

85 CONNAUGHT ROAD

RICHMOND UPON THAMES /// LONDON

RENOVATION AND EXTENSION

Response to Online Comments & Objections

Planning

OCTOBER 2021

Mark Smith Architects

1.1 Introduction

This document has been prepared as a response to the online objections and comments to a planning application at 85 Connaught Road (21/2729/FUL). The proposed development includes renovating and extending the existing building to provide 6 self-contained dwellings in total.

1.2 Format

In section 2 of this document, each comment is shown in full (in black), with our response where necessary **shown in red**.

2.1 Comment 01

Type: Objection

Address: 87 Connaught Road Teddington TW11 0QQ

As immediate neighbours of 85 Connaught Road we have considered carefully the resubmitted application dated 2 August 2021 and are responding with our views, objections and concerns.

1. Layout and Density of building

Whilst accepting the visual improvement to the planned frontage, the proposals envisage the building being converted from originally a single home into a block of flats unlike any other buildings in Connaught Road. **I would like to point out that the existing building in its current arrangement comprises of two large flats.** The construction of six flats over four levels to accommodate up to 14 people is disproportionate with all other houses in the neighborhood and will have a direct impact on the quality of services and comfort to other local residents. **This is not a valid planning objection. The London Plan encourages intensification of these type of properties. In addition, there is also an extant fallback scheme of five units and numerous examples of flatted schemes on Connaught Road namely; Connaught Court and on the corner of Connaught Road and Kings Road.**

Whilst unlike the previous application on this occasion no comparison roof line street view plan has been submitted in the proposed plans, the modifications will still increase the height of the building, dwarfing all other buildings neighbouring buildings on the same side **Page 10 of the DAS confirms that the proposed ridge height does not exceed the existing ridge height therefore no comparative streetscene was required however for completeness I now have provided this** and impacting on the sunlight to all facing houses for many months a year. **This is an incorrect assertion, the only difference between the extant five unit scheme and the proposed scheme is the new roof but this does not exceed the existing ridge height and is almost identical in bulk and massing terms to the existing roof therefore no daylight and sunlight infringement is possible.**

We also object to the proposal to significantly extend a pre existing untanked and damp basement. None of the neighbouring properties have any form of basement and given the age of our own and other neighbouring properties they will have been built with shallow foundations. The modifications will require major construction with very limited accessibility

and may well present a significant risk to our and property and the other immediate neighbour at number 83. **This comment is incorrect and without any expert basis - see attached letter from the applicant's structural engineer which addresses this comment.**

The reports being relied upon are outdated as regards flooding risk that has damaged other properties with below ground garages and commercial basements in the area. **This comment is incorrect and without any expert basis - see attached letter from the applicant's structural engineer which addresses this comment.** The existing basement has long suffered from damp presently requiring fans to run 24/7 that vent onto our property. **The existing basement, like all other old basement, suffers from minor damp issues but in planning terms this is irrelevant.**

Another major concern for us is the number of vents and running fans that will be required to accommodate the number of new kitchens and bathrooms on the same wall immediately to the side of our property will be a considerable nuisance from both a noise and smell perspective. No details of these are on the plans and their positioning in relation to the 6 windows that we have on that side of our property. **The applicant owns the freehold of the building and as such any boundary wall is owned by the applicant. Notwithstanding this, I can confirm that no vent or fans will be placed on the boundary wall and this will be something that will be addressed in detailed design by us, Mark Smith Architects Ltd, as construction architects. Respectfully, this is not a planning issue and furthermore if it was then the same would apply to the extant five-unit scheme.**

2. Traffic generation and Adequacy of Car Parking

Street parking is a major area of concern in light of the number of cars that already park at our end of Connaught Road. The demand for free overspill parking has clearly increased since the long out of date Arden Consulting 2017 report following the new parking restrictions on Hampton Hill high street and on Wellington Road. The Burtons Road traffic timing restrictions, the closure of Bushy Park to flow through traffic and local businesses such as Neatsmith, Callaghans, local estate agents and surveyors who frequently park in our road throughout the day have also had an impact on the use and amount of day time parking in Connaught Road.

