

Application Reference: 17/2759/FUL

Site Address: Garages Adjacent 75 Churchview Road Twickenham

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of an existing garage block and the erection of a mews development, consisting of 3 x 2 bedroom dwellings, together with associated car parking and landscaping works.

Site and Surroundings

The site concerns a terrace of 10 garage units, 123sqm in area, located at the northern end of Churchview Road, Twickenham. The site is situated close to the A305 Staines Road to the south and is bounded by the River Crane to the north with Crane Park to the west. The site does not comprise and is not located within the setting of a statutory or locally listed building and is not located within a conservation area.

The site is however located within an Archaeological Priority Area, with part of the rear of the site within flood zones 2 and 3a. The application site is also located to adjoin the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), the Crane Park/River Crane nature conservation site (and an Other Site of Nature Importance) and River Crane Area of Opportunity.

The area is predominantly residential in character which comprise of dwellinghouses and flatted accommodation.

Relevant Planning History

16/P0338/PREAPP - Demolition of existing garage block and erection of three, two bedroom houses – CLOSED

Public and Other Representations:

- The application has been advertised by way of neighbour notification. 22 letters of objections have been received which can be summarised as follows:
 - Loss of trees
 - Loss of biodiversity and wildlife
 - Impact to MOL and River Crane
 - Parking Stress
 - Noise
 - Views to Crane Park obstructed
 - Drainage issues

- Loss of light
 - Overlooking/lack of privacy
 - Risk of flooding
 - Construction issues
 - Safety of people in the area
 - Timing of the application is unfair
 - These garage should remain as parking for Sontan Court
- Requests have been made for the application to be heard at the planning committee by neighbours should the application be recommended for approval
 - A councillor has also commented on the scheme but has concluded issues regarding wildlife from the residents

Planning Policy Context

The proposal has been considered having regard to the policies within the National Planning Policy Framework, the National Described Space Standards (2015), the London Plan Consolidated with Alterations (March 2016), and the Council's Local Plan, in particular:

London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames Core Strategy 2009:

- CP1 (Sustainable Development)
- CP2 (Reducing Carbon Emissions)
- CP3 (Climate Change - Adapting to the Effects)
- CP5 (Sustainable Travel)
- CP7 (Maintaining and improving the Local Environment)
- CP14 (Housing)
- CP15 (Affordable Housing)

London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames Development Management Plan 2011:

- DM SD 1 Sustainable Construction
- DM SD 2 Renewable Energy and Decentralised Energy Networks
- DM SD 6 Flood Risk
- DM SD 7 Sustainable Drainage
- DM OS 2 Metropolitan Open Land
- DM OS 4 Historic Parks, Gardens and Landscapes
- DM OS 5 Biodiversity and New Development
- DM HO 1 Existing Housing
- DM HO 2 Infill Development
- DM HO 3 Backland Development
- DM HO 4 Housing Mix and Standards

- DM HO 6 Delivering Affordable Housing
- DM HD 3 Buildings of Townscape Merit
- DM HD 4 Archaeological Sites
- DM TP 1 Transport and New Development
- DM TP 2 Enhancing Transport Links
- DM TP 6 Walking and the Pedestrian Environment
- DM TP 7 Cycling
- DM TP 8 Off Street Parking - Retention and New Provision
- DM TP 9 Forecourt Parking
- DM DC 1 Design Quality
- DM DC 4 Trees and Landscape
- DM DC 5 Neighbourliness, Sunlighting and Daylighting
- DM DC 6 Balconies and Upper Floor Terraces

The Publication Version Local Plan 2017:

- LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality
- LP 2 Building Heights
- LP 7 Archaeology
- LP 8 Amenity and Living Conditions
- LP 13 Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Local Green Space
- LP 15 Biodiversity
- LP 16 Trees, Woodlands and Landscape
- LP 18 River corridors
- LP 20 Climate Change Adaptation
- LP 21 Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage
- LP 22 Sustainable Design and Construction
- LP 31 Public Open Space, Play Space, Sport and Recreation
- LP 34 New Housing
- LP 35 Housing Mix and Standards
- LP 36 Affordable Housing
- LP 39 Infill, Backland and Backgarden Development
- LP 40 Employment and Local Economy
- LP 44 Sustainable Travel Choices
- LP 45 Parking standards and servicing

