centres Ltd

**Application received:** 24<sup>th</sup> July 2009

**Main development plan policies:**

UDP – First Review: BLT 11, 15, and 16; EMP 4; HSG 11, 12; TRN 2, 4

LDF Core Strategy: CP 1, 2, 7, 14

**Present use:**

Office

*referred*  
**Summary of Application:** A previous application was ~~the subject of an appeal which was dismissed~~ on grounds relating to loss of employment, sustainability and infrastructure contributions. It is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that the loss of employment floorspace will not be significant and the sustainable development requirements of the Council can be met. The applicant is willing to make the appropriate infrastructure contributions.

**Recommendation:** Approve subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 Agreement securing:

- a financial contribution of £13,553.03 towards transport, health and the open space
- preventing future occupants of the flats from obtaining parking permits should the area be included within a CPZ in the next 5 years
- requiring occupiers of the premises hereby approved to be made lifetime members of a car club

**Site, history and proposal:**

The Causeway is a short road containing terraces on either side. There are shops on either side of the road with a mixture of flats and offices above them. 22 is a mid terrace three storey property towards the eastern end and backs on to a rear access road off Middle Lane. The property is used by solicitors. There was a single storey shop on the site for some years and the two storeys of offices above were added in 1960.

In January 2009 an application was made for demolition of the existing building and replacement with a modern design four story building with a flat roof. This was to contain ground floor offices with five one-bedroom flats on the storeys above (Application ref 09/0104/FUL). The application was refused permission (delegated decision) on the following grounds:

*The proposal would result in the loss of employment floorspace and in the absence of any*

*detailed submitted justification this would be contrary to policy EMP 4 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005.*

*In the absence of a binding obligation securing a financial contribution towards health, open space and transport infrastructure in accordance with the adopted Planning Obligation Strategy the proposal would be contrary to policies IMP 3 and TRN 2, HSG 19 and CCE 4 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review.*

*The applicant has failed to demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that the development would comply with the Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD or make appropriate CO2 savings using renewable energy sources contrary to the principles of sustainable development and policies STG3, BLT11, BLT13 and HSG18 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review and policies 2A.1, 3B.10, 4A.3, 4A.4, 4A.7, 4A.16, 4A.17, 4A.19, 4B.1 and 4B.5 of the adopted London Plan (February 2008).*

This new application is an amended version with ground floor offices and three one-bed flats and a pair of studio flats on three storeys above.

**Public and other representations:**

Letters have been received from three properties in Middle Lane objecting on the following grounds:

- Increased parking and traffic problems and blocking of access road
- Overdevelopment
- Lack of affordable housing
- Out of character
- Overlooking and overbearing impact
- Noise and disturbance
- Inadequate refuse arrangements

An adjoining business has objected on the grounds of loss of light and inadequate parking provision.

**Professional comments:**

Appearance

The building is intended to have a modern design, and this is the case for other properties at this end and on this side of the road. 28 is an award winning design sited on the prominent corner of The Causeway and Middle Lane (built in 2000 using the same architect). That property is a far larger building, but has a flat roof with inset top floor as is proposed here. 24 is a flat roofed three storey building of similar height to the existing 22. 16-20 is three storey with a pitched roof, although this is set back from the front elevation giving the appearance, from some angles, of a flat roof.

In the case of the proposed development the top floor is set back 2.9m from the front elevation and 3.5m from the rear elevation and therefore softens the impact of the increased height, appearing similar from street level to 16-20. Overall the height would be lower than the ridge of the roof of 16-20 by just under 1m. It would be the same height most of the top floor of 28, although this has a feature element on the corner which is higher. In my opinion the additional height would not be discordant in relation to the surrounding buildings. The Causeway incorporates various designs – both at front and rear-, a number of them modern, and no objection is seen to this approach. The windows are not aligned, but this is also the case with 28/26 and bearing in mind the varied designs this is not objected to.

