

Application reference: 21/3022/HOT SOUTH RICHMOND WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
25.08.2021	27.08.2021	22.10.2021	22.10.2021

Site:

35 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DQ,

Proposal:

Rear dormer roof extension and single storey side/rear extension. Rooflights on front and rear roof slopes.

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

APPLICANT NAME

BAGHAEI
35, Princes Road
Richmond
TW10 6DQ

AGENT NAME

Mr alistair ewen
23 FIELDWAY
Lindfield
LINDFIELD
RH162DD
United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on and posted on 03.09.2021 and due to expire on 24.09.2021

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee
14D Urban D

Expiry Date
10.09.2021

Neighbours:

24 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DH, - 27.09.2021
22 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DH, - 27.09.2021
37 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DQ, - 27.09.2021
33 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DQ, - 27.09.2021
17 Beatrice Road, Richmond, TW10 6DT, - 27.09.2021

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:69/1669
Date:12/11/1969 Erection of a first floor flat roofed extension at the rear to provide one bedroom; insertion of new bay window on front elevation and extension of the roof of the bay to form a porch.

Development Management

Status: REF Application:21/0476/HOT
Date:18/05/2021 Rear dormer roof extension and rooflight to front roof slope.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:21/3022/HOT
Date: Rear dormer roof extension and single storey side/rear extension. Rooflights on front and rear roof slopes.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 28.07.2014 Two storey rear extension and underpinning of existing rear party wall
Reference: 14/1741/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 15.07.2015 Install replacement windows in a dwelling
Reference: 16/FEN00647/FENSA

Enforcement

Opened Date: 19.08.2014 Enforcement Enquiry
Reference: 14/0436/EN/UBW

Application Number	21/3022/HOT
Address	35 Princes Road Richmond TW10 6DQ
Proposal	Rear dormer roof extension and single storey side/rear extension. Rooflights on front and rear roof slopes.
Contact Officer	Ella Milton
Target Determination Date	22/10/2021

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 west side of Princes Road within a row of four terraced dwellings. The rear of the property faces Albert Road.

The application site is situated within Character Area 11 of the Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance and is designated as:

- Article 4 Direction – restricting basement development
- Building of Townscape Merit
- Conservation Area – CA30 St Matthias Richmond
- Critical drainage area – Environment Agency
- Main centre buffer zone – Richmond town centre
- Throughflow catchment area – throughflow and groundwater policy zone.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

This application seeks to construct a rear dormer roof extension and single storey side/rear extension, and install rooflights on front and rear roof slopes.

Relevant planning history for the site includes:

- **69/1669** - Erection of a first floor flat roofed extension at the rear to provide one bedroom; insertion of new bay window on front elevation and extension of the roof of the bay to form a porch. **Granted.**
- **21/0476/HOT** - Rear dormer roof extension and rooflight to front roof slope. **Refused**

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No representations were received.

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

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

Policy D4 – Delivering good design
 Policy HC1 – Heritage Conservation and growth
 Policy D12 - Fire Safety
 Policy SI12 – Flood risk management
 Policy SI13 – Sustainable Drainage

These policies can be found at: 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	Yes	No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	Yes	No
Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets	LP4	Yes	No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
Impact on Flood Risk	LP21	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

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
 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:
 St Matthias Richmond (CA30) 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 Flood Risk
- iv Fire Safety

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 subject site consists of a two-storey terraced property, located in an area characterised by tight-knit rows of Victorian terrace houses, all recognised as Building of Townscape Merit and commonly known as 'The Alberts'. The site forms part of 4 terrace group with no alterations at roof level. The Conservation Area recognises the loss of tradition features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations, whereas preservation and enhancement of architectural quality and unity is recognised as an opportunity.

Dormer extension and rooflights:

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations states the following in regard to roof extensions:

- *Hip to gable extensions are not desirable and will not be encouraged.*
- *Avoid roof extension in the front of the house, where not in character of the street*
- *Keep roof-extensions 'in scale' with the existing house*
- *Dormer windows and other roof extension must not project about the ridgeline*
- *Roof extension should not dominate the roof*
- *Dormer windows should be smaller than that of windows of the floor below*
- *Keep existing profiles*
- *Ensure sensitivity to existing character*
- *Match or use complimentary materials*
- *Excessive use of rooflights can appear visually disruptive.*

The application proposes to construct a dormer on the rear roof slope. The proposed dormer has been designed to be of the same dimensions as the approved dormer at 19 Princes Road (17/3374/HOT). The proposed windows are painted timber sash windows, which are considered to harmonise well with the existing dwelling. An annotation indicates that the external walls are to match the exterior of the existing property and roof. However, noting the limited details provided of this, a condition has been attached to the decision notice requiring the dormer cheeks to be lead-clad. The dormer falls well within the existing roof height and roof frame. Therefore, the original roof form can still be appreciated, and the dormer is not overbearing.