London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames Supplementary Planning Documents:

- Small and Medium Housing Sites (2006)
- Residential Development Standards (2010)
- Affordable Housing (2014)
- Refuse and Recycling Requirements (2015)

- Sustainable Construction Checklist SPD (2011)
- Front Garden & Other Off-Street Parking SPD (2006)

Amendments

- None

Professional Comments

The main issues for consideration in the assessment of the development proposals are as follows:

- *Principle of Development including loss of existing car parking spaces;*
- *Standards of Accommodation;*
- *Neighbouring Residential Amenity;*
- *Character and Appearance of the area*
- *Impact upon the MOL and parkland area*
- *Sustainability;*
- *Parking and Transport including refuse storage;*
- *Trees and Landscaping;*
- *Affordable Housing and CIL;*

Principle of Development including loss of existing car parking spaces

Chapter 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages local planning authorities to 'boost significantly the supply of housing' to 'deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities'. Encouragement for the delivery of new housing is also expressed within Policy 3.3 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy CP14.

The predominant character of the surrounding area as residential is noted; with the immediate streetscene comprising three-storey flatted blocks (1-73 Churchview Road), and two-storey semi-detached and detached dwellings. Furthermore, the loss of the existing garages will be offset with the reconfiguration of the existing on-site parking to provide thirteen spaces to the rear with three new parking spaces along the grass verge. As such, it is considered that the use of this site for residential accommodation is acceptable. However, the nature of the proposed development displays elements of both infill and back-land development, and as such it is pertinent to consider Policies DM HO2, DM HO3, and emerging Policy LP 39. Whilst a residential development is considered acceptable, it is important for the scheme to demonstrate that it is sustainable, not harmful to the surrounding character and circumstances of the area and residential amenity and overall policy compliant.

Standards of Accommodation

Policy DM HO4 states development should generally provide family sized accommodation, except for town centre locations where a higher proportion of small units would be acceptable, the housing mix should be appropriate to the location. Furthermore, new housing developments must comply with external and internal space standards. It states the Council will only grant planning permission for new dwellings that provide adequate internal space and appropriate external private and/or communal amenity space to meet the needs generated by the development.

The nationally described space standard sets a minimum gross internal floor area of 79sqm for a 2 bed 4 person two-storey dwelling, there is no such equivalent for a three storey dwelling. Given the proposed houses are each 106.5sqm and exceed the nearest equivalent standard, no objections are raised.

The requirements of Policies DMHO4 and LP35 (C and D) and the Residential Development Standards SPD continue to apply to external amenity space. For houses a minimum total private space of 40sqm for 2 beds is required. The Planning Statement states private amenity space is provided in the form of a recessed terrace at first floor level, as an extension of the living room, providing 7.5 sqm of outdoor amenity space. It states the ground floor provides a decked terrace area for each dwelling, as part of a shared landscape concept is to be implemented for the wider site to the rear. From the landscape plan, it appears that landscaping works would occur to the rear of the proposed houses, by way of a new grass lawn. It is not clear from the plan or statements whether this space would be used or acted as amenity space for the 3 mews houses. However, despite the amenity space being lower than the minimum standards, it is considered the River Crane, Crane Park and the new proposed communal grass lawn to the rear could contribute to the overall amenity space available for future occupiers.

Policy CP14 states that all new homes should be built to Lifetime Homes Standards. Since 1 October 2015 all new housing is expected to meet Building Regulation Requirement M4 (2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. However M4(2) requires step free access and therefore would not be applicable. The mandatory M4(1) would be applicable, as that is the default it does not need to be secured by condition.

All habitable rooms would be of sufficient size and would have good standards of natural light entering the rooms. The habitable rooms would provide a good level of outlook for future occupiers.

It is considered on these grounds, the development would, on balance, be acceptable.

Neighbouring Residential Amenity

Policy DM DC5 and LP8 states in considering proposals for development, the Council will seek to protect adjoining properties from unreasonable loss of privacy, pollution, visual intrusion, noise and disturbance. The Council will generally seek to ensure that the design and layout of buildings enables sufficient sunlight and daylight to penetrate into and between buildings and that adjoining land or

properties are protected from overshadowing in accordance with established standards.

