

DCM

PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by
Ms Rebecca Shilstone on 9 December
2015

Application reference: 15/4780/FUL

HAM, PETERSHAM, RICHMOND RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
16.11.2015	09.12.2015	03.02.2016	03.02.2016

Site:

59 Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HR

Proposal:

Demolition of the existing bungalow (C3) and the erection of four x three bed family dwellings with basement accommodation and off-street parking.

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

APPLICANT NAME

C/O Agent

AGENT NAME

Mr James Lloyd
15 Teddington Business Park
Station Road
Teddington
TW11 9BQ

DC Site Notice: printed on 09.12.2015 and posted on 09.12.2015 and due to expire on 30.12.2015

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

14D Urban D
LBRUT Transport
14D POL
LBRUT Trees Preservation Officer
LBRuT Ecology

Expiry Date

23.12.2015
23.12.2015
23.12.2015
23.12.2015
23.12.2015

Neighbours:

15 Back Lane, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7LA, - 09.12.2015
13 Back Lane, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7LA, - 09.12.2015
3 Lovell Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7LB, - 09.12.2015
1 Lovell Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7LB, - 09.12.2015
Adjacent To, Ham Library, Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HR, - 09.12.2015
Ham Library, Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HR, - 09.12.2015
6 Tollemache Almshouses, Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HP, - 09.12.2015
57 Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HR, - 09.12.2015
48 Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HT, - 09.12.2015
5 Tollemache Almshouses, Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HP, - 09.12.2015
50 Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HT, - 09.12.2015
2 Lovell Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7LB, - 09.12.2015

History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application: 15/4780/FUL

Demolition of the existing bungalow (C3) and the erection of four x three bed family dwellings with basement accommodation and off-street parking.

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

This application is CIL liable

YES* NO
(*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement

YES* NO
(*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online (which are not on the file)

YES NO

This application has representations on file

YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): *SAS*.....

Dated: *05/04/15*.....

I agree the recommendation:

[Signature] *6/4/15*

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.

[Handwritten mark]

Development Control Manager: *[Signature]*

Dated: *6/4/15*

REASONS:
CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:
UDP POLICIES:
OTHER POLICIES:

see report.

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

CONDITIONS

INFORMATIVES

SV - 6-1-16 - Agents + Nicolette D.

- stated enlarged scale for car parking layout would be required, but not sure if this is best layout 1:0. large area of hardstudy (other alternatives from Park Lane or individual spaces).
- only issues trees to do with off-site ones.
- (rightwell large
- affordable housing - big issue
- Bespoke have go ahead to review.
- arch. style, arch. value of exis bldg.
& whether cramped to be discussed in CID
- Group Meeting
- didn't mention DM Ho 1.
- may be similarites to adj site at 57 where recent redevelopment.

15/4780/FUL

59 Ham Street, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7HR

Site description:

The application site is on the western side of Ham Street, with Back Lane running along the rear (western) boundary of the property. The property is occupied by a small single storey bungalow located adjacent to the northern boundary of the property. With the exception of the northern boundary, all other boundaries are heavily vegetated and boundary treatment consist of 1.80m boundary walls on all external boundaries. Vehicular access is provided from Ham Street.

This property and all the properties/buildings in the immediate vicinity are located within the Ham House Conservation Area. A number of properties on the eastern side of Ham Street are also designated as Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM's) and the Almshouses, north east of the application site, are also subject to an Article 4 Direction.

Planning history:

There is no recent or relevant planning history relating to the application property.

A planning application was approved in 2014 in relation to the adjacent property to the south, 57 Ham Street, for the demolition of the existing building and its replacement with a two storey dwellinghouse with basement accommodation and integral garage (ref. 14/0297/FUL).

Proposal:

This application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of four three-bedroom dwellings with accommodation over three levels including a basement level. Lightwells would be provided to the front elevations (fronting Ham Street) to light habitable accommodation at basement level.

The dwellings would be arranged as semi-detached pairs with access provided from Ham Street and six off street parking spaces provided to the front of the properties. Each property would be provided with its own private amenity space to the rear of the property. Low level boundary treatment is proposed to the front elevation to Ham Street with a higher fence to Back Lane to enclose the proposed rear gardens.

Amendments:

Further information was submitted on the 08/01/15, 08/02/2015, 19/02/2015, 29/03/2015 including a Heritage Statement Addendum, Construction Management Plan, parking tracking diagram, Viability Rebuttal and revised site layout plan amongst other things. This information has been considered in the assessment set out below.