There are usually three cars parked in Connaught Road that can be attributed to the two present flats. When combined with the latest proposal to triple the number flats and according to the Planning Statement to accommodate up to 14 people, this will surely have a greater impact than the additional 2 to 3 cars referred to in the Transport Statement and therefore in conjunction with the neighbourhood overspill, will very likely exceed Richmond's unacceptable parking stress level of 85% in the road.

See continuing objections on next pages submitted separately.

Respectfully, the above assertion is without basis. The previously refused six-unit scheme was found to be sound from a transport point of view by the Council – below is an excerpt from the Officer's Report dated 18 June 2021:

The application is supported by a Transport Statement which specifies that no parking spaces are proposed. The extant permission gave approval for 5 flats (with a requirement for 2 additional Officer Planning Report – Application 21/1110/FUL Page 11 of 15 Official

spaces beyond the existing situation). The submitted application has been supported by an onstreet parking survey which identifies that the existing highway network could accommodate the proposed overspill parking of 2 parking spaces. The bulk of this is given over to the previous parking survey results under 19/1759/FUL, which demonstrated a parking stress of 82%, with the potential additional parking stress from the development increasing this to 83.80% The addition of another unit increases this to 84.27% which is still within the Council's threshold of 85% specified in the SPD guidelines. It is therefore considered that the shortfall of 2no. off-street parking spaces could be sufficiently accommodated on-street, and the addition of one further flat compared to the previous extant permission (19/1759/FUL) would not exacerbate this. Given the findings of the on-street- parking survey, the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy LP45 and has been demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact on the area in terms of street scene or on-street parking.

3. Refuse and Landscaping

The proposal for 6 bins to be enclosed in the front garden causes us major concern from both a visual and a health perspective. In our view the 6 bins proposed for 6 flats is a significant underestimation given that the two flats presently have x2 wheelie bins and x2 recycling bins , this is without the possibility of potentially x2 green waste garden bins being required for a second proposed garden too. *The refuse enclosure has been designed to accommodate sufficient bin capacity including communal waste containers (8 bedrooms x 70 litres = 560l = 2 x 360litre bins) and communal recycling containers (2 x 360litre bins), with space for flexibility for future alternative waste/recycling needs.*

Even though the proposal is for them to be enclosed and slightly sunken, such an increase will be visible through the iron railings and based upon the experience of two flats, the bins are frequently not returned to their enclosures and excess rubbish is left on pavements. *The design of the bin store has already been approved via a condition discharge on the extant five-unit scheme (planning ref: 20/0419/DD01) and accordingly this was deemed acceptable by the Council. Regarding bins not being returned to their enclosure, a comprehensive building management plan will be operated to ensure that tenants and refuse collectors return bins to their enclosure.*

4. Site set up

We are also concerned as to the site set up. In the Basement Impact Statement 7.3 it states that it is "assumed" that excavated earth will be collected by skip or lorry kerb side. If the property has no side access is this possible? Otherwise it will need to be removed from the rear garden via the Electricity Board substation access, again is this feasible/allowable? *A conveyor belt will be used to bring excavated earth from the basement to a skip or lorry kerbside. This conveyor belt will be positioned entirely within the demise of the applicant's property, side access is not required.*

The fact that the property has no side access we can not see how this major work can be undertaken without requiring the neighbours' permissions for access to their own properties which we for one will not agree to. We have allowed access in the past for repair works but these plans are entirely different. No where in the application do we see this being addressed adequately. *As above, side access is not required. The applicant has confirmed that they are happy to accept a condition for a Construction Method Statement.*

Thank you for the opportunity to share our objections and comments

2.2 Comment 02

Type: Objection

Address: 126 Connaught Road Teddington TW11 0QQ

We yet again reiterate our objection to this planning development proposal. The additional tweaks provide no improvement to the proposal. The additional of huge structural basement work will add significant disruption to an already overcrowded street.

