

## Application reference: 21/0257/HOT TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
27.01.2021	29.01.2021	26.03.2021	26.03.2021

**Site:**

18 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL,

**Proposal:**

Rebuilding the front porch. First floor side/rear extension. Install skylights to the pitches of the butterfly-roof. Demolition of rear conservatory and form a single-storey studio to the location of the former outbuilding with a link connection to the house.

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

mr Amos Grima  
18, Orleans Road  
Twickenham  
TW1 3BL

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Jonathan Nicholls  
Hayhurst and Co  
26 Fournier Street  
London  
E1 6QE  
United Kingdom

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 29.01.2021 and posted on 05.02.2021 and due to expire on 26.02.2021

**Consultations:****Internal/External:****Consultee**

14D Urban D

**Expiry Date**

12.02.2021

**Neighbours:**

28 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL -  
24 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL -  
26 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL -  
22 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL -  
The Old Chapel, Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BJ, - 29.01.2021  
10 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL, - 29.01.2021  
21 Montpelier Row, Twickenham, TW1 2NQ, - 29.01.2021  
23 Montpelier Row, Twickenham, TW1 2NQ, - 29.01.2021  
22 Montpelier Row, Twickenham, TW1 2NQ, - 29.01.2021  
20 Montpelier Row, Twickenham, TW1 2NQ, - 29.01.2021  
16 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL, - 29.01.2021  
20 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL, - 29.01.2021  
26A Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL -  
Orleans Park School, Richmond Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BB, - 29.01.2021

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

Status: GTD Application: 92/0172/FUL  
Date: 25/02/1992 Single Storey Rear Extension.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 82/0478  
Date: 24/06/1982 Erection of a part single part two storey rear extension involving partial

demolition of the existing rear addition. (Revised drawings No. 354/3A, 4A received 3.6.82).

---

Development Management

Status: PCO

Application:21/0256/HOT

Date:

First floor side/rear extension. Replacement front porch. Install skylights to the pitches of the butterfly-roof.

---

Development Management

Status: PDE

Application:21/0257/HOT

Date:

Rebuilding the front porch. First floor side/rear extension. Install skylights to the pitches of the butterfly-roof. Demolition of rear conservatory and form a single-storey studio to the location of the former outbuilding with a link connection to the house.

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 13.12.1994

Alterations to front entrance

Reference: 94/1759/BN

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 05.12.2008

Dwelling house New consumer unit

Reference: 09/NIC00012/NICEIC

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 04.08.2018

Install a gas-fired boiler

Reference: 20/FEN02618/GASAFE

---

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>21/0257/HOT</b>
<b>Address</b>	18 Orleans Road, Twickenham, TW1 3BL
<b>Proposal</b>	Rebuilding the front porch. First floor side/rear extension. Install skylights to the pitches of the butterfly-roof. Demolition of rear conservatory and form a single-storey studio to the location of the former outbuilding with a link connection to the house.
<b>Contact Officer</b>	Alice Murphy
<b>Target Determination Date</b>	26/03/2021

## 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 subject site consists of a two storey, mid-terrace dwellinghouse on the east side of Orleans Road Twickenham.

The application site is situated within the St Margarets and East Twickenham Village and is designated as:

- Archaeological Priority – English Heritage
- Article 4 Direction – restricting basement development
- Building of Townscape Merit
- Conservation Area – CA8 Twickenham Riverside
- Protected Views – View 4 (Near Ham House to Orleans House) and View 5 (Marble Hill House north)
- Throughflow Catchment Area – Throughflow and Groundwater Policy Zone.

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The application seeks to rebuild the front porch, construct a first floor side/rear extension, demolition of rear conservatory, new outbuilding and connection/link to main house. Skylights will be installed to the pitches of the butterfly-roof.

Relevant planning history include:

- **92/0172/FUL** – single storey rear extension. **Granted.**
- **82/0478** - Erection of a part single part two storey rear extension involving partial demolition of the existing rear addition. **Granted.**
- **21/0256/HOT** – First floor side/rear extension. Replacement front porch. Install skylights to the pitches of the butterfly-roof. **Pending consideration.**

## 4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

Seven representations were received from third parties; four objections, 2 support; and 1 observation.

The objections received outlined the following material planning considerations:

- Impact on surrounding character of CA and BTM
- Visual continuity of terrace frontages
- Visual bulk and infill of garden
- Loss of light and sunlight for occupants and adjoining neighbours

- Overdevelopment
- Erosion of character of terraced row
- Loss of rear garden and amenity space
- Size of first floor extension
- Height of extensions and overshadowing
- Out of scale.