With regards to residential amenity Policy DM DC6 and LP8 states that balconies and upper floor terraces should be [inter alia]: designed to provide some shelter and privacy to neighbouring properties, either by using screens or by setting the balcony back within the façade. Balconies and upper floor terraces to existing properties will not generally be permitted unless they satisfy the criteria within Policy DM DC6 and they do not adversely affect neighbourliness.

Owing to the orientation of the proposed development, with the existing units at 1-73 Churchview Road having its flank wall sited approx. 90° to the scheme, the main properties to consider in the assessment of residential amenity are those to the south west along Campbell Close, specifically Nos.19 and 20.

The applicants have submitted a Daylight and Sunlight Report (prepared by Point Surveyors, ref: P1187, dated June 2017), which concludes that the proposals fall within the allowances of the VSC criteria specified within the BRE guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (Littlefair 2011). On the basis of the information submitted it is considered that the proposals would not cause significant harm to the daylight amenities of the occupiers of those along Campbell Close. Having further been on site and reviewing the submitted documents, it is considered natural light issues would not be detrimental to the occupiers of no.19-20 Campbell Close with this development in place

The orientation of the properties and fenestration, and the enclosure of the balconies, is not considered to give rise to opportunity for overlooking towards neighbouring properties.

However, the proposed dwellings by reason of their combined siting, design, bulk and mass and resultant loss of trees would result in a visually intrusive, overbearing and overlooking form of development, including new views from Sontan Court that detracts from the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties, in particular nos. 15-20 Campbell Close. The removal/works of trees along the western boundary, to allow for the four parking spaces on the grass verge would enable new views from Sontan Court onto the properties along Campbell close. This would cause significant overlooking and privacy issues, which currently the trees are reducing, given Sontan Court being much larger in scale. Furthermore, the properties of no.18-20 Campbell Close would see a significant intrusive and overbearing development approximately 11 metres away from the rear of their properties at three-storey high. The existing garage, which are of one-storey would be removed and replaced with an overbearing piece of development which has not followed the guidance set out in the SPDs. It is noted that the Sontan Court is much higher than the proposed development. However, the Court is set away from the properties along Campbell Close at a respectable distance so does not appear significantly overbearing.

It is considered the development on these grounds, would be unacceptable.

Character and Appearance of the area

Policy CP7 requires all new development to recognise distinctive local character and contribute to creating places of a high architectural and urban design quality that are well used and valued.

Policy DM DC1 and LP1 require schemes to be of a high standard of design, ensuring that they are compatible with the scale and character of the existing development.

Policy DM HD 1 and LP3 specify that Buildings or parts of buildings, street furniture, trees and other features which make a positive contribution to the character, appearance or significance of the area should be retained. New development (or redevelopment) or other proposals should conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Given the variety in the form, scale, design, and use of materials to properties along the streetscene and surrounding area, the Council raise no objection to the provision of 'mews style' units within this location, particularly as these are largely contained within the limited footprint of existing garages.

With regards to mass and scale, whilst concerns are raised in terms of the impact of the proposals upon the amenities of neighbouring residents and MOL (see below), in character and design terms, the height and form of the proposals is considered to remain subservient to the adjacent flats. This subservience is assisted through the design detailing of the dwellings, where the large panel glazing, inset porches, and amended banding between the first floor and mansard provide appropriate projections and steps which visually 'break-up' the front elevations and reduce the overall bulk and mass of this short terrace.

The proposed choice of materials in terms of character and design terms would not detract from the visual amenities of the streetscene and surrounding area. Although this development appears overbearing and visually intrusive in a neighbouring amenity point of view, the use of mews style is considered appropriate.

It is considered on these grounds, the development would, on balance, be acceptable.

Impact upon the MOL; Parkland area; Biodiversity; Trees and Landscaping

Impact upon the MOL and Parkland area –

The proposed three dwellings, by reason of their siting, design, height, width, scale and mass would represent an overly dominant structure that conflicts with the open character and appearance of the adjacent parkland and Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) thereby eroding the setting and views into and from this public open space. The site is currently of single storey and constructing a three-storey structure would damage the setting and views into the public open space to a significant extent. The proposed site would be approximately 6 metres away from the MOL at three-storeys high which is considered to be an over dominant structure which would have negative impact to the MOL and

parkland area given its close distance. It is noted that the surrounding properties along Campbell Close are of two-storey which makes their impact appear less harmful. The Sontan court is of three-storeys but this is significantly set away from the MOL and parkland area to the rear of the site.