As immediate opposite neighbours of 85 Connaught Road we have considered carefully the application dated 30/04/2021. We would reiterate our prior core objections that were made in relation to application : Ref 20/3237/FUL

1. Planning Statement

Whilst there is no consistent roof line in Connaught Road due to mix of housing but the height roofline of this proposal rather than being described as modest is well in excess of any existing roof line in the road including other comparable three storey houses. By adding a floor onto the front elevation, no.85 will become the tallest house in the road and could set a precedent that might see other properties being similarly added to. **This assertion is factually incorrect as per p. 10 of the DAS.**

2. Light, overshadowing and privacy

As the house immediately opposite this proposed development we will be directly impacted by a loss of sunlight. Likewise, from a privacy perspective, an additional storey would overlook our family bedroom .**This statement is without basis, the proposed replacement roof does not exceed the existing ridge height. Furthermore the proposed replacement roof does not breach the 25 degree daylight and sunlight angle – see enclosed drawing.** Noting that our house (and the others in this terrace), experience sunlight in the morning, the additional storey would quite simply block it out for most houses. In the winter months the sun is barely above the existing roofline of Number 85, if they were to extend as per the proposals it would mean a severe loss of daylight and overshadowing. **Respectfully, as demonstrated by the 25 degree test there is no severe loss of daylight and sunlight, let alone any loss of sunlight for 126 Connaught Road or any properties adjoining 126 Connaught Road arising from the proposed replacement roof.**

3. Conservation area proximity

We border extremely closely with the Mays Road conservation area and this proposed building will look significantly out of place and tower above the Mays Road properties. **First, the subject property is not in the setting of Mays Road Conservation Area and has never been considered as in the setting of Mays Road Conservation Area by the Council in any previous applications. Second, as the architect of the proposed replacement roof, I contend that the proposed replacement roof is a significant architectural improvement which offers visual interest compared to the existing dull and utilitarian roof and I hope the Council would agree. I also contend that my proposed design is in fact of high enough quality to be in a Conservation Area.**

4. Transport /Traffic/parking

Parking is already difficult for residents on Connaught Road especially at the Wellington Road end.

The previously refused six-unit scheme was found to be sound from a transport point of view by the Council – below is an excerpt from the Officer's Report dated 18 June 2021:

The application is supported by a Transport Statement which specifies that no parking spaces are proposed. The extant permission gave approval for 5 flats (with a requirement for 2 additional Officer Planning Report – Application 21/1110/FUL Page 11 of 15 Official spaces beyond the existing situation). The submitted application has been supported by an onstreet parking survey which identifies that the existing highway network could accommodate the proposed overspill parking of 2 parking spaces. The bulk of this is given over to the previous parking survey results under 19/1759/FUL, which demonstrated a parking stress of 82%, with the potential additional parking stress from the development increasing this to 83.80% The addition of another unit increases this to 84.27% which is still within the Council's threshold of 85% specified in the SPD guidelines. It is therefore considered that the shortfall of 2no. off-street parking spaces could be sufficiently accommodated on-street, and the addition of one further flat compared to the previous extant permission (19/1759/FUL) would not exacerbate this. Given the findings of the on-street- parking survey, the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy LP45 and has been demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact on the area in terms of street scene or on-street parking

With no parking restrictions in force, parking spaces are already few and far between. Commuter parking is again on the increase as lockdowns ease, free parking for those using Fulwell train station, local businesses and shops on Hampton Hill High Street as well as people visiting nearby Bushy Park. This new proposal, with even more flats and residents that the original proposal,(which was already excessive), could potentially bring a lot more cars and make parking for existing residents even more difficult. (The Burtons road changes have seemingly created more congestion around the traffic signals, and the loss of on street parking spaces).

