

DRAFT REPORT/DELEGATED DECISION SHEET

1/2

PLANNING PERMISSION/LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT

Ref: 04/1085/FUL

Contact: Mr J Brown

Extn.: 4585

Ward:
App Rec'd: 14/04/2004

APPLICANT: ST MARYS COLLEGE

AGENT: ASH DESIGN CONSULTANTS
Site: ST. MARYS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, WALDEGRAVE ROAD
TWICKENHAM

Proposal: ERECTION OF HAZARDOUS CHEMICAL STORE.

* EM may direct		Full Planning			
Decision by R.U.T.		Outline			
Listed Building Consent		Other			
C.A. Consent		Council		Committee	
RECOMMENDATION:		APPROVE/ CONSENT	REFUSE	OTHER	ENFORCEMENT/ COURT ACTION
Prepared by	<i>JRB</i>	Submitted for decision by			
Date:	<i>3/8/05</i>	PLANNING AND TRNSPT COMMITTEE	PLANNING SUB-CITTEE	DELEGATED POWERS	
TEAM LEADER	Agreed	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	
Date:		Date:	Date:	Date:	
PPO	Agreed	Application dealt with under delegated authority by			
Date:				
		on:			

Visit neighbouring property YES / NO DATE:

CONTINUED ...

OFFICER'S REPORT (to include the following information)

Site and Proposal. (v) Local Amenity groups
THE FOLLOWING PROPERTIES WERE CONSULTED
 Public & other representations Reconsultation
 (i) Stat./Official bodies Professional comments
 (ii) C.A.A.C Background Papers
THE FOLLOWING PROPERTIES WERE CONSULTED AT APPEAL STAGE

STANDARD CONSULTATIONS WHERE APPLICABLE CAN BE SEEN AT THE END OF THIS REPORT

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

UDP PLAN 1, PART 11 Specify

Supplementary Planning Guidance _____
 Conservation Area Study/Proposal _____
 Conservation Area Description: Waldegrave Park, Teddington CA54
 Conservation Area Number: []
 Listed Building Grade: []
 Conflict with Development Plan: _____
 Building of Townscape Merit: _____ Tick
 Tree Preservation Order No.: _____
 Advertised: []
 Site Notice: []
 CMAG: []
 Metropolitan Open Land: _____
 Area of Mixed Use: _____
 Key Shopping Frontage: _____ Tick
 Secondary Shopping Frontage: _____ &
 Archaeological Priority Zone: _____ Specify

PRESENT USE (If vacant previous use if commercial give name)

College

**Wards
Contact Officer:
Officers**

Proposal:

Applicant:

Application received:

Consultations:
Adv, Site Notice

Main development plan policies:
UDP - First Review ENV 1, BLT 11, 16

Site, history and proposal:

Application site is a patch of land just inside the southerly gate on the Waldegrave Road boundary. The land is in the corner of the playing field area, which is Metropolitan Open Land. A small building has been erected there and is used to store hazardous chemicals; it replaces a previous facility which was non compliant with guidelines for such stores. The building has been painted green and measures 5.4 by 3.4 in footprint, with a flat roof at a height of 2.84m.

Public and other representations: two local residents object

1. The building would be more secure from intruders if it was situated in the main building group.
2. traffic hazard arising from delivery vehicles
3. risk of fire or chemical leakage, dangerous to students and school children

Professional comments:

General:

There is no evidence that there is a significant risk arising from the store, which is used for low level hazard chemicals mainly on Geography and Human Science experiments. The store complies with CLEAPSS guidelines for storage of chemicals, Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and Workplace Regulations 1992. Environmental Health Officers did not object. I see no planning reason to object to its location within the campus, other than its presence on MOL.

Metropolitan Open Land:

Strategic Planning Guidance for London (RPG 3 1996), reaffirms the commitment to green belt and states (para 58) that it must be maintained "as far as can be seen ahead". It also emphasises the importance of metropolitan open land and states: "The presumption against development in the green belt applies equally to metropolitan open land". LBRUT Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan Review 2005 policy ENV 1 states that, on Metropolitan Open Land, building development, including extensions, will generally be unacceptable. However, the policy also recognises that there may be exceptional cases where it is appropriate to allow modest buildings or extensions which are related to the function of metropolitan open land and where this would not have a harmful effect on its character.

The location on MOL is regrettable and there is no functional link between the proposed building's use and the open use of the MOL, other than that they are both part of the same college. There is thus no justification for relaxation of policy ENV 1 which restricts development

on MOL to modest proposals linked to the use. The college has an envelope of non-MOL around the buildings, and there should be another acceptable location off the MOL. Erosion of MOL could be a problem on this site, and it is felt that the policy should be rigorously adhered to in order to prevent cumulative development damaging the open character. If the building had not already been constructed, there is no doubt that this location would be resisted.

No tree issues, and no sustainable justification on highway or traffic grounds.

I therefore recommend

1 - REFUSAL for the following reason:-

The building would erode the open character of this part of the site which is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and, having a use not functionally related to the open use of the land, is not considered to contribute to its character and long term open use. The proposal is thereby contrary to policy ENV 1 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan Review 2005.

2 - ENFORCEMENT ACTION requiring the removal of the building within 6 months for the following reason:-

The building would erode the open character of this part of the site which is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and, having a use not functionally related to the open use of the land, is not considered to contribute to its character and long term open use. The proposal is thereby contrary to policy ENV 1 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan Review 2005.

Standard informatives.

IL05 - Decision drawing numbers

For the avoidance of doubt the Drawing(s) No(s) to which this decision refers are as follows:- 041001/PL(0)01 and 041001/PL(0)02 received on 14 April 2004