Whilst rear dormer roof extensions do not form a predominant character of the area, there are some other examples of dormer roof extensions across the rear elevations of the properties along Princes Road and

surrounding streets. For example, at 57 (20/1394/HOT) and 59 Princes Road (19/1561/HOT) and 19 Hyde Road (13/1412/HOT) to the North-West. Therefore, the modest proposal would not result in an incongruous addition to the host BTM or the wider conservation area.

As such, no objections are raised regarding the dormer's visual amenity.

Rooflights

Two new rooflights are proposed on the front elevation, and one rooflight is proposed on the rear roof beside the dormer. The addition of rooflights can be found to a number of dwellings within the locality. The proposed rooflights are appropriately located, and of an acceptable scale. As annotated on the elevations, all rooflights will be flush to the roof and of conservation style, demonstrating a central glazing bar. A condition has been included on the decision to ensure this.

Rear Extension:

With regard to extensions, the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD states:

- *The overall shape, size and position of side and rear 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 should be made to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure, so that the original form can still be appreciated. The ridge of the extension should be set lower to that on the main house.*
- *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 application also seeks planning permission for a rear-side extension along the side return of the property. The new extension would be white render to match the existing property and extension. The plans indicate the design of the roof would be pitched with three conservational style rooflights. Large sliding timber frame doors are proposed on the rear face of the extension and the existing outrigger.

Overall, the extension is considered to remain subservient to the main dwelling, as it sits below the sill of the first-floor rear windows. The fenestration design is considered acceptable as it retains verticality and a satisfactory window hierarchy. Single storey rear extensions are a prevalent feature along Princes Road, and, as such, the extension would not appear out of character in the locality.

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

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.

Dormer

Due to the location of the proposed dormer across the roof of the host property it is not considered that the high vantage point would lead to an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing to the neighbouring dwellings on Princes Road. The high vantage point and set back within the roof profile would also mitigate any potential significant loss of daylight or sunlight to the habitable rooms of neighbouring properties. In addition to this, the proposed dormer raises no significant issue of privacy due to the sufficient distance between the dormer windows and the adjoining properties.

As such, having regard to its siting, design and scale it is considered that the proposed dormer would not impact the amenity of the neighbouring properties, and no objections are raised in this regard.

Rooflights

The proposed rooflights across the principal and rear elevations raise no significant issues in terms of privacy due to the fact they are above head height and face skywards.

Side/Rear Extension

The proposal is situated along the Southern side return of the property and therefore is not expected to have any impact upon Number 33 to the North.

With regards to No 37, this property currently benefits from a ground-floor rear extension, and the proposed extension at No.35 will not protrude more than 3m beyond the rear elevation of this. Therefore, it is found to be compliant with the council's SPD on 'House Extensions and External Alterations'. It is considered that the subject extension will not result in overbearing, loss of light, visual intrusion or create a sense of enclosure to this property.

Given distance and siting, and that the extension is at ground floor level, the properties to the rear are not considered to be materially harmed by 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 property, and therefore is in line with Policy LP8 of the Local Plan and relevant SPD's.

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.

The site is also located within the Throughflow and Groundwater policy zone. However, there is no change to internal floor levels and the use remains residential. The scheme can be considered consistent with LP21.

The scheme can be considered consistent with LP21.

Issue iv – Fire Safety

London Plan policy D12 requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all planning applications. The Fire Safety Statement should be presented as a standalone document with a clear structure that addresses the criteria set out in London Plan Policy D12 part A.

The submitted drawings should address the requirements set out at paragraphs 3.12.3 and 3.12.4 of the London Plan. Where the applicant considers parts of or the whole policy do not apply, this should be justified in a Reasonable Exception Statement (RES).

A Planning Fire Safety Strategy was prepared and submitted to the Council on 25 August 2021.

The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. This permission is not a consent under the Building Regulations for which a separate application should be made.

A condition will be included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with this Policy D12 of the London Plan.

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

Approve, subject to conditions.

Approve 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): ...EMI.....

Dated:19/10/2021.....

I agree the recommendation:

Senior Planner

Dated: VAA 19.10.21