We again note , that those in favour thus far, are far removed from the local community in question than those supporting the last application; as such will not suffer any negative impacts from this egregious proposal.

I therefore consider that the proposal is contrary to the local plan and the London plan and request that the planning application is refused.

2.3 Comment 03

Type: Objection

As immediate neighbours of 85 Connaught Road we have reviewed the resubmitted application dated August 2021 with careful consideration.

As the closest neighbours and most overlooked by the existing property, unfortunately a great many of our concerns are still not addressed.

1. Layout and Impact

Whilst some improvements to the street-facing elevation have been made, unlike the previous application on this occasion no comparison roof line street view plan has been submitted. **P. 10 of the DAS confirms that the proposed ridge height does not exceed the existing ridge height therefore no comparative streetscene was required however for completeness I now have provided this. Please see enclosed.** The modifications will still increase the height of the building, **This is factually incorrect as per p. 10 of the DAS dwarfing all other buildings neighbouring buildings on the same side and impacting on the sunlight to all facing houses for many months a year. This is also factually incorrect as demonstrated by the 25 degree assessment enclosed.**

We also share the objections laid out by no 87 concerning the proposal to significantly extend a pre-existing, untanked and damp basement. None of the neighbouring properties have any form of basement and given the age of other neighbouring properties they will have been built with shallow foundations. The modifications will require major construction with very limited accessibility and may well present a significant risk to immediate neighbours nos 83 and 87. The reports being relied upon are outdated as regards flooding risk that has damaged other properties with below ground garages and commercial basements in the area. **This comment is incorrect and without any expert basis - see attached letter from the applicant's structural engineer which addresses this comment.** The existing basement has long suffered from damp presently requiring fans to run 24/7 that vent onto adjacent property. **The existing basement, like all other old basement, suffers from minor damp issues but in planning terms this is irrelevant.**

Another major concern is the number of vents and running fans that will be required to accommodate the number of new kitchens and bathrooms which will overlook our property. These would be a considerable nuisance from both a noise and smell perspective. No details of these are on the plans and their positioning. **The applicant owns the freehold of the building and as such any boundary wall is owned by the applicant. Notwithstanding this, I can confirm that no vent or fans will be placed on the boundary wall and this will be something that will be addressed in detailed design by us, Mark Smith Architects Ltd, as construction architects. Respectfully, this is not a planning issue and furthermore if it was then the same would apply to the extant five-unit scheme.**

2. Parking & Traffic Generation

Our concerns about the increase of traffic and parking requirements stand as in previous applications. Nothing in the new plan has changed.

Car Parking Street parking is a major area of concern in light of the number of cars that already park at our end of Connaught Road. The demand for free overspill parking has clearly increased since the long out of date Arden Consulting 2017 report following the new parking restrictions on Hampton Hill high street and on Wellington Road. The more recent Burtons Road traffic timing restrictions, the closure of Bushy Park to flow through traffic and local businesses such as Neatsmith, Callaghans, local estate agents and surveyors who frequently park in our road throughout the day have also had an impact on the use and amount of day time parking in Connaught Road.

There are three cars parked in Connaught Road that can be attributed to the two present flats. When combined with the latest proposal to triple the number flats and to accommodate up to 14 people, this will surely have a greater impact than the additional 2 to 3 cars referred to in the Transport Statement and therefore in conjunction with the neighbourhood overspill, will very likely exceed Richmond's unacceptable parking stress

level of 85% in the road.