On the 01/04/2015 "two alternative options" were submitted by the agent. The covering email states that "option 2 removes the basement" and notes "it is proposed to [re]place low boundary walls to the front with landscaping which will ensure that the semi-rural character of the area is preserved". Option 1 seeks to rearranged the car parking and pedestrian access to the front of the properties and option 2 seeks this change but also includes the omission of the basement lightwells. No changes are shown in respect of the front boundary treatment and minor changes are proposed to the landscaping. Revised floor plans/elevations did not accompany this submission and therefore the acceptability of the options cannot fully be assessed, but these options are referred to in the assessment below for completeness.

Main Development plan policies:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance
Development Management Plan – DM SD1, DM SD2, DM OS5, DM HD1, DM HD3, DM HD4,
DM HO2, DM HO4, DM HO6, DM TP1, DM TP2, DM TP7, DM TP8, DM DC1, DM DC4, DM
DC5

Core Strategy Policies – CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP5, CP6, CP7, CP14, CP15

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents – Affordable Housing, Sustainable Construction Checklist, Design Quality, Residential Development Standards, Small & Medium Housing Sites, Ham House Conservation Area Statement and Study

Public and other representations:

Two representation in support (including one that appears to be from the family of the applicant) and 25 representations in objection has been received and a summary of the key points raised is set out below:

Objection:

- Materials, design and architecture is out of character with other buildings and wider area
- Concerns regarding loss of existing boundary walls, and exposure of proposed parking area to the front of property which is uncharacteristic of area
- Density, scale and massing is unsuitable and out of proportion with the surrounding area and would result in a loss of the semi-rural feel of site and area
- Instability, noise and disturbance associated with basement construction
- Addition parking/traffic movements causing disruption on Ham Street and difficulty manoeuvring in and out of proposed car parking spaces
- Failure to provide affordable housing
- Demolition of building resulting in loss of interesting architecture and concerns about the level of information contained within the heritage statement

Support:

- Architecture sits comfortably with area and care has been taken to ensure design is fitting with area

A number of residents raised concerns about the length of the consultation period (the 21 days formally ending just before Christmas). All representations made before the determination date (including those received outside the formal consultation period) have been considered in the summary above, and assessment below.

No requests were made for the application to be heard by the Planning Committee.

A representation has also been received from the Twentieth Century Society who object to the proposed demolition of the existing building as they consider it to be an example of significance architectural and historical interest.

A letter and advice report from Historic England was received on the 17/03/2015 which confirmed that an application to list the application property has been considered but the decision had been taken not to list the property.

Professional comments:Land use

The London Plan requires Local Planning Authorities to prevent the loss of housing without its planned replacement at existing or higher densities. Similar objectives are set out in Core Strategy policy CP1.

DMP policies (HO1 – 6) recognise the substantial housing need within the Borough, but make it clear that this need should not lead to development that adversely impact on local character and established residential neighbourhoods. Paragraph 5.1.1 notes that the quality of housing to be provided is as important as the quantity.

Given the site is in a predominately residential area and is close to existing facilities, the re-use of the site for residential use is acceptable. In addition, and subject to other considerations including the impact on local character and the conservation area (assessed under the relevant sections below, a net increase of residential units on the site would be welcomed. Policy DM HO 2 makes clear that infill development must reflect the character of the surrounding area and protect the amenity of neighbours. The policy lists a number of criteria to be considered in the assessment of applications. This assessment is included in the relevant sections below.

Affordable Housing

Policy CP15 expects the provision of a range of housing to meet the needs of all households. 50% of new units should be affordable with contributions expected on all new housing sites.

Policy DM HO6 looks for a financial contribution to the Affordable Housing Fund on sites of less than 10 units, based on a sliding scale. The Council's suggested approach to calculating affordable housing on site is based on the principle set out within the policy of capturing the subsidy a developer would have put in had the scheme been for affordable housing, further details are contained in the Affordable Housing SPD. The contribution that would be sought would be discounted to represent 20% of the affordable housing given the proposal will create four new units. The commuted sum can be calculated using the pro-forma attached as Annex A to the Affordable Housing SPD. Using this tool, Officers suggest that a contribution of £693,829 be made toward affordable housing.

The applicant has submitted a Viability Report prepared by Andrew Gollard Associates which concludes that the development is viable, but cannot support any CIL, S106 or affordable housing contributions.

