

Application reference: 20/1770/HOT NORTH RICHMOND WARD

| Date application received | Date made valid | Target report date | 8 Week date |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 29.06.2020 | 29.06.2020 | 24.08.2020 | 24.08.2020 |

Site:

13 Larkfield Road, Richmond, TW9 2PG,

Proposal:

Ground floor side/rear extension. First floor rear extension. Alterations/re-cladding of the existing second floor rear dormer. Replacement window and door on side elevation.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr & Mrs Jon & Karla Niblett
13, Larkfield Road
Richmond
TW9 2PG

AGENT NAME

Mr Robin McGuinness
15 Raymead Close
Fetcham
Leatherhead
KT22 9LU
England

DC Site Notice: printed on 30.06.2020 and posted on 10.07.2020 and due to expire on 31.07.2020

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

2 Larkfield Road, Richmond, TW9 2PF, - 01.07.2020
22 St Johns Road, Richmond, TW9 2PE, - 01.07.2020
4 Salisbury Road, Richmond, TW9 2JB, - 01.07.2020
6 Salisbury Road, Richmond, TW9 2JB, - 01.07.2020
15 Larkfield Road, Richmond, TW9 2PG, - 01.07.2020
11 Larkfield Road, Richmond, TW9 2PG, - 01.07.2020

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:08/T0022/TCA
Date:26/02/2008 T1; Mulberry - Reduce to previous reduction points

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:09/T0815/TCA
Date:10/02/2010 T1 - Mulberry - Reduce to previous reduction points

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:11/T0033/TCA
Date:08/03/2011 T1 - Mulberry - Reduce previous pruning points

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:11/T0954/TCA
Date:02/02/2012 T1 - Mulberry in rear garden - reduce crown back to previous reduction points T2 - Pear in rear garden- reduce lightly to tidy and shape, thin crown by 10-15% by removing weak, suppressed and crossing branches

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:12/T0860/TCA
 Date:23/01/2013 T1 - Mulberry - Rear Garden - Reduce crown back to previous reduction points as part of annual maintenance schedule

Development Management
 Status: RNO Application:17/T0003/TCA
 Date:02/02/2017 T1 - Mulberry - Reduce crown back to previous reduction points

Development Management
 Status: RNO Application:17/T1034/TCA
 Date:19/01/2018 T1 - Mulberry - Reduce crown back to most recent previous reduction points (1-2m)

Development Management
 Status: RNO Application:18/T0942/TCA
 Date:20/12/2018 T1 - Mulberry - Crown reduce back to previous reduction points (i.e. by 1-1.5m)

Development Management
 Status: GTD Application:20/1043/HOT
 Date:04/06/2020 Ground floor side/rear extension. First floor rear extension. Alterations/re-cladding of the existing second floor rear dormer.

Development Management
 Status: PDE Application:20/1770/HOT
 Date: Ground floor side/rear extension. First floor rear extension. Alterations/re-cladding of the existing second floor rear dormer. Replacement window and door on side elevation.

Development Management
 Status: PCO Application:20/2034/HOT
 Date: Ground floor side/rear extension. First floor rear extension. Alterations of the existing second floor rear dormer.

Building Control
 Deposit Date: 01.10.2006 Installed a Gas Fire
 Reference: 06/93338/CORGI

Building Control
 Deposit Date: 17.07.2020 Single storey rear extension and refurbishment. (Any notifiable electrical works or works in relation to gas appliances carried out by a member of a Competent Person Scheme are not included with these works)

Reference: 20/0881/IN

Application reference: 20/1770/HOT

Site Address: 13 Larkfield Road, Richmond TW9 2PG

| | |
|--|---|
| Proposal | Ground floor side/rear extension. First floor rear extension. Alterations/re-cladding of the existing second floor rear dormer. Replacement window and door on side elevation. |
| Site description / key designations | <p>The subject site consists of a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Larkfield Road.</p> <p>Relevant site designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological Priority – English Heritage • Conservation Area - Central Richmond (CA17) • Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency • Character Area 15 of the Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance. <p>The site is also subject to the borough-wide Article 4 Directive restricting basement developments.</p> |
| Planning history | 20/1043/HOT - Ground floor side/rear extension. First floor rear extension. Granted. |
| Policies | <p>The proposal has been considered having regard to the policies within the Council's Local Plan, in particular:</p> <p>Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality • LP 3 Designated Heritage Assets • LP 8 Amenity and Living Conditions <p>Supplementary Planning Documents / Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House extensions and external alterations SPD • Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance • Conservation Areas SPD and Central Richmond CA Statement. |
| Material representations | None. |
| Amendments | None. |
| Professional comments | <p>The proposal will be assessed in relation to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design/visual amenity and impact on heritage assets • Neighbour amenity <p>Design/Visual Amenity <i>Policy LP1 of the Local Plan seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area.</i></p> <p><i>The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 3.5m in depth for a semi-detached property will be acceptable. Where the proposed extension seeks a larger depth, the eaves should be reduced to 2.2m at the shared boundary to mitigate detrimental impact on neighbours such as sense of enclosure or overbearing. The SPD also specifies:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The external appearance of any extension must be carefully designed in order to avoid the visual confusion that can result when the style and materials of the original house are ignored.</i> • <i>The overall shape, size and position of rear and side extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. They should harmonise with the original appearance, which should be taken as the starting point for any future changes.</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The extension is made to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure.</i> <p><i>Policy LP3 of the Local Plan 2018 covers Designated Heritage Asset and states that proposals should conserve and take opportunity to make positive contribution to the historic environment such as retaining and preserving the original structure, layout, architectural features and materials or reinstatement of heritage assets. Appropriate materials and techniques should be used. There is a requirement to seek to avoid harm or justify for loss and demolition will be resisted. The significance of the asset is taken into consideration when assessing works proposed to a designated heritage asset.</i></p> <p><i>In assessing the impact of the development on the conservation area, the Local Planning Authority must consider the tests set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) 1990 Act. Under this legislation, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) must have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The tests as set out above are also encapsulated in policy LP3 of the Local Plan, where applications should only be granted where they conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of the heritage asset and the surrounding historic environment.</i></p> <p><i>Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) together with the Act deal with conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Paragraph 190 of the NPPF also sets out that the LPA should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset (including its setting), and take this assessment into account when considering the impact of the proposal on the heritage asset. Paragraph 185 of the NPPF deals with sustaining and enhancing heritage assets, and the desirability for new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</i></p> <p><u>Ground floor rear extension</u> It is noted that the rear extension is unaltered by this proposal and does not differ from that approved under 20/1043/HOT and is therefore considered acceptable in regard to design. Copper cladding is proposed, however this is only at ground floor level and will not be visible and is therefore considered acceptable.</p> <p><u>First floor extension</u> The first-floor extension approved under the previous 20/1043/HOT measured 3.3m wide and 1m deep. The current application seeks to increase this to a 3.3m wide and 1.75m deep. This will be constructed with matching materials being stock brick and white timber framed window. This is considered to be acceptable in regard to design when considering the surrounding area and complimentary materials, overall the CA is not impacted.</p> <p><u>Recladding rear dormer</u> The current application also seeks to cover the existing second floor dormer with copper cladding. An example of this material finish has been provided by the applicants, the image is below:</p> |
|--|---|