Respectfully, the above assertion is without basis. The previously refused six-unit scheme was found to be sound from a transport point of view by the Council – below is an excerpt from the Officer's Report dated 18 June 2021:

The application is supported by a Transport Statement which specifies that no parking spaces are proposed. The extant permission gave approval for 5 flats (with a requirement for 2 additional Officer Planning Report – Application 21/1110/FUL Page 11 of 15 Official spaces beyond the existing situation). The submitted application has been supported by an onstreet parking survey which identifies that the existing highway network could accommodate the proposed overspill parking of 2 parking spaces. The bulk of this is given over to the previous parking survey results under 19/1759/FUL, which demonstrated a parking stress of 82%, with the potential additional parking stress from the development increasing this to 83.80% The addition of another unit increases this to 84.27% which is still within the Council's threshold of 85% specified in the SPD guidelines. It is therefore considered that the shortfall of 2no. off-street parking spaces could be sufficiently accommodated on-street, and the addition of one further flat compared to the previous extant permission (19/1759/FUL) would not exacerbate this. Given the findings of the on-street- parking survey, the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy LP45 and has been demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact on the area in terms of street scene or on-street parking.

Comment: 3. Refuse and Landscaping

Our concerns about the impact of tripling the refuse needs of the development stand as in previous applications. Nothing in the new plan has changed. **The refuse enclosure has been designed to accommodate sufficient bin capacity including communal waste containers (8 bedrooms x 70 litres = 560l = 2 x 360litre bins) and communal recycling containers (2 x 360litre bins), with space for flexibility for future alternative waste/recycling needs.**

The proposal for 6 refuse bins to be enclosed in the front garden causes us major concern from both a visual and a health perspective. In our view the 6 bins proposed for 6 flats is a significant underestimation given that the two flats presently have x2 wheelie bins and x2 recycling bins, this is without the possibility of potentially x2 green waste garden bins being required for a second proposed garden too. Even though the proposal is for them to be enclosed and slightly sunken, such an increase will be visible through the iron railings and based upon the experience of two flats, the bins are frequently not returned to their enclosures and excess rubbish is left on pavements. **The design of the bin store has already been approved via a condition discharge on the extant five-unit scheme (planning ref: 20/0419/DD01) and accordingly this was deemed acceptable by the Council. Regarding bins not being returned to their enclosure, a comprehensive building management plan will be operated to ensure that tenants and refuse collectors return bins to their enclosure.**

4. Privacy, noise and light levels

Our concerns about the impact of tripling the occupation levels of the new development with 6 sets of living areas that directly impact our property have not been met. The new proposal is in many ways even more disruptive. **This point is lacking any specific or meaningful explanation of what will cause perceived "disruption". The proposed scheme is extremely**

well designed and will be built in accordance with current Building Regulations and by the extension the levels of acoustic insulation will far exceed the levels of acoustic insulation in the existing building therefore there is unlikely to be any transfer of noise. In addition, one must note that the building of the proposed scheme is completely detached from any of the neighboring buildings which will prevent any transfer of noise.

In addition to these comments our own property at No. 83 (immediately to the left of the proposed development from the street) is already overshadowed at the back of the property with all three levels of the property directly overlooking our property and garden. No overlooking will exist as all windows facing No 83 are opaque. Regarding overshadowing, the raising of the rear extension / outrigger roof which has already been approved under the extant five-unit scheme is only 750mm and coupled with the fact that the outrigger lies to the west of No. 83 any increase in overshadowing can only be marginal if at all occurring. At present this consists of several windows which look directly onto our property mainly on the ground and first floors. This proposal would add further windows on the second floor. The proposed additional windows have already been approved under the extant five-unit scheme however all windows facing No. 83 are opaque and as such this represents an improvement on the existing neighboring arrangement between No. 83 and No. 85 which are not opaque. Previous owners of our property have planted bamboo screening to attempt to prevent the oversight of our decked area however they do nothing to screen out noise. Conversation from any of these overlooking rooms can be clearly heard without any raised voices and whilst tenants have so far been considerate the thought of this impact being increased from 2 flats to 6 is very worrying. As above, the proposed scheme is extremely well designed and will be built in accordance with current Building Regulations and by extension the levels of acoustic insulation will far exceed the levels of acoustic insulation in the existing building therefore there is unlikely to be any transfer of noise. In addition, one must note that the building of the proposed scheme is completely detached from any of the neighboring buildings which will prevent any transfer of noise.