The letters of support outlined the following:

- Provision of larger workspace and modern development/updated facilities
- Not overdevelopment
- Similar examples in Montpelier Road
- Enhancement of front garden
- No effect on the problems and pressures of the CA statement
- Support of green roof.

## 5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

### NPPF (2019)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/810197/NPPF\\_Feb\\_2019\\_revised.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf)

### London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- Policy D4 Delivering good design
- Policy HC1 Heritage conservation
- Policy HC3 Strategic and local views
- Policy HC4 London view management framework

These policies can be found at: [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/the\\_london\\_plan\\_2021.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/the_london_plan_2021.pdf)

### 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	<del>Yes</del>	No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	<del>Yes</del>	No
Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets	LP4	<del>Yes</del>	No
Impact on Views and Vistas	LP5	Yes	<del>Ne</del>
Impact on Archaeological	LP7	Yes	<del>Ne</del>
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	<del>Ne</del>
Impact on Flood Risk	LP21	Yes	<del>Ne</del>

These policies can be found at

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted\\_local\\_plan\\_interim.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf)

### Supplementary Planning Documents

- House Extension and External Alterations
- Conservations Areas
- Building of Townscape Merit
- St Margarets and East Twickenham Area

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning\\_policy/local\\_plan/supplementary\\_planning\\_documents\\_and\\_guidance](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance)

## **Other Local Strategies or Publications**

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are:  
Twickenham Riverside (CA8) Conservation Area Statement  
Article 4 Direction – restricting basement development

## **Determining applications in a Conservation Area**

In considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to that duty, decisions of the court have confirmed that for development proposed to be carried out in a conservation area, a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

In applications where the decision-maker is satisfied that there will be no harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area, the statutory presumption against granting planning permission described above falls away. In such cases the development should be permitted or refused in accordance with the policies of the development plan and other material considerations.

## **6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and Impact on Heritage Assets
- ii Impact on Neighbour Amenity
- iii Views and vistas
- iv Archaeology
- v Flood Risk

### **Issue i - Design and Impact on heritage assets**

*Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'*

*Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'.*

*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.*

*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.*

*Policy LP 4 states that development shall preserve the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets.*

*The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations specifies the following in regard to extensions:*

- *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.*
- *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.*
- *The extension is made to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure.*

The application seeks the following:

- First floor rear extension
- Demotion of rear conservatory, new studio and link to house
- Replacement front porch
- New rooflights.

The terraced BTM row is situated within the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area (CA8), an area with significant historical and architectural value. The CA Statement has specified that problems and pressures for the area include loss of traditional features and materials, and unsympathetic alterations. The terraced row is recognised for its distinct visual continuity along the street frontage, characterised by long front gardens, and it is noted that some have small porches and shutters. There is a flat parapet which runs the length of the houses, both back and front, behind which is a shallow pitched slate roof, punctuated by valleys running at right angles to the main line of the roof along the row. To the rear, some cottages have had rear extensions at both ground and first floor, and some have outbuildings along the rear wall. The rear gardens are narrow with limited depth, and consequently tight knit.

#### Ground floor rear extension

The existing rear conservatory at the rear of the dwelling will be removed, an outbuilding at the rear of the garden is proposed and an internal link/connection is proposed between the two, adding a WC and utility area.

Council's Conservation Officer has reviewed the application and notes that the further development at the rear of the property would be considered an overdevelopment. Whilst a modest rear extension or the construction of an appropriately scaled outbuilding may be considered acceptable, the combined impact together with the link addition would overwhelm the BTM and remove any remaining courtyard garden context which is important for these cottages as the only other space they have is at the front. Visually this would be dominating and there would be no clear distinction between the BTM and outbuilding. This has resulted in virtually the whole of the rear garden courtyard being covered in building so that the main cottage can hardly be read or appreciated anymore when viewed from the rear, except in glimpses from a disproportionate distance. Overall this is considered an overdevelopment of the site and is out of character for the surrounding area. The extension dominates the original dwellinghouse and is not considered to be subordinate in size.

The application refers to a granted appeal in the neighbouring terraces, however this was before the current SPD (2015) and local plan (2018) and does not sufficiently justify the proposed extensions in the current policy environment. It is noted that the referred to appeals do not involve first floor extension, discussed below and retained a greater garden area.

