

Application reference: 21/1963/HOT NORTH RICHMOND WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
31.05.2021	08.06.2021	03.08.2021	03.08.2021

Site:

24 Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX,

Proposal:

Proposed ground floor side/rear infill extension and rear dormer extension.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr David Evans
24, Rosedale Road
Richmond
TW9 2SX

AGENT NAME

Mr A BROWNE
18 Chelsea Manor Street
London
SW3 3UH

DC Site Notice: printed on 09.06.2021 and posted on 18.06.2021 and due to expire on 09.07.2021

Consultations:**Internal/External:****Consultee****Expiry Date****Neighbours:**

Studio 3 Part 2 Ground Floor Rear The Loft, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Studio 3 Part 1 Ground Floor To Rear, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Ground Floor Front Studio, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 21, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 20, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 19, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 18, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 17, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 16, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 14, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 13, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 12, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 11, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 10, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 9, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 8, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 7, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 6, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 5, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Office 4, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Studio 3, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Studio 1, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Studio 2, Rosedale House, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 Rosedale Studios, Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SZ, - 09.06.2021
 26 Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021
 22 Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX, - 09.06.2021

38 Jocelyn Road, Richmond, TW9 2TH -

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:88/0636
Date:06/05/1988 Erection of new conservatory, first floor extension and loft extension at the rear. (Application amended by letter dated 27th April 1988 and received on 28th April 1988).

Development Management

Status: PDE Application:21/1963/HOT
Date: Proposed ground floor side/rear infill extension and rear dormer extension.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 04.09.2000 Internal alterations and new first floor bathroom and en-suite shower room.
Reference: 00/1701/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 09.08.2006 Installed a Gas Boiler
Reference: 07/98992/CORGI

Application Number	21/1963/HOT
Address	24 Rosedale Road, Richmond, TW9 2SX
Proposal	Proposed ground floor side/rear infill extension and rear dormer extension
Contact Officer	Sarah Griffiee
Target Determination Date	03.08.2021

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 application site is located to the North of Rosedale Road which is North of Richmond Station and South of Kew Gardens. The property forms a central part of a terrace row within which properties are two stories with tiled roofscapes. While most properties are formed of exposed stock brick, the application site is white rendered to the front elevation.

The application site is situated within Richmond Village and is designated as:

- Article 4 restricting basement development
- Kew Foot Road Conservation Area
- Main Centre Buffer Zone
- Throughflow Catchment Area
- World Heritage Site and Buffer zone
- Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance: Character Area 1

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

This application seeks permission for a proposed ground floor side/rear infill extension and rear dormer extension.

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

88/0636 – Erection of new conservatory, first floor extension and loft extension at rear. Granted: 06.05.1988

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

1 letters of objection have been received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- Building structure and fabric are low quality and not designated for habitation
- Poor quality residences with some habitable rooms having no windows
- Acoustic separation not possible between residences

Upon review of the comments submitted, reference to change of use and loss of employment use does not relate to the proposal. It is therefore unclear whether the comments relates to this application or a different application.

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

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
- 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

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- Policy D4 Delivering Good Design
- Policy D12 Fire Safety
- Policy HC1 Heritage Conservation and Growth

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

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
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	Yes
Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets	LP4	Yes
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes

These policies can be found at

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

Supplementary Planning Documents

- Buildings of Townscape Merit
- House Extension and External Alterations
- Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance

These policies can be found at:

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:

- Kew Foot Road 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 Fire Safety

Issue i - Design and impact on heritage assets

The application site is not a listed building, nor is it a designated Building of Townscape Merit. However, the application site and surrounding properties do form part of Kew Foot Road Conservation Area. As such, great weight shall be given to the preservation of heritage assets in accordance with Policy LP3 and the NPPF.

The Kew Foot Road Conservation Area Statement describes the area as small scale than the neighbouring Kew Road, being formed of brick built terrace houses which are 2 to 3 stories in height. Generally materials are brick or render under slate roofs. Issues within the area include a loss of traditional architectural features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations and so opportunities for enhancement are to preserve, enhance and re-instate architectural quality and unity.

Proposed Extension

The proposed extension does not result in the loss of any traditional architectural features or materials.

The proposed extension is to be sited to infill to the side of the existing outrigger and to finish flush with the maximum rear extent of the outrigger. This limits the overall increase in footprint.

The proposed height is single storey and finishes well below the cill of the first floor windows such that it is proportionate and in scale with the host dwelling.

