

PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by

Jack Morris on 25 August 2021

Application reference: 21/2093/HOT

FULWELL, HAMPTON HILL WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
09.06.2021	09.06.2021	04.08.2021	04.08.2021

Site:

10 Park Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1HB,

Proposal:

Renewal and replacement of existing roof, rear dormer extension, and installation of air-conditioning unit at ground level

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr David Stappard

10, Park Road

Hampton Hill

TW12 1HB

AGENT NAME

Mr Hannes du Plessis

57 Villiers Avenue

Surbiton

KT5 8BE

United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on 14.06.2021 and posted on 25.06.2021 and due to expire on 16.07.2021

Consultations:
Internal/External:
Consultee

LBRUT Non-Commercial Environmental Health

14D Urban D

Expiry Date

28.06.2021

28.06.2021

Neighbours:

Unit 3, Hampton Hill Business Park, High Street, Hampton Hill, Hampton, TW12 1NP, - 14.06.2021

Units 1 And 2, Hampton Hill Business Park, High Street, Hampton Hill, Hampton, TW12 1NP, - 14.06.2021

12 Park Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1HB, - 14.06.2021

8 Park Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1HB, - 14.06.2021

7 Park Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1HE, - 14.06.2021

5 Park Road, Hampton Hill, TW12 1HE, - 14.06.2021

History: Planning – Appeal – Enforcement – Building Control

Development Management

Status: REF Application:08/2568/HOT
Date:24/09/2008 Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of full width rear extension. Internal refurbishment.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:08/4825/HOT
Date:11/02/2009 Single storey rear/side extension to no. 8 and part single, part two storey rear extension to no. 10.

Development Management

Status: REF Application:21/0722/HOT
Date:07/05/2021 Renewal and replacement of existing roof, rear dormer extension, and installation of air-conditioning unit at ground level

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:21/2093/HOT
Date: Renewal and replacement of existing roof, rear dormer extension, and installation of air-conditioning unit at ground level

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:21/T0587/TCA
Date:10/08/2021 Front Garden (Front Boundary) T1: Privet/holly/thuja hedge - Reduce height by ? meter, trim to shape (all sides) height 4m & spread 5m. Reduce height to 3.5m & spread to 5m Back Garden (Left Boundary) T2: Hornbeam tree x2 - Reduce height to match by 1.5 - 2m, prune sides by 0.5 - 1m, divide both trees and form tear drop shape, lift second branches by 2m from ground level over path side only (maintain screening from neighbour's property) height 6m & spread 4m. Reduce height to 4.5m & spread to 5m T3: Small hornbeam tree - Fell to ground level, dig or grind out stump height 12m & spread 6m. Reduce height to 10m & spread to 5m (Back Boundary) T4: Pleached hornbeam hedge - Remove dead wood, wire in new growth height 4m & spread 6m. Reduce height to 3.9m & spread to 6m Reason for work: General tree maintenance, maintaining this tree in its current setting, T3 is in decline and movement at root ball

Building Control

Deposit Date: 31.01.1995 Removal of chimney
Reference: 95/0073/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 02.07.2009 Rear ground and first floor extension

Reference: 09/1073/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 06.10.2009 Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 09/FEN01154/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 29.01.2010 New installation rewire or partial rewire

Reference: 10/ELE00053/ELECSA

Application Number	21/2093/HOT
Address	10 Park Road, Hampton Hill. TW12 1HB.
Proposal	Renewal and replacement of existing roof, rear dormer extension, and installation of air-conditioning unit at ground level
Contact Officer	JMO- Jack Morris
Target Determination Date	26/08/2021

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 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 has considered 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 property is three-storeys and forms part of a terrace.

The application site is situated within Twickenham and is designated as:

- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Building of Townscape Merit (Site: 10 Park Road Hampton Hill Middlesex TW12 1HB)
- Conservation Area (CA38 High Street Hampton Hill)
- Land Use Past Industrial (a Builder's Yard on map Start: 1956 End: 1956)
- Take Away Management Zone (Take Away Management Zone)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The application proposes the renewal and replacement of existing roof, rear dormer extension, and installation of air-conditioning unit at ground level.

The relevant planning history is set out below:

Development Management

Status: GTD
Date:11/02/2009

Application:08/4825/HOT
Single storey rear/side extension to no. 8 and part single, part two storey rear extension to no. 10.

Development Management

Status: REF
Date:24/09/2008

Application:08/2568/HOT
Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of full width rear extension. Internal refurbishment.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

Only one letter of representation was received (in objection) from: 10 Park Road, Hampton Hill. TW12 1HB. Copied in below:

“We are concerned about the installation of an external air-conditioning unit at ground level less than 2 metres from and facing our property. This could potentially be run throughout the day and night causing noise and disturbance resulting from use.”

LBRUT Urban Design – No objection to renewal and replacement of existing roof and installation of air-conditioning unit at ground level however objection to the rear dormer. Comments summarised below.

Environmental Health – Object, not accompanied by any form of acoustic assessment in respect of the proposed air conditioning plant and as such I am unable to determine impact on residential amenity. Comments summarised below.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2021)

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/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D6 Housing quality and standards
- D12 Fire Safety
- 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	No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	No

Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets	LP4		No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8		No

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
 Design Quality
 House Extension and External Alterations
 Residential Development Standards
 Village Plan – Hampton Hill

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:

High Street, Hampton Hill Conservation Area Statement
 High Street, Hampton Hill Conservation Area Study

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

i Design and impact on heritage assets

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 Council's 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.