It is noted that associated landscape works (including removal of trees) would occur to the rear of the site. However, sufficient detail has not been provided to ensure the MOL and Parkland area would not be harmed.

Biodiversity –

The new parking arrangements on the northern boundary would prejudice tree retention, local biodiversity and a wildlife corridor link to Crane Park. The proposed parking arrangements across the site are considered to be harmful to the local biodiversity in the area.

Trees and Landscaping –

Policy DM DC 4 and emerging Policy LP16 state that the Boroughs trees and landscape will be protected and enhanced by requiring landscape proposals in submissions for new development, which retain existing trees and other important landscape features where practicable and include new trees and other planting.

The trees on this site are not protected by Tree Preservation Order (TPO) nor conservation area but the proposal does back onto Crane Park a LBRuT public open space.

The following trees are due for removal:

T9 (Hawthorn at a 4m height)

T11 (Hawthorn, at a 4m height)

T12 (Hawthorn, at a 4m height)

T13 (Hawthorn, at a 4m height)

T15 (Ash, at a 7m height) on the north side of the property adjacent to Trafalgar Infant school- all considered category U and of small to moderate size.

Whilst these trees are not considered significant, their removal will reduce the privacy and wildlife screen between the proposal and the school (although considered to be sufficient on these grounds. Furthermore, works to T1 (Holly, a 4.5m tree), T2 (Privet, a 3m tree) and T3 (Leyland cypress, a 4m tree) - low quality category C on the southern boundary adjacent to properties in Churchview road and to the rear of properties in Campbell road would also be significantly harmful and introduce new views from Sontan Court.

The landscape plan (PL900) rev B does not provide sufficient detail at this time and includes trees which will be removed. An improved plan is required and must include replanting along the boundaries to

replace trees being removed. This is to ensure the privacy screen is retained and the wildlife corridor link to Crane Park, which would not be the case here.

It is considered on these grounds, would be unacceptable.

Sustainability

Policy CP1 requires the effective use of resources including land, water and energy, and assist in reducing any long term adverse environmental impacts of development. Development will be required to conform to the Sustainable Construction checklist, including the requirement to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 (for new homes), Ecohomes "excellent" (for conversions) or BREEAM "excellent" (for other types of development).

The submitted Energy Statement and BREEAM Assessment (submitted by Derek GC White) suggests a reduction of 35% in regulated CO2 emissions could be possible with the following preferred options:

- PV cells
- Air Sourced Heat Pumps

A sustainable construction checklist has also been submitted which demonstrated a score rating of 50.5 (rating B) which would help to significantly improve the Borough's stock of sustainable developments

Within the statements and supporting documents it is not clear that the development would ensure a reduction of CO2 emissions by more than 35%. Despite the checklist showing a reduction of 39%, it has not been demonstrated how this would be achieved.

Whilst the renewable methods could be considered acceptable, a condition would have been attached to ensure how the proposed energy measures reduce CO₂ emissions by 35%. Information regarding the air source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels would also be conditioned if the application were to be approved.

Parking and Transport including refuse storage

Policies DM TP8 and LP45 state that developments will have to demonstrate that the new scheme provides an appropriate level of off-street parking to avoid an unacceptable impact on on-street parking conditions and local traffic conditions. The maximum car parking standard for 1-2 bed units is 1 space. The site is within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1a.

Policies DM TP7 and LP44 seek the provision of appropriate cycle access and sufficient, secure cycle parking facilities. Appendix Four - Parking Standards of the Local Plan outlines parking requirements. The minimum cycle parking requirement for 1-2 bed unit is 1 space.

The proposal provides substandard integral garaging and no segregated pedestrian access giving rise to an inconvenient and unsafe form of development and in the absence of a binding obligation securing an exemption from future car parking permit eligibility in the event that this area is designated a Community Parking Zone, the development would give rise to additional pressure for kerbside parking prejudicial to local highway conditions, traffic movement and public safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM TP 2 and DM TP 8 of the adopted London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan 2011 and Policy LP45 of the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document: Parking in Front Gardens.

