

Application reference: 20/3059/FUL
NORTH RICHMOND WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
29.10.2020	29.10.2020	24.12.2020	24.12.2020 EOT 08.01.2021

Site:

18 Warren Avenue, Richmond, TW10 5DZ,

Proposal:

Demolition of existing conservatory. Erection of part two-storey and part single-storey side and rear extensions.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Nassif Mansour
18 Warren Avenue
Richmond
TW10 5DZ

AGENT NAME

Miss M Celik
Parkshot House
Richmond
TW9 2PR

DC Site Notice: printed on and posted on and due to expire on

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (South)

Expiry Date

28.12.2020

Neighbours:

22 Warren Avenue, Richmond, TW10 5DZ -
36 Clifford Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 7BP, - 30.10.2020
34 Clifford Avenue, East Sheen, London, SW14 7BP, - 30.10.2020
20 Warren Avenue, Richmond, TW10 5DZ, - 30.10.2020
19 Warren Avenue, Richmond, TW10 5DZ, - 30.10.2020
17 Warren Avenue, Richmond, TW10 5DZ, - 30.10.2020
16 Warren Avenue, Richmond, TW10 5DZ, -

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

Development Management

Status: WDN Application: 19/0812/FUL
Date: 29/04/2019 6m Single Storey rear extension with wrap around extension & 1st floor extension with wrap around

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 19/2519/PS192
Date: 28/08/2019 Single storey rear and side extension.

Development Management

Status: INV Application: 20/1644/HOT
Date: Single-storey, wrap-around extension on the ground floor and double-storey side and rear extension on first floor.

Development Management

Status: PDE Application: 20/3059/FUL
Date: Demolition of existing conservatory. Erection of part two-storey and part single-storey side and rear extensions.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 17.01.2004

FENSA Notification of Replacement Glazing comprising 7 Windows and 0 Doors. Installed by Professional Windows & Conservatories Ltd. FENSA Member No 10927. Installation ID 1400483. Invoice No 25148/4373

Reference: 04/5506/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 19.09.1996

Single storey side extension

Reference: 96/1300/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 27.11.2010

Replacement consumer unit Kitchen

Reference: 11/NAP00276/NAPIT

Enforcement

Opened Date: 30.01.2002

Enforcement Enquiry

Reference: 02/00041/EN

Application Number	20/3059/FUL
Address	18 Warren Avenue, Richmond, TW10 5DZ
Proposal	Demolition of existing conservatory. Erection of part two-storey and part single-storey side and rear extensions.
Contact Officer	Kerry McLaughlin
Legal Agreement	No

1. INTRODUCTION

This application is of a nature where the Council's Constitution delegates the authority to make the decision to Officers rather than it being determined by the Planning Committee.

Before preparing this summary report the planning officer has considered any relevant previous planning applications in relation to the development and considered any comments made by those interested in the application such as consultees with specialist knowledge and nearby residents.

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant Local Plan Policies, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, any comments received in connection with the application and any other case specific considerations which are material to the decision.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The proposal site is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling, located on the eastern side of Warren Avenue.

The application site is subject to the following planning constraints:

Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Main Centre Buffer Zone	East Sheen Town Centre Boundary Buffer Zone - A residential development or a mixed use scheme within this 400 metre buffer area identified within the Plan does not have to apply the Sequential Test (for Flood Risk) as set out in Local Plan policy LP21.
Village	Richmond and Richmond Hill Village
Village Character Area	Between Upper and Lower Richmond Road - Area 7 Richmond & Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance Page 28 CHARAREA06/07/01
Ward	North Richmond Ward

3. PLANNING HISTORY

Ref	Proposal	Decision
20/1644/HOT	Single-storey, wrap-around extension on the ground floor and double-storey side and rear extension on first floor.	Received, Not Yet Validated
19/2519/PS192	Single storey rear and side extension.	Granted Permission

19/0812/FUL	6m Single Storey rear extension with wrap around extension & 1st floor extension with wrap around	Withdrawn by the Applicant
-------------	---	----------------------------

Plan No.	Particulars	Applicant	Council's Decision
7605	Rebuilding private motor garage.	C.J.Herbert	DIS.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

The list of neighbours notified of this application are listed above.

