

Application reference: 21/0535/HOT HAM, PETERSHAM, RICHMOND RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
16.02.2021	17.02.2021	14.04.2021	14.04.2021

Site:

3 Headway Close, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YW

Proposal:

Single-storey side and rear extension.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr John Holt
3 Headway Close
Ham
Richmond
TW10 7YW

AGENT NAME

Mr Tony Fisher
30 Clifford Road
Richmond
TW10 7EA

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

4 Locksmeade Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YT, - 17.02.2021
9 Headway Close, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YW, - 17.02.2021
4 Headway Close, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YW, - 17.02.2021
2 Headway Close, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YW, - 17.02.2021

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

Status: GTD Application: 19/0838/HOT
Date: 10/05/2019 A two storey front extension at ground and first floor levels.

Development Management

Status: PDE Application: 21/0535/HOT
Date: Single-storey side and rear extension.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 27.08.2003 FENSA Notification of Replacement Glazing comprising 5 Windows and 2 Doors. Installed by Anglian Windows Ltd. FENSA Member No 13229. Installation ID 1001573. Invoice No S101269935

Reference: 03/5248/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 26.01.2010 Installed a Gas Boiler
Reference: 10/FEN00680/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 10.12.2018 Two storey front extension incorporating new staircase.
Reference: 18/2118/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 09.10.2019 Remodelling first floor layout, including new window to create two bedrooms
Reference: 19/1648/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 13.10.2019 Install replacement window in a dwelling
Reference: 19/FEN01840/FENSA

Enforcement

Opened Date: 24.01.2019 Enforcement Enquiry
Reference: 19/0050/EN/UBW

Application Number	21/0535/HOT
Address	3 Headway Close, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YW
Proposal	Single-storey side and rear extension.
Contact Officer	Kerry McLaughlin
Target Determination Date	14.04.2021

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 proposal property is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling, located on the corner of Headway Close.

The application site is subject to the following planning constraints:

Archaeological Priority (English Heritage)	Site: Ham Fields - Partly built over by grow of Ham, and used for gravel extraction, finds of prehistoric material indi
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Floodzone 2.	Fluvial Models
Land Use Past Industrial	Gravel Pit. EXTENTS FROM BGS ARTIFICIAL GEOLOGY LAYER Start: 2002 End: 2004
Neighbourhood Plan Area	Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Area - Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan - Adopted by Council on 22 January 2019
Take Away Management Zone	Take Away Management Zone
Village	Ham and Petersham Village
Ward	Ham, Petersham and Richmond Riverside Ward

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above however the most relevant planning history is as follows:

There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of representation were received.

5. AMENDMENTS

None.

6. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2019)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places

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

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- Policy D4 - Delivering Good Design
- Policy HC1 - Heritage Conservation and Growth
- Policy SI12 - Flood Risk Management
- Policy SI13 - Sustainable Drainage

These policies can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/london-plan-2021>

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 Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

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

Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan (2019)

Which can be found via the following link:

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn_plan_2018_to_2033_january_2019.pdf

Supplementary Planning Documents

- House Extension and External Alterations
- Ham and Petersham Village Plan

These policies can be found at:

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

7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design/Visual Amenity
- ii Neighbour Amenity
- iii Flood Risk

Issue i - Design/Visual Amenity

Policy LP1 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and

urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area. Proposals should demonstrate an understanding of the site and its context when considering the design including layout, siting and access and the compatibility of the works to the neighbouring uses.

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.

The proposal seeks to erect a wrap-around, ground floor side/rear extension. The extension comprises a part flat, part slopped roof, which, while relatively high, is sited comfortably below the cill of the first-floor level fenestration, as required under SPD. The proposed dimensions are found acceptable as the form of the original house can still be appreciated and the scheme appears subordinate to the original built form.

The proposed exterior materials comprise; facing brickwork, manmade slate and PVCu fenestration to match that of the existing, ensuring the development integrates with the existing character of the host property and wider locality.

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.

Whilst the extension will form views from the street scene, as it is set back from the front boundary by a significant distance and is single-storey only it is not considered the views will cause any undue harm to the visual amenity of the area.

There are various examples of existing rear extensions similar in scale to that proposed here within the wider area, this confirms the development will not result in an incongruous addition.

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable in terms of design/visual amenity. The proposal is not considered to detrimentally impact the character of the wider area or host building and therefore, is in line with the aims and objectives of Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) and relevant SPD's.

Issue ii - Neighbour Amenity

Policy LP8 states that development must protect the amenity and living conditions of existing, adjoining and neighbouring occupants. Design must allow for good daylight standards, avoid overlooking or noise disturbance, avoid visual intrusion, overbearing impacts or harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the uses of buildings and gardens. Harm may arise from various impacts such as noise, air pollution, odours or vibration.

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 3m in depth for a terrace 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. However, the final test of acceptability is dependent on the specific circumstances of the site which may justify greater rear projection.

4 Headway Close

The proposed extension would project no more than 3m beyond the rear elevation of No.4, this is considered an acceptable projection which would satisfy the guidelines set out in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD. Thus, 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.

2 Headway Close

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 the above adjoining neighbouring property to the rear of the application site.

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.

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity. The proposal is not considered to detrimentally impact the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers and therefore, is in line with policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018) and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance.

Issue iii - 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.

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been provided as part of this application to comply with the requirements of LP21, which states the floor levels within the proposed development to be set no lower than existing levels AND, flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where appropriate.

8. 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.

9. RECOMMENDATION

Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains how the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. For the reasons set out above, this application falls to be determined in accordance with the test under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the proposal is in general conformity with the Development Plan overall and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify refusal.

The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the above policies and guidance, and therefore it is recommended the scheme is approved without delay.

Grant planning permission with conditions

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): KM

Dated: 12.04.2021

I agree the recommendation: 

Team Leader/~~Head of Development Management~~/Principal Planner

Dated:12.04.2021.....