The proposed mews houses would be provided with substandard integral garaging. The garage must be 5.5 metres long and 2.75 metres wide (minimum clear internal dimensions) which has not been achieved. Furthermore, the parking spaces provided to the northern and western boundary, which is an increase to what is currently arranged in the area, would rise an inconvenient and unsafe area with the presence of this development. There is no segregated pedestrian footpath to the proposed dwellings which would make this a hazardous place in terms of a highways point of view for future occupiers. The increase of number of parking spaces in the area would overcrowd the area, something which is noted already when visiting the site. This would add pressure to the local highway and make the areas significantly unsafe. The proposed 4 parking spaces on the grass verge (on the western boundary) would overhang the grass verge. The development has not demonstrated whether the proposed parking arrangements to the Mews houses, on the grass verge, and the spaces to the northern boundary would not cause problems in terms of manoeuvring.

If the scheme were to be approved, cycle storage, refuse/recycling and construction management statement would be conditioned. The S106 agreement would also remove access to resident/visitor permits for the proposed units if the road becomes a CPZ, no time limit.

Affordable Housing and CIL

Policy CP15 states that some form of contribution towards affordable housing will be expected on all new housing sites. Policy DM HO6 states the Council will seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on private residential schemes.

The Council has considered the Secretary of State's Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 (and any future reinstatement of Planning Policy Guidance in this respect) in light of the Court of Appeal's judgement of 11 May 2016. The Council's local evidence of affordable housing need remains substantial and small sites make a significant contribution to housing supply and therefore need to contribute to affordable housing provision through continued implementation of Policy DMHO6. Furthermore, the approach outlined above is also set out in the Publication Local Plan policy LP 36 which has been adopted for the use of determining planning applications and development management following a report to the Council's Cabinet on 23 June 2016.

Policies DMHO6 and LP 36 require contributions to affordable housing from all small sites, further details are set out in the Affordable Housing SPD. The contribution that would be sought would be discounted to represent 15% affordable housing, given the proposal is to create three new build units. The commuted sum can be calculated using the pro-forma Annex A to the SPD.

It is noted there is reference to an Affordable Housing Statement by DS2, however, it is unclear that this is the submitted proforma but this could be because the Planning Statement states "the Applicant is willing to enter into a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure contributions towards the provision of off-site affordable housing in line with the Council's commuted sum pro-forma." However, without any clear evidence, this remains unknown.

The commuted sum spreadsheet submitted with this application suggests a contribution of £129,898. This is correctly on the basis of 15% and the rent per week does not reflect the Council's benchmark (reflecting the Tenancy Strategy) of £225 for a 2 bed rented unit.

The details of this application have been passed to the Council's Planning Viability Advisor to review the open market values who on the basis of comparables agrees the open market values are reasonable for use in the pro-forma. On that basis, with the Council's benchmark rent, a contribution of £148,758 is suggested. This amount should be secured via a legal agreement. If the scheme were to be approved, and if there were issues of viability to raise, then financial appraisal information would need to be submitted and the Council would require this to be independently verified.

In the absence of a binding agreement, the development proposes solely market housing without a appropriate contribution to affordable off-site housing.

Notwithstanding the above, the proposed development is liable for both the Mayor and Borough Community Infrastructure Levy, and as such an informative for the applicant will be attached to any consent in this regard.

Conclusion

The proposed scheme is considered to be detrimental to the neighbouring amenity, MOL, POS and Wildlife Corridor, highways including substandard parking and is therefore considered to prejudice the aims of Core Strategy policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP5, CP7, CP14 and CP15, Development Management Plan policies DM SD1, DM SD2, DM SD6, DM SD7, DM OS2, DMOS4, DM OS5, DM HO1, DM HO2, DM HO3, DM HO4, DM HO6, DM HD3, DM HD4, DM TP1, DM TP2, DM TP6, DM TP7, DM TP8, DM TP9, DM DC1, DM DC4, DM DC5, DM DC6 and Local Plan (Publication Version for Consultation) Policies LP1, LP2, LP7, LP8, LP13, LP15, LP16, LP18, LP20, LP21 LP22, LP31, LP34, LP35, LP36, LP39, LP40, LP44 and LP45, and Supplementary Planning Document 'Small and Medium Housing Sites' (2006), 'Residential Development Standards' (2010), Affordable Housing (2014), Refuse and Recycling Requirements (2015), Sustainable Construction Checklist (2011) and Front Garden and Other Off Street Parking Standards (2006).

Recommendation Refuse