2 letters of objection have been received. These comments are summarised as follows:

- The proposal includes side windows facing No.16, this will impede on privacy and restrict any future planning applications on No.16. *Officer Note - Implications of any future planning applications are not a material planning consideration, and therefore will not form part of this assessment.*
- The extension is out of character in terms of size and height
- The extension will create a sense of enclosure and lead to loss of light

Neighbour amenity considerations are assessed under Section 6 (impact on neighbour amenity) in the report below.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

Richmond Local Plan (2018)

The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated Local Plan policies are:

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1	Yes	No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
Impact on Biodiversity	LP15	Yes	No
Impact on Trees, Woodland and Landscape	LP16	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf

Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations
Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Plan

These policies can be found at:

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design/Visual Amenity
- ii Neighbour Amenity
- iii Trees

Issue i - Design/Visual Amenity

LP 1 'Local Character and Design Quality' states the Council will require all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality. The high quality character and heritage of the borough and its villages will need to be maintained and enhanced where opportunities arise. Development proposals will have to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance, and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces and the local area. Development must respect, contribute to and enhance the local environment and character.

The House Extensions and External Alterations SPD acknowledges that there are a variety of ways in which the living accommodation of a house can be extended. 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.

Two-Storey Side Extension

In relation to two storey side extensions the SPD states;

The overall shape, size and position of side and rear 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. There are alternative methods of achieving this aim:

- *The extension is integrated with the house which can work well with detached houses and sometimes on the end of uniform terraces.*
- *Alternatively, the extension is made to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure, so that the original form can still be appreciated. In such circumstances, the ridge of the extension should be set lower to that on the main house.*
- *Two storey side and rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building, to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the building's original scale and character.*
- *Avoid side extensions that project beyond the existing front elevation – Where the extension is to be subordinate to the existing house it is usually desirable to set back the extension by at least 1 metre behind the front elevation.*
- *Development, which would result in the significant reduction of an existing important space or gap between neighbouring houses, is not normally acceptable. In conjunction with existing extensions to neighbouring buildings this can have a terracing effect on the street. Consequently, two storey side extensions should be sited 1m from the side boundary.*

The proposed two-storey side extension has been set back by 1m from the side boundary with No.16, as required under SPD. This ensures the space between the terrace rows is not closed.

It is noted that the host property benefits from a recessed first floor giving it its distinguished 'L' shape at first floor level. Whilst two-storey side extensions are expected to be set down from ridge and set back from the front elevation, given the existing design and configuration, it is considered the proposed extension of the existing roof ridge/eaves is an acceptable design approach.

The council raise no objections to this element of the proposal.

Part Single-Storey, Part Two-Storey Rear Extension

The Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. It should harmonise with the original appearance, either by integrating with the house or being made to appear as an obvious addition.

Single-Storey Element

The proposal includes the construction a full-width, ground floor rear extension, which will extend 4m from the original rear elevation of the host property. The extension will have a maximum height of 2.97m, with 2.2m to the eaves, consistent with the height and eaves of the rear extension at No.20.

The extension will be finished in silicone render to match that of the existing dwellinghouse, this ensures the development will integrate satisfactorily with the original building. The proposed fenestration comprises aluminium framed, bi-folding doors. Whilst the proposed fenestration will not match that of the existing, as this is at ground level only and to the rear of the property, they are found an acceptable addition, which will appear an obvious contemporary addition and will help to reduce the bulky appearance of the large single-storey extension.

Single storey rear extensions are a characteristic feature within the locality, this confirms the scheme will not appear incongruous within the wider area.

The amenity space in the rear garden would be reduced as a result of the proposal. However, the reduction will be no more than 50% of the total area of ground covered by buildings within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse (other than the original dwellinghouse) and is therefore acceptable.

The council raise no objections to this element of the proposal.

Two-Storey Element

The House Extensions SPD states that two-storey rear extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building. The proposed two-storey element of the rear extension therefore does not comply with the SPD.

