

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): JOS Dated: 8/6/16

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Development Control Manager: 
Dated: 8/6/16

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:

| |
|------------------------|
| REASONS: |
| CONDITIONS: |
| INFORMATIVES: |
| UDP POLICIES: |
| OTHER POLICIES: |

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

15/5407/FUL

61 Belmont Road, Twickenham

Site, History, Proposal

- The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached building that has been converted into a ground floor flat and first floor flat. The garden comprises an existing garage and is bounded by the River Crane to its rear. The rear garden of the site forms part the Metropolitan Open Land. The site is not located within a Conservation Area and has not been identified as a Building of Townscape Merit.
- 84/0776 was granted for a single storey rear extension to the main dwelling. 79/1471 was refused and dismissed at appeal for the erection of a single storey dwelling house. The size and location of this proposal was different to this current proposal, however the principal of that development is still considered relevant and will be discussed below.
- The proposal is for the construction of a single storey dwelling house to the rear of the existing dwelling at 61 Belmont Road. The dwelling would comprise two bedrooms.

Main Development Policies:

London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames, Development Management Plan, DM SD1, DM SD2, DM SD7, DM TP8, DM TP9, DM DC 1, DM DC4, DM DC 5, DM HO3 and DM HO4, Core Strategy Policy CP1, CP2, CP3, CP7, CP14 and CP 15.

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

'Front Garden and other Off-Street Parking Standards'

'Design Quality'

'Residential Development Standards'

'Small and Medium Housing Sites'

Public and other representations:

Public Representations

One (1) objection was received which outlined the proposal would harm the visual amenity and character of the area. This objection has since been withdrawn via a general observation.

Internal Comments

Highways

- a. The google view of the drive shows a car parked in the driveway. As the drive and garage belongs to no.61 at least 1 car would be displaced on street from no.61. Parking surveys will be required showing that the displacement of 1 vehicle to the street can be accommodated
- b. Submission of plan at 1:200 scale showing the proposed house in context with the drive and the end of Belmont Road, with any formal application.
- c. Show refuse/recycling and cycle storage.
- d. A draft CMS is.

2. Plans do not show the parking space for the new house. Given the very narrow access way it needs to be demonstrated that pedestrians or cyclists can get past a car.

Professional Comments:

The main planning issues that are to be considered are as follows:

Pre-application Advice

Formal pre-application advice was sought prior to the lodgement of this application which raised concerns that the erection of a dwelling would not contribute to the functional used of the MOL and that such a scheme would not be supported. Although the footprint of this proposal is slightly different to the scheme that the advice was based on, it is still of a similar size and scale and is not considered to address the concerns raised in that initial advice. Furthermore the application has not addressed the above comment from the Council's Highways Engineer which were also raised during at the pre-application stage.

Land Use

The predominant character within Belmont Road is residential with a mixture in the types of dwellings. At the end of the cul-de-sac the buildings are semi-detached and one detached building some of which (including the application site) have been converted into flats. The rest of the Belmont Close

(not including the application site) form part of Belmont Road Conservation Area and a number of the dwellings have been identified as being Buildings of Townscape Merit. There is a variance of detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and a row of terraces.

Policy DM OS2 outlines that Metropolitan Open Land will be protected and retained in predominately open use. Appropriate uses include public and private open spaces and playing fields, open recreation and sport, biodiversity including rivers and bodies of water and open community uses including allotments and cemeteries which the proposal is not included in. It will be recognised that there may be exceptional cases where appropriate development such as small scale structures is acceptable, but only if it:

1. Does not harm the character and openness of the metropolitan open land; and

The footprint and scale of the proposal is larger than the existing character which would result in unreasonable harm and erosion to the character and openness of the land. This would encroach into the continuous strip of unbuilt land that runs between the buildings and River Crane.

2. Is linked to the functional use of the Metropolitan Open Land or supports outdoor open space uses; or

The proposed dwelling is not linked to the functional use of the Metropolitan Open Land which is currently used as private amenity space for the dwelling at number 61 Belmont Road.

3. Is for essential utility infrastructure and facilities, for which it needs to be demonstrated that no alternative locations are available and that they do not have any adverse impacts on the character and openness of the metropolitan open land

The proposal is not be essential utility infrastructure.

An in-principle objection is raised with regard to the development in this location as the form of development would fail to preserve the character of the local area or the functional use of the Metropolitan Open Land that the site forms part of. The development fails to appropriately achieve the objectives of a number of the Council's planning policies which are discussed further in this report.

Design and Appearance

The properties within Belmont Road are all residential building which has a consistent pattern of open rear garden. The new dwelling would be a detached dwelling at the rear of the plot of land of number 61 and would be at odds with the prevailing character and pattern of residential development within Belmont Road given its back-land setting and design (characteristically and flat roof).

Policy DM HO3 relates back-land development and outlines there will be a presumption against the loss of back gardens due to the need to maintain local character and amenity space. The proposed dwelling would replace the existing shed structure at the rear of the existing dwelling therefore is considered back-land development. Notwithstanding the existing structure; the footprint, scale and mass of the new dwelling is larger than the existing shed and is not consistent with siting of other dwellings with rear gardens in the surrounding area. Further to the above a previous appeal for a new rear dwelling on the site was dismissed and although that scheme was for a larger and differently sited dwelling the same principle applies as the planning inspector for application 79/1471 outlined that *'this land is an important amenity feature of the area'* and *'the encroachment of a house onto it should be avoided'*. The siting of this proposal would be encroaching into this rear garden area which should be protected and retained. The new dwelling represents an incongruous form of development that fails to reflect the existing pattern of built form to the front and open rear gardens.