The Viability Report and scheme has been reviewed by the Council's Planning Viability Advisor. The Council's advisor has found a number of areas of difference between the parties including estimated build costs, proposed sales values, benchmark land value (based on market value) and profit level. The Council's advisor has carried out their own appraisal using a 17.5% gross profit margin (as opposed to the 20% used by the applicant), medium build costs rates from BCIS (which was elevated by 43.5% in the applicant's assessment) and pricing that reflects the average per square meter sales values based on market research. The Council's advisor has also included the mandatory CIL contributions.

The Council's advisor's appraisal finds a residual land value of £2,701,000 which is above their defined benchmark land value of £1,008,000 by £1,693,000 making the development viable with both CIL and S106/affordable housing contributions.

The report produced by the Council's planning viability advisors was provided to the applicant and a response was received on the 19th February. Although the applicant's response argues with a number of the points of difference, no new evidence was submitted by the applicant that enables a different conclusion to be reached, nor do the arguments made alter the view of the Council's advisor. Options 1 and 2 have not been considered by either of the viability consultants, but it is noted that the omission of the basement will significantly reduce the build costs.

In the absence of a binding obligation to secure the payment of the required contributions towards the provision of affordable housing or evidence to justify the absence of such, the proposal is contrary to the aims of policy CP15 of the Core Strategy, DM HO6 of the Development Management Plan and the adopted Affordable Housing SPD.

Design and impact on heritage assets

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Paragraphs 17 and 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework highlight that the Government attaches great importance to the design of built environment, as good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Thereby as outlined in paragraph 64, permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Paragraph 17, pg. 5 lists the Core Planning Principles, noting that these are designed to underpin both plan-making and decision-taking and include the need to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations".

Core Strategy Policy CP7 requires all new development to recognise and contribute to locally distinctive character in order to create and improve places that are well used and valued whilst maintaining a high architectural and urban design quality.

Policy DM DC1 states that new development must be of a high architectural and urban design quality based on sustainable design principles. Designs should respect local character, including the nature of particular road and connect with and contribute to its surroundings. Design qualities will need to have regard to local character, including scale, height, massing, proportions and form as well as the space between buildings and relationships to the public realm as well as detailing and materials. Development that is out of scale with existing surrounding development will not be supported by the Council.

Paragraph 6.1.1 of DM DC1 states that 'Schemes that are not of a high design quality, and will not result in the improvement of the area where they will be built or implemented, will not be acceptable'. Paragraph 6.1.7 goes on to note that this does not have to result in the imitation of existing architectural forms or features, 'but should recognise the rhythm, height, proportion and plot relationships of existing properties.'

Policy DM HO2 deals with infill development and notes that this must reflect the character of the surrounding areas. The supporting text notes the importance of development reinforcing the character of streets by reflecting the scale, mass, height, form, fenestration and architectural details of its neighbours (para. 5.1.11) and notes that the character of streets has often been weakened by infilling space between dwellings. In considering new development the width of the remaining and the new plot should be similar to that prevailing in the immediate area and the established spacing between dwellings, building line and height should be maintained.

Policy DM HD1 seeks to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas, with an emphasis on positively enhancing the Conservation Area. It notes that buildings, or parts of buildings that contribute positively to the character, appearance or significance of the area should be retained. Policy DM HD3 looks to enhance and encourage the preservation of Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM) by protecting their significance, character and setting.

The property is within the Ham House Conservation Area and the associated Statement describes the character of the areas as follows:

"Ham Street runs North to South from the riverbank and Ham House to Ham Common. It contains an eclectic collection of buildings including a group of elegant 18th century listed mansions of The Manor House, Beaufort House and Newman House, with their enclosing high brick walls and mature gardens, and also a number of terraced cottages and almshouses on a smaller scale... The resulting mix of styles and traditional materials gives texture and interest to this street. Those gaps between the houses and groups of houses provide glimpses of the wider backdrop of trees and green space, a landscape setting which contributes to the distinctive rural character of this area.

Dealing firstly with the principle of demolition, the 20th Century Society has objected to the demolition of the building as they consider that the building has significance. However, as set out above, Historic England have considered an application for listing the building and have decided not to list. The building had some significance historically as part of a designed pair (with no. 57) however, the associated building has now been demolished and therefore the historical significance has been lost. Extensions and alterations to both buildings have diminished any significance these might have once had. Aesthetically, the building has a neutral impact on the character of the conservation area, and due to the age of the building and construction materials, is in a rundown state of repair and performs poorly from an environmental perspective. On this basis, no objection is raised to the principle of demolition, subject to the agreement of a satisfactory replacement building.