### Impact on neighbours

The building is to project further rearwards than the existing and will have an extra storey. The additional rearward projection on the upper floors is 2m and on the ground floor, 2m then a further 4.3m at a point 1.5m from the side boundary. The owners of the adjoining offices have pointed out that there would be an impact on light as the 45 degree test would not be satisfied. This may be unacceptable for residential properties, but 24 is an office. Whilst there would be some loss of sunlight to the rear windows of 24, where the ground floor would be most affected, it is not considered that the impact would be so great as to warrant refusal bearing in mind the commercial rather than residential nature of that building..

The closest houses are in Middle Lane and Park Road. There are also flats above shops on the opposite side of the road. With regard to the impact on light, although the building will be taller, the top floor is set back from the front and rear elevations as described above and, bearing in mind the existing situation, the height of neighbouring properties and the distance of other residential properties from the site they would not experience unreasonable light loss.

Objections have also been made on the grounds of overlooking and rear balconies are proposed on the first floor and third floor (together with a small balcony on the second). However there are existing balconies at 28 which were approved within the last 10 years. They would be closer to the Middle Lane gardens than 28, however the first floor balcony would be screened by the greater rearward projection of 16-20. The second floor would be further away than existing windows at 16 – 20 (25m away from the nearest, property, No. 10, as opposed to 12m). The plans indicate an intention to screen the balcony to the top floor and details of this could be required by condition.

I see no obvious reason for the finished development to significantly impact on local noise levels.

### Proposed use

The proposal involves the loss of the two floors of B1 floorspace with the proposed upper floors all residential and one of the previous reasons for refusal related to this. Policy EMP 4 states that where the loss of employment floorspace is accepted and other commercial or community uses are not appropriate housing may be accepted, but only affordable housing. The applicant has argued, in the case of this application, that the quality of the new employment floorspace will be substantially greater and more attractive to users and that the actual loss of employment floorspace is not considerable. In addition, the applicant has contacted local housing associations who confirmed that they did not have an interest in the proposed development.

I would agree that the existing building would probably not be attractive to office users due to its layout with narrow corridors and staircases and that a modern building could better cope with modern office demands such as IT cabling. Having the office use wholly on the ground floor allows for a more flexible layout without the need for a staircase or corridors within the office area. Without the staircase and corridors the current amount of floorspace is 117.5 sq m. The proposed would amount to 88 sq m and consequently the loss would be 29.5 sq m. To put this into context, the baseline standard for a one-bed flat is 45 sq m. Bearing in mind the advantages gained by redevelopment which would include better offices, five new dwellings and a more sustainable form of development I consider that the loss of this amount of office floorspace would not amount to a justifiable reason for refusal.

The use of the upper floors as flats would not be unusual in this location and is not objected

to in principle.

### Transport

The site is in a town centre location with particularly good transport links, being sited near the station. Transport grounds were not a reason for refusal on the previous application, however if it had been otherwise acceptable conditions would have been required. Siting for cycle and refuse storage is indicated on the plans although further details will be required.

There is currently space for three or four cars to park at the rear of the existing building and this will be reduced to one. The parking standards allow a maximum of one space for the amount of office floorspace existing and proposed and consequently this is not objected to. No parking is provided for the flats and it will be necessary for the applicant to sign a legal agreement agreeing that parking permits will not be made available to residents if the site becomes a Controlled Parking Zone within the next five years. The agreement will also require that residents and occupants of the office are members of a car club.

### Planning Obligations

Contributions to infrastructure required are as follows:

Transport: £7160

Open space £4,726

Health £1021.65

Management fee £645.38

Total £13,553.03

### Sustainability

The application is required to satisfy the sustainability checklist. Confirmation has been given that the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 requirement can be attained. It has also been demonstrated how CO2 emissions could be offset by the 20% required by the use of renewable energy resources. Other aspects of the sustainable construction checklist are considered to be acceptable.

### Conclusion

A previous application ~~was the subject of an appeal which was dismissed~~ <sup>refused</sup> on grounds relating to loss of employment, sustainability and infrastructure contributions. It is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that the loss of employment floorspace will not be significant and the sustainable development requirements of the Council can be met. The applicant is willing to make the appropriate infrastructure contributions.

