

Application reference: 06/2110/HOT
SOUTH RICHMOND WARD

| Date application received | Date made valid | Target report date | 8 Week date |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 30.06.2006 | 30.06.2006 | | 25.08.2006 |

Site:

53 Mount Ararat Road, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6PL

Proposal:

Erection of a single storey pavilion in rear garden.

Present use: STO

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr And Mrs Ackermans
53 Mount Ararat Road
Richmond
Surrey
TW10 6PL

AGENT NAME

Clifford Rance, Clifford Rance
Architects
63 Curzon Street
London
W1J 8PD

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRUT Urban Design 14 Days

Expiry Date

20.07.2006

Neighbours:

55A Mount Ararat Road, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6PL, - 06.07.2006
18 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
22 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
30A Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
30B Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
32A Onslow Road, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QE, - 06.07.2006
24 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
32 Onslow Road, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QE, - 06.07.2006
55 Mount Ararat Road, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6PL, - 06.07.2006
30E Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
51 Mount Ararat Road, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6PL, - 06.07.2006
20 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
28 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
30C Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
16 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
26 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
34 Onslow Road, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QE, - 06.07.2006
34A Onslow Road, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QE, - 06.07.2006
30D Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
Flat 1, 16 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, TW10 6QB - 06.07.2006
Flat 2, 16 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, TW10 6QB - 06.07.2006
Flat 3, 16 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, TW10 6QB - 06.07.2006
30 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
Flat B, 34 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006
Flat C, 34 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006

Flat D, 34 Onslow Avenue, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QB, - 06.07.2006

History:

| Ref No | Description | Status | Date |
|-------------|--|--------|------------|
| 00/0399 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Alterations And Refurbishment Including Front Extension At First And Second Floor Level And Rear Basement Extension (amendments To Planning Permission 99/1224/ful). | GTD | 14/04/2000 |
| 00/T1223 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Row Of Leylandii - Fell Row Of Two Italian Cypress, Two Cypress, Small Group Of Leyland Cypress And Eucalyptus Adjacent To Building. | GTD | 04/10/2000 |
| 01/T1615 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Sycamore Tree - Remove Deadwood, Snag And Ivy, Lift Lowest Branches To A Minimum Clearance Above Ground Of 5m. Thin Remaining Branch Structure By 40,. | GTD | 13/11/2001 |
| 02/0136 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Establish Use As Single Dwelling House. | GTD | 19/04/2002 |
| 92/0117/FUL | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Rebuilding Of Part Of Side Boundary Wall. | PDV | 14/02/1992 |
| 92/0118/CAC | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Demolition Of 12 Feet Of Side Boundary Wall Between 53 Mount Ararat Road And 18 Onslow Avenue | GTD | 10/03/1992 |
| 99/1224 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Partial Side Extension To First And Second Floors (front Only), Single Storey Glazed Extension To Rear At Basement Level. | GTD | 30/09/1999 |
| 05/3438/HOT | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Erection of a tea pavilion | REF | 24/01/2006 |
| 06/2110/HOT | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Erection of a single storey pavilion in rear garden. | PCO | |

Constraints:

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): *AP*

Dated: *7/18/06*

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated: *Willy Nante 18/05/2006*

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: | <i>Reasons for Refusal</i> |
| CONDITIONS: | |
| INFORMATIVES: | <i>1209</i> |
| UDP POLICIES: | <i>BLT 11 & 16</i> |
| OTHER POLICIES: | <i>JPG for house extensions</i> |

The following table will populate as a quick check by running the template once items have been entered into Uniform

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| CONDITIONS: | |
| INFORMATIVES: | |

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:

Notes of Telephone calls/discussions/meetings

DATE

ACTION

14/8

Agent called wanting updates,
stated not in a position to
give him info until I had
written my report.

File Reference: 06/2110/HOT

Address: 53 Mount Ararat Road, Richmond, TW10 6PL.

Site, history and proposal:

The application property is substantial four-storey house with a long linear garden that measures 49m deep and 10m wide. The adjacent property is no.55 Mt Ararat Road that also benefits from a substantial rear garden. To the north west boundary are the small rear gardens of 18 to 30 Onslow Avenue. They generally measure an average width of 5m (approx); the closest point to the host sites boundary would be 6m (approx) from rear windows. To the south west is the rear garden of 34 Onslow Road, that benefits from a long rear garden.

The site is located with the St Matthias Conservation Area (no.30) and the house is classified as a building of townscape merit. There are no trees that are worthy of Tree Preservation Orders to the site.

05/3438/HOT: Erection of a tea pavilion, refused permission 2005.

02/0136: Establish use as a single family dwelling, approved 2002.

00/0399: Alterations and refurbishment, front extension at first and second levels and rear basement extension (amendments to permission 99/1224), approved 2000.

99/1224: Partial side extension to first and second floors, single storey rear extension at basement level, approved 1999.

92/0117: Rebuilding of boundary wall.

92/0118: Demolition of boundary wall.