As set out above, the character of the area is of an eclectic collection of buildings. However, what unites the area and provides the conservation area with its character is the gaps between the houses and groups of houses, the backdrop of trees and green space – the

landscape setting which gives the area a rural character. The character of the area is largely arrived at through the plot sizes, scale, height, massing, and proportions of the buildings, but also and importantly, the spaces between the buildings. The gaps between the buildings contribute much to the feeling of space and, by enabling views through to the mature trees behind, contribute to the leafy character of the street and adjacent conservation area. The gaps provide a sense of spaciousness and continuity to the street scene.

It is noted that the applicant describes views to the property from the conservation area to be "localised". However, the environmental quality associated with the conservation area is evident not only in the public realm, but also at the rear and sides of properties, particularly, around areas of private gardens. Residents' appreciation and enjoyment of the special character and appearance of this conservation area derives from both public viewpoints and views from within their dwellings. As such, in applying policies in relation to the built environment, the Council considers it appropriate to assess the impact not only the street scene, but also as viewed from other buildings and gardens. This approach has been supported at appeal (see appeal ref. APP/L5810/A/09/2098345 for example).

The single storey nature and modest footprint of the existing building allow the property to appear as a walled garden with mature trees dominating the views above the boundary treatment both from Ham Street and Back Lane. The openness of the site and mature trees make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area when viewed from both adjacent roadways. The buildings on neighbouring properties to both the north, but particularly to the south have similar sized footprints and garden dominated settings. The planning permission currently under construction on the site to the south maintains this character, and will occupy a footprint of a similar size to the building which previously occupied the site.

The application proposal falls to respect or acknowledge the open character and garden setting of the conservation area. The proposal would significantly increase (approximately double) the built footprint on the site, resulting in a marked reduction in garden space and associated openness. In addition, the development would be two storeys with a pitched roof and would span the width of the plot from north to south leaving only minimal gap between the detached pairs and adjacent property boundaries reducing the feeling of space.

What results is a proposal that appears cramped and contrived and sits awkwardly and uncomfortably within the wider street scene. The dwellings appear squashed and unrelieved and introduce an uncharacteristic type of design into the leafy and open character of the street. These new housing types will detract from the prevailing pattern of development and dilute the character of the area.

This proposal is clearly different from the permission approved on the adjacent property to the south where the Committee Report acknowledges that "the proposed dwelling would be located in broadly the same location on the site as the existing property, would be set back from the front and rear site boundaries, and would not appear overtly prominent or dominant in the streetscape as a result". In addition, the approved building is two storey, with the lower storey set partially below ground and a flat roof. The approved drawings show a maximum building height above ground of 6.0m. Conversely, the current proposal is two storey with a pitched roof with a maximum height of 7.5m (approx.) to ridge and 8.5m (approx.) to the chimney stack. The increased height, when combined with the increased footprint, results in a significantly larger extent of massing.

Additionally, this part of the conservation area is characterised by high boundary walls. The proposal seeks to introduce a low level wall (600mm) to Ham Street exposing the extensive area of hardstanding required to accommodate the off street parking requirements for four houses. Whilst a small area of planting is proposed adjacent to the front boundary, this would not obscure this parking area from view. It is noted that in the event the proposal was acceptable, a condition could have been imposed proposed to address the suitability of the boundary treatment, however, given the central location of the vehicular entrance and requirement for visibility splays, Officers are not satisfied that a solution exists which would ensure this adverse impact could be overcome.

Whilst no objection is raised to the removal of the trees proposed as part of the application as these are not of a size or species worthy of protection in their own right (as further explained below), the extensive area of parking required would prevent the planting of any trees/shrubs in future further reducing the area of garden space adding more weight to the concerns identified above. The options presented by the applicant on the 01/04/15 would not overcome these concerns.

In the event the proposal had been acceptable, conditions would have been recommended to control the materials and detailing, and boundary treatment.

In view of the above the proposed development by reason of its density, design, massing, plot width, siting and enclosure of gaps between the development and the respective neighbouring properties would result in an intrusive form of development, eroding the sense of spaciousness in the streetscape to the detriment of the locality and its character whilst failing to at least preserve the character, appearance and setting of the Ham House Conservation Area. The proposal would thereby be contrary to policy, particularly CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames adopted Core Strategy, policy DM HD1, DM DC1, DM HO1, DM HO2 of the Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan and SPD Small and Medium Housing Sites and Design Quality.