**I therefore recommend PERMISSION subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 Agreement securing:**

- a financial contribution of £13,553.03 towards transport, health and the open space
- preventing future occupants of the flats from obtaining parking permits should the area be included within a CPZ in the next 5 years.
- requiring occupiers of the premises hereby approved to be made lifetime members of a car club

### **Standard conditions:**

- AT01 – Development to commence within 3 years
- BD05 – Details of materials to be approved
- DV33A - No reduction in dwelling units '5'

DV44 – Code for Sustainable Homes – 3  
LT09 - Hard and soft landscaping required

**Non Standard Condition**

NS01 - None of the buildings hereby approved shall be occupied until a dustbin enclosure and cycle store have been provided in accordance with detailed drawings to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, such drawings to show the siting and design thereof.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the property and the amenities of the area.

NS02 - Notwithstanding details shown on approved plans, drawings showing details of screening to the third floor rear balcony shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being carried out.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of neighbours

**Standard Informatives:**

IE05C – Noise control – building sites

IH06B– Damage to public highway

IM13 - Street Numbering

IL10A – Building Regulations

IL12A - Approved Drawing Nos – 'PL/01A, 02A, 03A, 04C, 05C, 06C 07C and 08D received on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2009 2009 and PL/11 received on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2010"

IL13 - S106 Agreement

IL16- Policies – 'UDP – First Review: BLT 11, 15, and 16; EMP 4; HSG 11, 12; TRN 2, 4

LDF Core Strategy: CP 1, 2, 7, 14'

IL19- Reason for granting – See summary

**Non-standard informatives:**

NI01 - S 106 and exemption of parking permits- the applicant is advised that the following sums of money are required to comply with the terms of this planning application:

Transport: £7160

Open space £4,726

Health £1021.65

Management fee £645.38

Total £13,553.03

**Background Papers:**

Application forms and drawings

Letters from neighbours

Application forms, drawings for previous application

09/0104/FUL

---

**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): JGS

Dated: 3/3/10

**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.

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:**



**Professional Comments:**

Mr Garson  
The Causeway

Planning Committee - Thursday 18 March 2010  
Application 09/1983/FUL

**22 The Causeway, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 0HF**

The planning officer's report makes reference to the objection from no. 24 The Causeway that the 45 degree test (as described in the Building Research Establishment report SITE LAYOUT PLANNING FOR DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT) would have an adverse impact on their natural light, and there would be loss of sunlight, to the rear of their property.

- The 45 degree rule is intended by BRE as a simplified calculation for use in connection with **domestic** extensions, and is to be applied flexibly and is not appropriate for **commercial** office applications.  
For offices quality and consistency of lighting is important to create a good working environment. This is achieved with the assistance of electric lighting
- The first check described by BRE for commercial situations is a calculation of obstruction of light from buildings opposite no. 24. In this case meaning no.s 14 and 16 Middle Lane).
- The development passes the 25 degree angle test and confirms there is and will continue to be a good level of natural daylight for no.24.
- The proposed redevelopment of no.22 The Causeway does not affect the level of daylight that is measured by this calculation. The development does not have an adverse impact on this standard.
- The rear elevation of no.24 The Causeway faces Middle Lane to the south south-west. On the BRE test there will not be any loss of **daylight** on this elevation from the proposed development of no.22.
- Further no loss of sunlight will occur until the sun reaches a position in the sky of south west. From Sunpath diagrams for London - the sun will be at an angle of between 10 to 30 degrees to the horizontal in the winter months, which is low in the sky and at times blocked by the existing properties opposite in Middle Lane. The loss of sunlight is not a relevant test. Within an office environment artificial light sources would be in use particularly in winter.
- During the rest of the year (from mid March to mid September) again from Sunpath diagrams for London the arc of the sun is higher and its loss during working hours will be marginal.
- It is noted that solar control glass (to reduce the level of direct sunlight) and internal blinds have been used in no. 24 to prevent the sun's glare and to assist in a controlled consistent interior lighting level for office use.
- The objection raised concerning the increased depth of the ground floor is misconceived and the correct application of the 45 degree test shows no impact whatsoever.

•  
18 March 2010