The combined siting and height ensures the proposed extension reads as a subservient addition to the host dwelling.

In regard to openings, it is proposed to remove the existing rear door which will be replaced by a window at the rear of the extension and to replace the window to the rear of the outrigger with French doors. Given these windows align with the positioning of the openings on the floor above and reflect the existing style of windows, they are considered to integrate well with the host property.

The render proposed for the extension is considered acceptable to allow the area to integrate to the outrigger it will abut. While the use of glazing for the roof is not a traditional material sympathetic to the heritage sensitivities of the site, it is limited in extent and gives a contemporary appearance allowing the area to read as a more modern addition to the host dwelling.

As such, the extension is considered suitable for the host dwelling and given its subservient appearance, will preserve the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.

Proposed Dormers

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations provides guidance on the formation of dormer windows. The dormer is partially compliant in that it is sited to the rear and not the front elevation, does not seek to raise or exceed the existing ridge line and proposes roof tiles to match

the existing. The dormer is set in slightly from either side and while not set up significantly from the eaves, this reflects the form of the existing dormer.

While the proposed dormer is wider than that currently existing, the proposed windows align with the openings on the floor below and it is proposed to use roof tiles to match the existing roof which will provide a degree of integration with the host dwelling.

While a flat roof is not a common feature of the original dwellinghouse, it is noted that the dormer would form part of the section of the terrace row which benefit from larger dormers which also have flat roofs. As such, the proposed dormer is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the terrace row and it's contribution to the Kew Foot Road Conservation Area.

Issue ii- Impact on Neighbour Amenity

Policy LP8 sets out that all development will be required to protect the amenity and living conditions of neighbouring properties with particular regard to daylight and sunlight provision, noise and disturbance, sense of enclosure, visual intrusion and overbearing impacts.

The neighbouring properties with the most potential to be impacted are No's 22 and 26 either side of the application site.

To the rear of the site is Rosedale Studio's which will not be detrimentally impacted as it has no windows facing the application site and is in use or commercial purposes which is less sensitive than a residential site.

Proposed Extension

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations sets out that a single storey rear extension of no more than 3m in depth is usually acceptable for a terrace property. In this instance, the neighbouring property which will abut the proposed extension, already has a rear projection. This means the proposed extension will not project more than 3m from the rear of the neighbouring property. As such, it does not result in a sense of enclosure, visual intrusion or overbearing impact to this neighbouring property.

Given the limited depth of the proposed extension beyond that existing at the neighbouring property, the proposal will not result in loss of light to this neighbour.

While the proposed extension involves alterations to and the creation of new openings, this would not result in harmful overlooking or loss of privacy as the lines of sight would be blocked by existing boundary treatment.

The proposed extension does not result in noise disturbance to neighbouring occupiers above that existing as the site is retained in residential use.

Proposed Dormer

The proposed dormer will not result in loss of light to neighbouring properties as its form is contained within the host building's roofscape. For this reason, the dormer will also not result in a sense of enclosure, visual intrusion or overbearing appearance to either neighbouring occupier.

Lines of sight from the proposed dormer level windows are likely to be similar to that existing. Therefore, the proposed dormer will not result in additional overlooking beyond that already possible and so does not result in loss of privacy in comparison to the existing on-site situation.

The proposed dormer is replacing an existing dormer and the alteration does not result in a change of use. As such, noise from the use of the dormer would not be significantly above that existing and so would not cause disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.

Therefore, no objection is raised to the proposal in regard to its impact on neighbour amenity.

Issue iii – Fire Safety

Policy D12 of the London Plan 2021 sets out that all development proposals must include a fire safety statement which fulfils the criteria set out in part A of the policy.

A Fire Safety statement has been submitted which sets out that the proposed works are small scale resulting in less than 7m2 of internal area being added. The construction of the dormer and extension will comply with Part B of Building Regulations and a fire suppression system including heat and smoke detectors is proposed for the ground floor. Bedroom doors at upper floors are also proposed to be FD30.

The document provided and the information contained within therefore satisfy the intent of Policy D12 and so no objection is raised to the proposal in this regard.

Other matters

This application does not assess the acceptability or lawfulness of the roof terrace shown on the drawings hereby approved. The application only assesses the works as described in the description of proposed development.

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, on initial assessment it 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.

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.

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):SGR.....

Dated:02/08/2021.....

I agree the recommendation:

Principal Planner

Dated:WWC.....2/8/21.....

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

U0053298	NPPF Refusal
U0053302	Decision Documents