The roof of the building is visible from public vantage points on the busy Lower Mortlake Road.

The conservation area statement identifies the loss of traditional architectural features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations as a significant pressure on this area. It further highlights that the preservation, enhancement and reinstatement of architectural quality and unity is an opportunity for enhancement.

When considering the character of the surrounding street, there are no other examples of non-traditional materials above ground floor level. Therefore, the recladding, although appearing as a modern addition, the material will be an incongruous feature and in stark contrast considering the immediate CA. All other dormers in the immediate vicinity are constructed with hanging roof tiles to match the existing.

The applicant specifies the recent development at 21-21A St John's Road (Council reference 14/5306/FUL) as an example of approval of non-traditional materials, however images of the site have not been provided, and it is acknowledged the site is not directly comparable in any case. Notwithstanding, it provides one example within the conservation area, and it remains that these materials do not form part of the character of the conservation area.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposed copper cladded dormer does not comply with Policy LP 1 and LP 3 of the Local Plan or relevant SPDs.

Neighbour Amenity

Policy LP8 requires all development to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties. This includes ensuring adequate light is achieved, preserving privacy and ensuring proposals are not visually intrusive.

With regards to rear extensions the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD states;

- *Extensions that create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted.*
- *A new extension should not result in any substantial loss of privacy to adjoining dwellings and gardens to prevent overlooking.*
- *Residential developments should create good living conditions and should not cause any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms or gardens in neighbouring properties.*

The proposed extension will extend the existing extension by less than 1.5m on the northern elevation and therefore approximately 1.5m past the neighbouring rear outrigger at no.11. This is considered acceptable for a semi-detached, and furthermore, the rear extension will be approximately 1m

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| | <p>setback from the shared boundary. The neighbouring dwelling at no.11 is also set back from the boundary. When considering the neighbouring habitable windows, the extension will comply with the 45-degree test. Therefore, this will not result in loss of light nor appear visually overbearing. The height of the extension on this area of the site is 3m, and approximately 1m off the boundary.</p> <p>On the southern boundary, neighbouring the semi-detached pair at no.15. The proposed rear extension will be approximately 1.7m. The SPD specified that up to 3.5m projection is acceptable in regard to residential amenity and therefore the scheme is acceptable on no.15. The primary neighbouring outlook at no.15 remains rear facing. When further considering the 45-degree test from the rear facing habitable windows/doors of the neighbouring extension, the proposed scheme does not impact/encroach on this.</p> <p>The proposed rooflight is above head height and therefore does not raise any issues of overlooking or loss of privacy for adjoining neighbours. No side windows are proposed.</p> <p>The first-floor extension will be 1.75m deep, 0.75m longer than the previously approved 20/1043/HOT. The extension complies with the 45-degree test when taken from neighbouring rear facing habitable room windows. Therefore, it is unlikely that a harmful impact will occur.</p> <p>It is noted that, like the previously approved, the extension will narrowly fail the horizontal 45-degree line when taken from the existing first floor bedroom window on the subject site, however will comply with the vertical 45-degree. This is still considered acceptable as there is a minor infringement to the horizontal however overall loss of light is not anticipated. The outlook from this bedroom window is already restricted from the existing first floor over the outrigger and a further 0.75m to this is not considered to result in a material impact on outlook or create a sense of enclosure.</p> <p>A sufficient amount of rear amenity space would be retained which would satisfy the guidelines set out in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD.</p> <p>As such, having regard to its siting, design, scale and materiality, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Overall the scheme proposed complies with LP 8.</p> |
| Recommendation | Refuse. |

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): ...AMU.....

Dated:18/08/2020.....

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Senior Planner



Dated: ... 18/08/2020.....

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Head of Development Management has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Head of Development Management:

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

| | |
|----------|----------------------------|
| U0045023 | NPPF REFUSAL - Para. 38-42 |
| U0045024 | |