#### First floor rear extension

The application seeks to extend the existing first floor extension to the full width of the rear elevation. This will result in the loss of the whole original rear elevation of the BTM with the first floor level covered with extensions. The extension fails to appear subordinate to the dwellinghouse and dominates the entire rear elevation. The extension will be greater than half the width of the rear elevation as specified in Councils SPD. The extension would be harmful to the character of the BTM and the terrace of BTMs to which it forms part, and to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

When considering the immediately adjoining terraced property at no.20 this exhibits a large full width first floor extension, approved by Council in 2012, however was approved as a replacement of an existing harmful extension which was out of character being a plastic conservatory and this formed a material consideration. Notwithstanding, this does not justify the harm caused by the first floor extension and further harm to the terraced row.

The proposed roof will be flat to reflect the existing extension and will be constructed with materials to match the existing, this being stockbrick work and white timber windows. The extension is located at the rear of the dwellinghouse, therefore the character of the streetscape is not impacted.

In view of the above, the proposal is not consistent with the aims and objections of policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Local Plan. There are no public benefits which would justify nor outweigh the harm outlined

above.

#### Replacement porch

A new enclosed porch on one of these cottages would not be in keeping with the overall character and age of the row; however, as the proposed is a replacement of the existing, this would be acceptable providing the footprint is no larger than the existing. The curved roof and matches similar neighbouring ones therefore visual continuity along the frontage of the BTM would be similar. Furthermore, materials proposed are painted timber and lead. Should the scheme have been considered acceptable, larger scale details would have been requested from Council's Conservation Officer.

#### New rooflights

Three new rooflights are proposed on the slopes of the butterfly roof. These are considered acceptable in regard to size and location and will not be visible from the streetscape. Should the scheme have been considered acceptable, a condition would have been included to ensure these were conservation type and flush to the roofscape.

#### Summary

As concluded above, the ground floor extension and alterations, as well as the full width first floor rear elevation result in over-development of the site and would fail to appear subordinate to the original dwellinghouse and harmful to its character and the character and appearance of the conservation area. There are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm caused to the character and fabric of the BTM, both the dwellinghouse individual and the row of BTM in the CA. The proposals are contrary to Local Plan policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 and sections 190-197 of the NPPF.

### **Issue ii- Impact on 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.*

The two adjoining properties are no.20 and no.16 Orleans Road. When considering the ground floor extensions and alterations, the additional projection of outbuilding is approximately 1m from the neighbouring outbuilding. The boundary treatment is 1.7m along the shared boundary. This is considered acceptable and will not impact neighbour amenity. The extension exhibits side windows on 'link' to the outbuilding, however when considering the boundary treatment is 1.7m, no overlooking or loss of privacy is anticipated. Overall no impact is anticipated on no.20.

The height of the extension has been reduced to approximately 2m high along the boundary with the boundary with no.16. This is consistent with Council SPD which species that extensions longer than 3m for a terraced house should be reduced to 2.2m. Therefore this complies with LP8 and no impacts are anticipated.

The first floor extension windows will be rear facing and the infill will not impact the recessed rear elevation windows on no.20 as the arrangement is consistent with the 45-degree BRE test.

New rooflights are above head height and therefore do not result in loss of privacy or overlooking of adjoining neighbours.

As such, having regard to its siting, design, scale and materiality, it is not considered that the proposed extensions and alterations would have a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

The proposal complies with LP8.

### **Issue iii – Views and Vistas**

*Policy LP5 requires Council to protect the quality of the views, vistas, gaps and the skyline, all of which contribute significantly to the character, distinctiveness and quality of the local and wider area.*

No alterations proposed will exceed the height of the original/existing roof. The scheme is considered consistent with LP5.

### **Issue iv – Archaeology**

*Policy LP 7 of the Local Plan states 'The Council will seek to protect, enhance and promote its archaeological heritage and will encourage its interpretation and presentation to the public.*

Whilst the site falls within an area of Archaeological Priority, given the developed nature of the application site and surrounding areas it is considered unlikely that an archaeological investigation would be required in

this instance. The scheme is considered consistent with LP7.

**Issue v – Flood risk**

*Policy LP 21 of the Local Plan states ‘All developments should avoid or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.*

The site is located within the Groundwater Throughflow Policy Area according to the Environment Agency. All works are above ground. There is no change to internal floor levels and the use remains residential. The scheme can be considered consistent with LP21.

**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.

On initial assessment this development is not considered liable for the Mayoral or Richmond CIL however this is subject to confirmation by the CIL Administration Team.

**8. RECOMMENDATION**

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process.

In making this recommendation consideration has been had to the statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the requirements set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the adverse impacts of allowing this planning application would significantly outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in NPPF (2019) and Development Plan, when taken as a whole.

**Refuse planning permission**

**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

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: .....25/03/2021.....

**I agree the recommendation:**



This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Head of Development Management / South Area Team 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.

South Area Team Manager: .....  .....

Dated: .....25.03.2021.....