Paragraph 199 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 202 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'. In this instance, whilst the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the setting, character and appearance of the conservation area, there is no public benefit arising from the proposal as such it is contrary to the NPPF.

Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states 'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be considered in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.

The application property is a two storey late Victorian semi-detached villa situated within the Hampton Hill High Street Conservation Area, the buildings is also designated as a BTM. The pair of semis form part of a collection of Late Victorian villas lining Park Road, there is a strong consistency of style and materiality to the group, which has been maintained to their principle elevations. It is noted that to the rear of the application property and the neighbouring villas later additions have somewhat resulted in the loss of the unity between the buildings. The application property benefits from a part two storey part single storey rear extension. The proposal seeks to renew and replace the existing roof over the property and introduce a rear dormer extension and at ground floor level an air conditioning unit will be introduced to the side of the property.

The proposed rear dormer would have a flat roof over it, it would extend across the majority of the rear roof slope. The dormer would not be set down from the ridge line or set in much from the sides of the roof slope, it is noted that that there would be a minor setback from the eaves of the property. The scale of the proposed dormer would dominate the rear roof slope and would appear overly large and assertive on the rear roof slope. The proposed rear roof addition would be contrary to the Council's External Alterations SPD which states that, roof extensions should not dominate the original roof, a significant area of the existing roof should be left beneath a new dormer and on either side of the dormer, thus setting the extension well in from either side of the roof. The SPD goes on to state that dormer windows should be smaller than that of windows of the floor below. The proposed dormer would fail to appear subservient to the host BTM and would dominate the roof slope it is to be added to, furthermore the windows to the dormer would be of a larger scale than the windows below.

The Council's conservation officer also objected to the proposal stating the proposed dormer is much too large. The applicant gives number 8, next door as justification but this was approved in 2010, 9 years before the property became part of the conservation area and therefore cannot be considered as precedent. A dormer may be acceptable if it was designed with properly proportioned cheeks and roof however the current proposal would cause harm to the character of the area, fail to preserve the conservation area and harm the setting of the host BTM.

The harm identified above would be less than substantial. In accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF when weighing this harm to the conservation area against a public benefit, given the proposed extensions would be private extensions to a private dwelling this is not considered to outweigh the harm identified to the conservation area.

Due to the siting of the air conditioning unit to the side of the property and its small scale there are no objections to this in design terms. The boundary fence would screen any views of the unit from within the Conservation Area, as such it would not detract from the appearance of the BTM or the wider Conservation Area. There are also no objections to the replacement of the roof as long as it is on a like for like basis in terms of materials. Those slates which are in good condition and not cracked should be set aside and reused as part of the works and any replacements slates should match exactly in colour, texture and size.

However in view of the above, the proposal, in particular the rear dormer fails to comply with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 the aims and objections of Paragraphs 199-203 of the NPPF and policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Local Plan.

ii Impact on 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 proposed works are not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours in terms of overbearing or loss of light. The proposal would not create any significant new views from the existing windows so is not considered to have an adverse impact in terms of overlooking.

The environmental health officer was consulted to comment on the application on the 14.06.2021 and responded on 24.06.2021 with the following comment:

I note the above application is not accompanied by any form of acoustic assessment in respect of the proposed air conditioning plant and as such I am unable to determine if this element would not lead to an unacceptable loss of amenity and recommend refusal on such grounds.

The neighbour concern regarding the placement of the air-conditioning unit within two metres their common boundary is taken on-board. While the LPA shares the view of the conservation officer that this would be most sensible and discreet location to place the unit, the potential noise that may result from the unit is unknown and could have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties as the unit could run both day and night. As such it is considered the proposal is contrary to Policy LP8 of the Local Plan.

iii Fire Safety

Policy D12 (Fire safety) of the London Plan requires all developments to achieve the highest standards of fire safety and all major development proposals to be submitted with a Fire Statement. The proposal was submitted with detailed plans outlining the strategy by which any occupant may evacuate the building in the event of a fire, but not a written fire statement document outlining materials used and procedures in place to reduce the risk to life in the case of a fire.

In the absence of a fire safety strategy detailing the developments approach to fire safety risk, the scheme has failed to demonstrate that it would not have an adverse impact on the safety of future occupants in the event of a fire and is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy D12(A) of the London Plan (2021).

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 (2021) and Development Plan, when taken as a whole.

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

The proposed dormer extension's unsympathetic design would result in the roofline being dominated which would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host Building of Townscape Merit and thus fail to preserve or enhance the setting, character, and appearance of Hampton Hill (CA38) Conservation Area of which it forms part. The scheme is therefore contrary to the SPD on house extensions and external alterations and local planning policies LP1, LP3, and LP4 of the adopted local plan (2018).

In the absence of information detailing the acoustic levels of the proposed air conditioning unit, a full assessment cannot be made on the impact of any noise generated on neighbouring amenity. As such the scheme is considered to adversely impact on the amenity of occupants of neighbouring properties contrary to the aims and objectives of Policy LP8 of the Local Plan.

Furthermore, the application failed to provide the adequate documents to meet policy D12 of the London plan and the specifications of the proposed air conditioning unit that could introduce an unacceptable noise level among neighbouring properties.

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):JM..... Dated:25/8/2021.....

I agree the recommendation: WT

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

Dated:26/8/2021.....

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

U0053935	Fire Safety Statement
U0053936	NPPF Refusal Paragraphs 38-42
U0053938	Drawings