Neighbour Amenity

Policy DM DC 5 seeks to protect neighbouring properties from an unreasonable loss of privacy, pollution, visual intrusion, noise and disturbance by seeking to ensure sufficient daylight can penetrate into and between buildings whilst protecting adjoining properties and land from overshadowing.

The proposed buildings would be sufficient separated from neighbouring properties to ensure there would be no loss of light, outlook or undue sense of enclosure arising from the development. Windows proposed in the flank elevations of the buildings with outlook over neighbouring gardens light non habitable spaces (stairwells) and therefore there would be no loss of privacy resulting from the proposed development.

Housing Standards/Living Conditions

Policy DM HO1 sets out the criteria to assess whether buildings are suitable for conversion and the impact on the character of the locality.

Policy DM HO4 looks to ensure that the housing mix is appropriate for the location, noting that family sized accommodation is preferred except in town centre locations. All new housing developments, including conversions need to comply with internal and external space standards. Paragraph 5.1.25 states that for houses a minimum total outdoor private space of 70sqm for 3 or more beds and 40sqm for 2 beds should be provided.

Policy CP14 (14.E) states that all new homes should be built to Lifetime Homes Standards and 10% to wheelchair standards.

Provision of three bedroom family sized dwellings in this location is considered appropriate. The proposed internal layouts are spacious and would accord with the minimum criteria set out in policy DM HO4 and the Residential Development Standards SPD. All habitable rooms, including the kitchen/breakfast room at basement level, would have sufficient access to natural light and ventilation (owning the inclusion of a lightwell at basement level). Each of the properties would have a rear garden that would be adequately sized. In the event the proposal was acceptable, a condition would be imposed to ensure compliance with Lifetime Homes Standards, *effectively superseded by a condition to meet Building Regulation Requirement M4(2)*

Parking & Traffic

Policy DM TP7 looks to maintain and improve conditions for cyclists ensuring new developments provide appropriate and sufficient cycle parking and do not adversely impact on the wider cycling network.

Policy DM TP8 seeks to ensure proposals for development, redevelopment, conversion or extension demonstrate that an appropriate level of off-street parking is provided to meet the needs of the scheme in order to avoid unacceptable impact on local on-street parking and traffic conditions.

Parking standards are expected to be met, unless the applicant can demonstrate that the proposal would have no adverse impact on on-street parking provision or traffic conditions. Paragraph 5.4.29 sets out the expectation that in areas of low PTAL (1-4) the parking standards should be met, whilst in areas of high PTAL (5-6) parking provision at a lower level may be appropriate in exceptional circumstances, subject to other mitigating measures.

The application site has a very low PTAL (of 1b) and the Councils Transport Team have noted that the surrounding areas are heavily parked and residents experience difficulties parking due to the existing levels of congestion. The proposal provides six off street parking spaces which would accord with the parking standards, although it is noted that the Transport Team suggest two parking spaces per house might be more appropriate here given the congestion. Notwithstanding, no objection to the proposal has been raised by the Transport Team subject to a number of conditions to control provision of a disabled parking bay, details of the crossover, boundary treatment and landscaping,

It is noted that a parking tracking diagram was provided to demonstrate that vehicles could manoeuvre in and out of the proposed parking spaces without conflict. Options 1 and 2 provided by the applicant on the 01/04/2015 seek to alter this arrangement. In order for this revised arrangement to be accepted, Officers would need to see revised tracking diagrams demonstrating the acceptability of the revised parking arrangement.

Cycle parking for each of the properties would be provided to the rear of each unit and communal refuse and recycling storage provided to the front of the properties. This appears acceptable but in the event the proposal was acceptable a condition would have been imposed requesting the detail of this.

Construction impacts

The implications of a basement development on the structural integrity of neighbouring properties are a material planning consideration, in line with the NPPF, and a number of local planning authorities, such as the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the City of Westminster have developed or are developing specific policies for basement development.

The regulation of basement construction goes well beyond the planning process and involves either, other legislative processes related to buildings (such as party wall matters), or other Council regulatory services. The national and legislative position to-date is to rely on the building industry to operate to appropriate methods and standards and to expect the Building Control process via Building Regulations to ensure that proposals are adequately designed and constructed. It is the legal responsibility of owners and contractors not to cause damage to neighbouring premises and to ensure the quality of construction work. The Party Wall Act and Building Regulations are the appropriate mechanisms for regulating the structural aspects of basement construction, rather than the planning process.