Potentially 6 different living areas, 4 of which have no outside space would impact directly on the noise levels directly at the back of our property. I also have doubts (from previous experience) that use of the flat roof in the planned side return could be adequately prevented from being used as a roof terrace. This is a what if scenario and the objector's previous experience is of no relevance. If such a situation transpires then the objector can seek to use the tools of planning enforcement.

In summary

To increase the density from 2 flats to 3 would be understandable but from 2 to 6 is highly concerning. All of the houses on this part of Connaught Road are currently family homes and I feel very strongly that this proposed change of use would impact not only our immediate property but of other neighbours nearby. As outlined above, the proposed scheme will not undermine any of the neighboring properties.

As already noted by another neighbour, the letters in support of this development are far removed from the local community in question as were those supporting the last application; as such will not suffer any negative impacts from this egregious proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our objections and comments

2.4 Comment 04

Type: Objection

Address: 128 Connaught Road Teddington TW11 0QQ

Whilst this is an improvement on previous applications this will still significantly dominate the street near an area of Conservation

First, the subject property is not in the setting of Mays Road Conservation Area and has never been considered in the setting of Mays Road Conservation Area by the Council in any previous applications. Second, as the architect of the proposed replacement roof, I contend that the proposed replacement roof is a significant architectural improvement which offers visual interest compared to the existing dull and utilitarian roof and I hope the Council would agree. I also contend that my proposed design is in fact of high enough quality to be in a Conservation Area.

and block sunlight through the winter to our property opposite, this would mean a severe loss of daylight and overshadowing.

As demonstrated by the 25 degree test there is no severe loss of daylight and sunlight, let alone any loss of sunlight for 128 Connaught Road or any properties adjoining 128 Connaught Road arising from the proposed replacement roof.

This application is significant in height and scale and do not want it to set a precedent that might see other properties being similarly added to.

This is not correct as per p. 10 of the Design and Access Statement.

Parking is already difficult for residents on Connaught Road especially at the Wellington Road end. With no parking restrictions in force, parking spaces are already few and far between.

Commuter parking is again on the increase.

The previously refused six-unit scheme was found to be sound from a transport point of view by the Council – below is an excerpt from the Officer's Report dated 18 June 2021:

The application is supported by a Transport Statement which specifies that no parking spaces are proposed. The extant permission gave approval for 5 flats (with a requirement for 2 additional Officer Planning Report – Application 21/1110/FUL Page 11 of 15 Official spaces beyond the existing situation). The submitted application has been supported by an onstreet parking survey which identifies that the existing highway network could accommodate the proposed overspill parking of 2 parking spaces. The bulk of this is given over to the previous parking survey results under 19/1759/FUL, which demonstrated a parking stress of 82%, with the potential additional parking stress from the development increasing this to 83.80% The addition of another unit increases this to 84.27% which is still within the Council's threshold of 85% specified in the SPD guidelines. It is therefore considered that the shortfall of 2no. off-street parking spaces could be sufficiently accommodated on-street, and the addition of one further flat compared to the previous extant permission (19/1759/FUL) would not exacerbate this. Given the findings of the

on-street- parking survey, the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy LP45 and has been demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact on the area in terms of street scene or on-street parking.

In my opinion the development of these 2 flats into 6 seems some what excessive and a severe over development of a road that mainly consists of family housing. Trying to fit 6 possible couples/ small families into such a small building would make this one building significantly over developed and put undue pressure on parking and neighbourly relations.

The proposals will optimise the use of the site and is consistent in delivering on Policy H2 in the London Plan which states that smaller sites 'must make a substantially greater contribution to new supply across the city. Therefore, increasing the rate of housing delivery from small housing sites is a strategic priority.' The proposal optimises capacity in a design lead approach (meeting Policy D3) with a high quality design that is respectful and positive. In summary, the proposal delivers new residential dwellings in an appropriate and accessible location and is compliant with planning policy.