

Mr Richard Pain  
Richard Pain Architect  
The Loft  
Chillington  
NR. Kingsbridge  
TQ7 2LW

Letter Printed 13 June 2018

**FOR DECISION DATED**  
13 June 2018

Dear Sir/Madam

**The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, (as amended)**  
**Decision Notice**

**Application:** 18/0320/FUL  
**Your ref:** 55-57 High Street, Hampton Wi...  
**Our ref:** DC/LEM/18/0320/FUL  
**Applicant:** Mrs Barbara Dearden  
**Agent:** Mr Richard Pain

**WHEREAS** in accordance with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the orders made thereunder, you have made an application received on **31 January 2018** and illustrated by plans for the permission of the Local Planning Authority to develop land situated at:

**55 - 57 High Street Hampton Wick**

for

**Demolition of existing buildings comprising 1 x 2 bedroom house, 32sqm of ground floor retail unit and 1 x 2 bed flat. Erection of 2No. 3 storeys 4B8P family dwellings with associated landscaping and refuse stores.**

NOW THEREFORE WE THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES acting by the Council of the said Borough, the Local Planning Authority HEREBY GIVE YOU NOTICE pursuant to the said Act and the Orders made thereunder that permission to develop the said land in accordance with the said application is hereby **REFUSED** subject to the reasons and informatives summarised and listed on the attached schedule.

Yours faithfully



Robert Angus  
Head of Development Management

# SCHEDULE OF REASONS AND INFORMATIVES FOR APPLICATION 18/0320/FUL

## APPLICANT NAME

Mrs Barbara Dearden  
55 High Street  
Hampton Wick  
KT1 4DG

## AGENT NAME

Mr Richard Pain  
The Loft  
Chillington  
NR. Kingsbridge  
TQ7 2LW

## SITE

55 - 57 High Street Hampton Wick

## PROPOSAL

Demolition of existing buildings comprising 1 x 2 bedroom house, 32sqm of ground floor retail unit and 1 x 2 bed flat. Erection of 2No. 3 storeys 4B8P family dwellings with associated landscaping and refuse stores.

## SUMMARY OF REASONS AND INFORMATIVES

---

### REASONS

U44441	Justification of Demolition
U44442	Loss of BTM/Design
U44443	Residential Amenity
U44444	Transport
U44445	Affordable Housing
U44446	Residential Standards of Future Occupant

---

### INFORMATIVES

U25399	Decision drawing numbers ~~
U25400	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 186 and 187

# DETAILED REASONS AND INFORMATIVES

---

## DETAILED REASONS

---

### **U44441      Justification of Demolition**

In the absence of satisfactory evidence demonstrating that the existing dwellings within the host Building of Townscape Merit are incapable of improvement or conversion to a satisfactory standard to provide an equivalent scheme, the proposed development, by reason of the proposed loss of existing housing, would be contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy (2009), DM HO1, DM HD1 and DM HD3 of the Development Management Plan (2011) and LP 3, LP4 and LP34 of the Local Plan (2017).

### **U44442      Loss of BTM/Design**

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, height, massing, bulk and design, would create a form of overdevelopment which fails to relate to, or harmonise with the surrounding development. The proposals would result in a visually obtrusive and incongruous form of development that would visually dominate the adjoining terraced row and would not respect the surrounding local context. The proposals would fail to preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area and street-scene. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with, in particular, policies CP7 and CP14 of the Core Strategy (2009), DM HD 1, DM HO2, DM HO4 and DM DC1 of the Development Management Plan (2011), and policies LP1, LP3, LP34, LP 35 and LP 39 of the Local Plan (2017) and Supplementary Planning Documents Design Quality and Small and Medium Housing Sites.

### **U44443      Residential Amenity**

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, bulk, height and scale would result in an overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings and their occupants, with particular regard to the adjoining no. 53 High Street. The proposals would result in unacceptable visual intrusion and overbearing development. The proposals would therefore fail to preserve the residential amenities of neighbouring residential properties with regards to visual intrusion, outlook, and privacy. The proposed development would thereby be contrary to, in particular, Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy (2009), Policy DM DC5 of the Development Management Plan (2011) and Policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2017), and Supplementary Planning Documents Design Quality and Small and Medium Housing Sites.

### **U44444      Transport**

In the absence of a car parking permit restriction, the proposed development, by reason of its lack of sufficient off-street parking provision and absence of a satisfactory parking survey to demonstrate there is capacity in the surrounding roads to accommodate the parking shortfall, would adversely impact on on-street parking, the free flow of traffic and pedestrian and vehicular safety on the surrounding highway network. The scheme is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of, in particular policies DM TP8 of the Development Management Plan (2011), LP 45 of the Local Plan (2017).

### **U44445      Affordable Housing**

In the absence of a binding legal agreement securing the necessary contribution to the affordable housing fund, the proposed scheme would not comply with the outcomes sought by Policies CP15 of the Core Strategy (2009), DM HO6 of the Development Management Plan (2011) and LP 36 of the Local Plan (2017) and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Documents.

### **U44446      Residential Standards of Future Occupant**

By reason of the unacceptable layout and unsatisfactory provision of private amenity space; the scheme represents an over-intensification and over-development of the site that would result in living conditions and external garden space which fails to meet the standards for modern day living requirements of family households, to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers. The development would thereby be contrary to policies CP7 of the Core Strategy (2009), policies DM HO4 and DC1 of the Development Management Plan (2011); Policy LP 35 of the Local Plan (2017), Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Development Standards' and 'Design Quality' and the Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015).

---

## **DETAILED INFORMATIVES**

---

### **U25399          Decision drawing numbers ~~**

For the avoidance of doubt the Drawing(s) No(s) to which this decision refers are as follows:

3837-01, 3837-02, 3837-03, 3837-04, 3837-05, 3837-06, 3837-07, 3837-08, 3837-09, HDH.43.08, HDH.43.09, HDH.43.10 and HDH.43.14 - Received: 31/01/2018

HDH.43.07A and HDH.43.16 - Received: 19/03/2018

HDH.43.11 C, HDH.43.12 C, HDH.43.13 C and HDH.43.15 A - Received: 22/03/2018

### **U25400          NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 186 and 187**

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Richmond upon Thames Borough Council takes a positive and proactive approach to the delivery of sustainable development, by:

- o Providing a formal pre-application service
- o Providing written policies and guidance, all of which is available to view on the Council's website
- o Where appropriate, negotiating amendments to secure a positive decision
- o Determining applications in a timely manner.

In this instance:

- o The applicants did not seek formal pre-application advice, and the scheme was found to be contrary to policy and guidance, and subsequently refused. The Council is ready to enter into discussions to advise the applicants of relevant policy and guidance; and where possible assist in the preparation of a new planning permission.

END OF SCHEDULE OF REASONS AND INFORMATIVES FOR APPLICATION

18/0320/FUL

---