The earlier application that was refused in January 2006 (ref: 05/3438/FUL), was for the erection of a tea pavilion. The application was refused for the following reason: -

" The proposed outbuilding, by reason of its size, design, height, bulk, mass, depth, and siting in close proximity to the boundaries of the site, together with the change in ground levels, would result in an overbearing, visually intrusive, unneighbourly form of development that would also result in undue levels of overlooking and loss of privacy, detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in Onslow Avenue. It would thereby be contrary to policies BLT 11 and 16 of the adopted Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan - First Review 2005."

The current application (an amended resubmission of the above) proposes to erect a single storey pavilion for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. As before, the building would be located at the far south western extremity of the garden. It would measure 8m in depth, 4m in width and include a flat roof to a height of 2.8m. Materials would be predominantly glass and steel supports, the roof would comprise of PVC and other materials.

Public and other representations: 9 letters have been received objecting on the following grounds:-

1. the scheme has not overcome the previous reasons for refusal.
1. design out of character, out of keeping and detrimental to the Conservation Area
2. over development of site
3. close proximity to neighbours boundaries
4. intensification of site
5. visually intrusive and dominant
6. density
7. materials are inappropriate.
8. overlooking issues
9. loss of privacy
10. creation of overshadowing

11. loss of daylight/sunlight
12. noise disturbance
13. light pollution
14. Dentis
15. loss of trees.
16. use of building could be considered D1. (non residential institutions).

Non planning matters: right of way.

Amendments:

None received.

Professional comments:

It is considered that the main issue relating to this planning application is whether the revised scheme has overcome the reasons for refusal (application: 05/3438/FUL) in terms of residential amenity to the properties on No. 16, 18, 20 and 22 Onslow Avenue.

Residential Amenity:

Since the previous refusal the scheme proposes to remain in the same in terms of siting (3m from the boundary of properties in Onslow Avenue), width (4m), depth (10m) and materials. The principle change is that the height has been reduced from 3.4m to 2.8m.

Due to a change in ground levels, the properties and their associated rear gardens located in Onslow Avenue are positioned lower (1m approx) than the rear garden of the host property. The distance between the proposed building and rear habitable windows (measured at the closest point) of 18, 20 and 22 Onslow Avenue would still be less than 10m, and the building would present a 8m deep by 2.8m high elevation when viewed from these particular sites.

Although the height has been reduced by 50cm, given the existing relationship between these properties and the overall massing of the proposed building, it is considered that there would be unacceptable adverse impacts upon the amenities of these residents. In particular, it is considered that the building would be viewed as overbearing and would result in an unneighbourly form of development, detrimental to views experienced from rear facing windows and amenity space of these neighbours.

Although there is some vegetation located on the boundary and that the building would be extensively glazed, this is not considered sufficient to soften the mass and bulk of the building. Given the extensive glazing, that it would be elevated above the ground level of the adjacent neighbours and there small rear garden size, occupiers would also experience increased overlooking and privacy would be eroded. *the presence of the boundary.*

As before, the proposal would comply with the Building Research Establishment's guidelines for daylighting and sunlighting when applied in relation to habitable windows of 16, 18, 20 and 22 Onslow Avenue.

No objection is raised in terms of 55 Mt Ararat Road, due a spacing of over 35m between the proposal and this properties rear elevation. Given that this neighbour has an extensive rear garden, the building is not considered to be viewed as visually intrusive in relation to this amenity space.

The properties immediately to the rear of the site, these being the flats of 34 and 32 Onslow Road, are also sited at an acceptable distance to mitigate an erosion of visual amenity. The distance that separates these particular sites would generally be 50m, the sites also benefit from substantial rear gardens.

Overall, given that the proposed building would be constructed relatively close to the boundaries of 16, 18, 20 and 22 Onslow Avenue, the unsatisfactory distances to the rear elevations of these houses and that these properties are sited lower on a lower ground level, the proposed building would result in a visually intrusive form of development and would result in an overbearing impact.

Design

Overall, from a design perspective and not considering issues of neighbour amenity, the design and form of this contemporary building and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the building of townscape merit and those surrounding.

Trees:

Given that the siting and width of the revised scheme remains the same and that the height is lower, the previous Tree Officer advice still stands. It is considered that there are no trees that will be affected by the proposal that are considered to be of any particular merit. To the south corner of the garden is a Sycamore tree, which considered to have poor structural form, is of low quality and also has potential for structural failure as the tree develops. Therefore, the tree would not merit a Tree Preservation Order.

However, the proposed building is likely to result in some root disturbance, although, given the trees age, vigour and surrounding soft ground it is unlikely to have an adverse impact on the trees health. It is recommended that the following condition is attached LA08 - Protection of major roots.

Conclusion

The proposal is not considered to overcome the previous reasons for refusal, given the relatively modest reduction in height. The proposed development is not acceptable in terms of size, design, height, and siting and given the close proximity to the boundary of the site, together with a change in ground levels would lead to loss of neighbour amenity.

Recommendation:

Refuse