The rear building lines at first floor level along this portion of Warren Avenue are largely consistent with only some minor variation. The proposed two-storey rear extension will substantially increase the bulk of the host dwelling at first floor level and result in a projection which is substantially beyond the first-floor rear elevations of No.16 & 20 and the terrace row that it forms a part of.

The proposed first floor rear extension fails to be subordinate to the original dwelling and would therefore be considered harmful to the architectural character and integrity of the host dwelling and would be detrimental in the wider context of the character of the terrace row.

The proposed first-floor extension is considered to be overly prominent and bulky in order to be subservient to the original dwellinghouse. It would over-dominate the rear elevation and disproportionately increase the scale of the property.

The applicant was advised at pre-application stage to locate the two-storey rear extension on the southern side of the host dwelling to form a bookend to the terrace row, this advice has not been followed and as a result the siting further dominates the rear elevation.

The combination of the proposed works due to their siting, excessive bulk and width would appear out of scale and character with the existing property and would appear dominant and incongruous to the area, contrary to policy LP1 of the Local Plan 2018 and relevant supplementary planning documents/guidance.

Single-Storey Front Extension

It is proposed to erect a single-storey front extension to the south-western side of the property, to align with the main front elevation. The proposed materials are to match that of the existing dwelling, ensuring the development integrates with the existing character of the building itself and wider locality.

Given evidence of similar designs in the locality, the extension is not considered to be overly incongruous to warrant a refusal. The scale is considered appropriate and the design and materials are suitably reflective of existing.

Issue ii - Neighbour Amenity

Policy LP 8 states all development will be required to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, adjoining and neighbouring properties. The Council will:

- 1. Ensure the design and layout of buildings enables good standards of daylight and sunlight to be achieved in new development and in existing properties affected by new development; where existing daylight and sunlight conditions are already substandard, they should be improved where possible;*
- 2. Ensure that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting, including through creating a sense of enclosure;*
- 3. Ensure there is no harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the use of buildings, gardens and other spaces due to increases in traffic, servicing, parking, noise, light, disturbance, air pollution, odours or vibration or local micro-climatic effects.*

Applicants are expected to have regard to the guidance set out within the Council's SPDs relating to design, including Village Planning Guidance, SPDs on extensions, infill and backland developments, housing mix and standards as well as residential development standards.

The principles of this policy are reiterated in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD.

Two-Storey Side Extension

Due to the side siting of the proposed two-storey extension the impact of this element of the proposal will be limited to No.16 only. No.16 does not currently benefit from any primary habitable windows along the effected elevation and therefore it is considered this element of the scheme will have a neutral impact on the amenities of the occupiers of this dwelling.

It is noted the side extension incorporates 2x side facing windows, these windows will be conditioned to be non-openable and obscure glazed to protect the privacy of neighbouring dwellings.

Rear Extension

16 Warren Avenue

The scheme is in compliance with the 45-degree test from the Building Research Establishment (BRE) standards, this confirms the scheme will not result in any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to any habitable rooms or garden of No.16.

There is sufficient distance between the two built forms, this ensures the proposed development will not result in any unreasonable overbearing, visual intrusion or create a sense of enclosure to this dwelling.

20 Warren Avenue

No.20 currently benefits from a single-storey rear extension. The proposed single-storey extension would project no more than 3m beyond the rear elevation of this extension, this is considered an acceptable projection which would satisfy the guidelines set out in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD. It is considered that the proposed rear extension will not result in any unreasonable overbearing, loss of light, visual intrusion or create a sense of enclosure to this property.

With regard to the two-storey element of the scheme, as the two-storey element is ~2.25m away from the shared boundary line, the sufficient distance will mitigate any potential unreasonable overbearing, visual intrusion or create a sense of enclosure to this dwelling. The scheme also complies with the 45-degree light test in relation to this dwelling.

34 & 36 Clifford Avenue

Whilst the proposed works will be a visible addition, the separation distance from the built form ensures the proposed scheme will not be visually intrusive or overbearing on either of the above adjoining neighbouring properties to the rear of the application site.