- Garden Land- The site forms part of a long stretch of open garden land which adjoins the Rive Crane. In the vicinity houses have been located some distance away from the river in order to maintain a continuous strip of unbuilt land alongside the river. This land is an important amenity feature of the area and provides a break in the continuous siting of residential buildings. Although there is an existing garage/shed on the site, the larger footprint and more intensive use of the site for the purpose of a standalone dwelling would not be reflective or consistent with pattern of development in the area with gardens to the rear of

dwellings. The footprint, scale and siting of the dwelling would result in a loss of private rear amenity space currently enjoyed by the residents in the flat at number 61.

- Impact on Neighbours- It is not considered that the proposal would result in unreasonable harm to the amenity of the neighbouring properties. This will be discussed further in the report.
- Mass and Scale of Development- The proposed dwelling is not an intimate addition to the area. Notwithstanding that the proposal is smaller in height than the front dwelling; its scale with regard to the massing of built form is not acceptable. The dwelling's dual pitched roof causes it to appear incongruous to the area and is not sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing buildings. It is not considered to fit in with the prevailing character of the area or represent exceptional circumstances which would warrant the granting of planning permission.

Policy DM DC1 explains that new development must be of a high architectural and urban design which is inclusive and respectful of the local character of a particular road based on a thorough understanding of the site and its context. The proposed dwelling will depart from the coherent and predominant character in the street by virtue of its design, materials and massing which all fail to be reflective of Belmont Road. The dwellings along Belmont Road have a consistent pattern of either being rendered or brick. The semi-detached and detached dwellings have hipped roofs and the terraced houses have gable roofs. The proposed dwelling would dual pitched roof and be constructed from cedar shingles and would appear at odds with the surrounding development rather than complementing it; departing from the coherent and predominant character of the road. Although the site is not located within the Belmont Road Conservation Area, given that the site is located right on its boundary it is considered that the development should still positively contribute to the preservation of the Conservation Area's appearance. The failure to sympathise with the local character means the proposal fails to achieve the objectives of DM DC1.

Neighbouring Amenity

The proposed dwelling would be single storey and is set off the new rear boundary for the front building (apart from the front porch). Although the distance from the rear of 61 Belmont Road would only be just over 4.5m, given that it is single storey and has a pitched roof sloping away from that dwelling it is not considered that it would result in unreasonable harm to the daylight/sunlight or visual amenity of the occupants at 61 Belmont Road.

With regard to impact on the flats at 57 and 59 Belmont Road; the dwelling would be set well away from the rear elevation of those flats and given its characteristics described above it is not considered it would result in unreasonable harm to the daylight/sunlight or visual amenity of those properties.

Car Parking

The proposed dwelling would result in the displacement of parking for number 61 which currently occurs in the driveway. The driveway is now proposed to be utilized for access to the new dwelling. It was advised in the initial pre-application stage that a car parking survey should be undertaken to justify the loss of the existing car parking. No parking survey or any other form of justification has been provided outlining that Belmont Road would be able to cope with the additional vehicle that would be parked on the street.

The site plan does not show the location of any cycle storage and given the width of the existing driveway 2.4m (the minimum width for a car space pursuant to the SPD 'Front Forecourt and other off-street parking standards) it would be difficult to fit the cycle storage into a location that would still allow the cars to use it. Furthermore if it is located in a position outside of the driveway again issues are raised with the width as it may be difficult for cycles and pedestrians to pass if a car is parked in the driveway.

Refuse and Recycling

The site plan has not shown the location of any refuse and recycling storage.

Residential amenity standards

The dwelling will have a floor space of 95.1sqm which exceeds the requirements of the Technical Housing Standards for a two bedroom single storey dwelling. The internal floor to ceiling height also has more than 2.3m in height for 75% of the development.

Pursuant to DM HO4 the dwelling requires 40sqm of external private amenity space and given it will have access to the land to its rear which is well in excess of 40sqm this is considered to be satisfactory.

Sustainability

The Energy and Sustainability Statement provided outlines that a total reduction of carbon emissions of 35.8%, which exceeds the minimum 35% reduction required. The development would have PV panels incorporated into the design on the roof.

The Council's Sustainable Construction Checklist has not been completed.

The application therefore fails to comply with the aims and objective of policy DM SD1 and the SPD 'Sustainable Construction Checklist'.

CIL

The proposal would be CIL liable.

Affordable Housing

The proposal would be liable for an Affordable Housing Contribution to be made. In the absence of the required documentation that is required to be submitted for affordable housing contributions the application fails to satisfy planning policies CP15, DM HO6 and the SPD 'Affordable Housing'.

Trees

The site has a number of trees located within close proximity to the proposed development. The Council's tree officer has not raised an objection the proposal subject to conditions being placed on any permission granted.

Summary

1. The proposed development by reason of its design, scale and siting represents an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development. It fails to appropriately respond or integrate with the prevailing appearance and character within the area and would fail to protect or retain the open use of the Metropolitan Open Land. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CP7 of the Core Strategy (2009), DM HO3, DM DC1 and DM OS2 of the Development Management Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents 'Design Quality' and 'Small and Medium Housing Sites'.
2. In the absence of any information with regard to the requirements of Affordable Housing Contribution which is required to be submitted as part of an application for new housing. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CP 15 of the Core Strategy (2009), DM HO6 of the Development Management Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 'Affordable Housing'.
3. The proposal would result in the displacement of existing on-site car parking for the dwelling at number 61 Belmont Road without it being replaced therefore there is no on-site car parking provided for the existing dwelling at number 61 Belmont Road. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Appendix 4 of Development.
4. In the absence of the Council's Sustainable Construction Checklist which is required to be submitted. The proposal would be therefore contrary to Policy DM SD1 of the Development Management Plan and Supplementary Planning Document 'Sustainable Construction Checklist'.

Recommendation: Refuse