The property is not located within Flood Zone 2 or 3 (thus is located in Flood Zone 1), neither is located within a Critical Drainage Area. As such, a Flood Risk Assessment is not required. The impacts of isolated single storey basements are unlikely to have a significant effect on the groundwater regime in the area. It is not considered that there are any particular flooding issues associated with the scheme and this type of development is therefore suitable in this location.

Where the specific circumstances of the site require it, a Construction Method Statement will be required, in order to minimise the impact of construction traffic, and details of foundations, in order to ameliorate noise and vibration during construction. Given Ham Street/Back Lane are relatively busy roads and the construction works will be significant (particularly the basement works), a construction method statement has been submitted which provides some details associated with the construction works. In the event the proposal has been found

acceptable a condition would have been imposed requiring the resubmission of this with additional information prior to the commencement of works.

Sustainability

Core Strategy Policy CP1 seeks to maximise the effective use of resources whilst assisting in reducing any long term adverse impacts of development. New buildings should conform to the Borough's Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD.

Core Strategy Policy CP2 aims to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by minimising energy consumption in new developments by requiring the use of renewable energy generation unless it can be demonstrated that provision is not feasible.

Policy DM SD1 requires all development to include measures capable of mitigating and adapting to climate change. It requires all new homes to achieve a minimum 25% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions over Building Regulations. Following the Government's Ministerial Statement released on 25 March 2015 in response to the Housing Standards Review Consultation, a number of changes have been introduced to technical housing standards in England, including the withdrawal of the Code for Sustainable Homes as a national standard. In respect of new homes and energy efficiency, proposal must now achieve a 35% reduction in CO2 emissions over Building Regulations requirements (2013). This approach is also in accordance with the London Plan.

The applicant has submitted a document titled "Energy Statement" which suggests that a 35.09% improvement beyond building regulations will be achieved through the provision of an air source heat pump. Although the information submitted is limited, it is considered that this matter could have been addressed by condition in the event the proposal had been considered acceptable.

The applicant has also submitted a Sustainable Construction Checklist which concludes that the proposal 40 credits which for a new build development demonstrates "minimal effort to increase sustainability beyond general compliance". Whilst Officers consider there are areas where additional credits could be achieved, as the proposal would not fail, a refusal on this basis cannot be sustained.

In view of the above the proposal is considered to comply with the above relevant policies from the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan relating to the sustainability and energy efficiency of the development.

Trees and ecology

Policy DM DC 4 seeks to protect and enhance the trees and landscape within the borough. Landscaping details are required for new development which retain existing trees and other important landscape features where practicable and include new trees and other planting.

An Arboricultural Survey and Preliminary Ecological Survey have been submitted with the application and reviewed by Officers.

There are no TPOs on this site or the neighbouring site. Whilst the scheme proposes the removal of four trees, these are considered to be of low significance due to their size and location. In the event the proposal had been considered acceptable conditions would have been imposed to ensure tree protection measures were implemented to protect trees on and off site during construction and to require replacement tree planting to offset against those trees proposed for removal (this is also required by the Ecological report recommendations submitted by the applicant). However, as set out above, the areas available for tree planting are much reduced (particularly along Ham Street) due to the increase footprint of development.

The Council's Ecology officer has reviewed the submitted details and raises no objections subject to conditions.

Summary:

The proposed development by reason of its density, design, massing, plot width, siting and enclosure of gaps between the development and the respective neighbouring properties would result in an intrusive form of development, eroding the sense of spaciousness in the streetscape to the detriment of the locality and its character whilst failing to at least preserve the character, appearance and setting of the Ham House Conservation Area. The proposal would thereby be contrary to policy, particularly CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames adopted Core Strategy, policy DM HD1, DM DC1, DM HO1, DM HO2 of the Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan, SPD Small and Medium Housing Sites and Design Quality, and the Ham House Conservation Area Statement and Study.

In the absence of a binding obligation to secure the payment of the required contributions towards the provision of affordable housing or evidence to justify the absence of such, the proposal fails to contribute to an identified housing need or widen housing choice in the borough in compliance with policies CP15 of the Core Strategy and DM HO6 of the Development Management Plan and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

Recommendation: Refuse