Single-Storey Front Extension

Due to its position and scale, the single-storey front extension will not result in any loss of light, loss of privacy or visual intrusion, therefore this element of the scheme complies with council policy.

The property would remain solely in residential use as a result of the proposal. An undue increase in noise or pollution would not occur as a result of the proposal.

For the above reasons it is found this scheme complies with the aims and objectives of LP8 of the Local Plan, 2018 and relevant SPD/SPG's.

Issue iii - Trees

Policy LP 16 states A. The Council will require the protection of existing trees and the provision of new trees, shrubs and other vegetation of landscape significance that complement existing, or create new, high quality green areas, which deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits.

LP15 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity in the Borough.

The location of this proposal is not sited within a Conservation Area, nor are there any recorded Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) within or adjacent to the site of the proposal.

The submitted "Tree Report from Studio 20 Architects" is insufficient for the purposes of assessing the impact of construction activities on the trees in the rear garden. Despite referencing a tree schedule in Appendix B, I am unable to find this in the submitted documentation. Consequently, there is no data that can be independently verified by the LPA as part of the application process.

There are several trees and shrubs present, both within and adjacent to the site boundary. The proposal appears to require the removal of at least one eucalyptus tree to enable construction.

However, no documentation has been submitted relating to tree protection measures and the impact of indirect construction activity by the way of storage of materials, the use and storage of plant and machinery (Where necessary) or ingress and egress to rear garden on other trees in the vicinity.

The council will require that the area around nearby trees is suitably protected from both direct and any indirect construction activity. This is to include submitted documentation with corresponding tree survey data that can be independently verified by the LPA as part of the application process. This must also include tree protection measures and the impact of indirect construction activity by the way of storage of materials, the use and storage of plant and machinery (Where necessary) or ingress and egress to rear garden etc.

Tree removal will be resisted. However, if unavoidable, the Council will expect either mitigation or compensation measures to be included for any tree loss, by way of suitable replanting, commensurate with the loss of tree cover. If agreed, any such tree replacements must be incorporated into a "Tree Planting Scheme" as recommend below.

The council are unable to approve this proposal in its current form as there is currently insufficient information regarding its impact on nearby trees and vegetation as specified in the comments above.

At this stage, the proposal in its current form will remove trees and put others at risk of damage, leading to tree loss, in contravention of Local Plan Policy LP16 Trees, Woodlands and Landscape.

This is to ensure development protects, respects, contributes to, and enhances trees and landscapes, in accordance with LBR Local Plan (LBRLP) 5.5, Policy LP16, subsection 5 and pursuant to section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

LBRuT Local Plan, policy LP16, subsection 5. requires;

"That trees are adequately protected throughout the course of development, in accordance with British Standard 5837 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, Recommendations (2012).

The council would require that the above has been accounted for in this proposal.

7. LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker. The Mayor of London's CIL and Richmond CIL are therefore material considerations.

This is to notify you that had this development received planning consent it would be liable for a chargeable amount under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2012).

8. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission

Reason for Refusal - Design

The proposed first-floor rear extension by reason of its combined siting, design, depth, width, height and bulk will create an unsympathetic and incongruous form of development which will appear out of keeping with the scale and character of the host property and is found harmful to the character, symmetry and appearance of the host terrace row. The scheme is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of, in particular, policy LP1 of the Local Plan, 2018 and following supplementary planning documents/guidance; House Extensions and External Alterations & Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Plan.

Reason for Refusal - Trees

In the absence of a satisfactory tree report and details of replacement tree planting, the proposal is considered to adversely impact on the health and longevity of existing trees to the detriment of the visual amenity and biodiversity in the locality. The proposal fails to comply with, in particular, Policies LP1, LP15 and LP16 of the Local Plan.

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / NO

I therefore recommend the following:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. REFUSAL | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. PERMISSION | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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): KM

Dated: 29.12.2020

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:WWC.....29.12.2020.....

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

U0047619	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42
U0047618	Decision Drawing Numbers