

Application reference: 21/4229/HOT
HAM, PETERSHAM, RICHMOND RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
10.12.2021	13.12.2021	07.02.2022	07.02.2022

Site:

3 Ashfield Close, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AF

Proposal:

Removal of double garage and installation of a two storey front extension with single garage. Removal of flat roof to existing extension and replacement with pitched roof. Render to all elevations.

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

APPLICANT NAME

P Bell
3 Ashfield Close
Petersham
Richmond
TW10 7AF

AGENT NAME

Philip White
14 Eve Road
Isleworth
TW7 7HS

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee
LBRUT Transport

Expiry Date
27.12.2021

Neighbours:

6 Ashfield Close, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AF, - 13.12.2021
7 Ashfield Close, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AF, - 13.12.2021
Bute Cottage, 7 Meadow Close, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AJ, - 13.12.2021
8 Ashfield Close, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AF, - 13.12.2021
Brae Cottage, Bute Avenue, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AX, - 13.12.2021
5 Ashfield Close, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AF, - 13.12.2021
1 Ashfield Close, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AF, - 13.12.2021
16 Cedar Heights, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AE, - 13.12.2021

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 68/0166
Date: 28/03/1968 Erection of garage to existing house.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application: 71/0359
Date: 20/04/1971 Erection of first floor extension to rear to provide additional bedroom.

Development Management

Status: REF Application: 21/1812/FUL
Date: 06/10/2021 Two-storey replacement dwelling.

Development Management

Status: PDE Application: 21/4229/HOT
Date: Removal of double garage and installation of a two storey extension with single garage. Removal of flat roof to existing extension and replacement with pitched roof.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 06.12.2006 17 Windows 4 Doors

Reference: 07/07430/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 29.05.2009 Cavity wall insulation

Reference: 09/0126/CWALL

Building Control

Deposit Date: 30.05.2013 Replacement consumer unit

Reference: 13/NIC01510/NICEIC

Application Number	21/4229/HOT
Address	3 Ashfield Close, Petersham, Richmond, TW10 7AF
Proposal	Removal of double garage and installation of a two storey front extension with single garage. Removal of flat roof to existing extension and replacement with pitched roof. Render to all elevations.
Contact Officer	Kerry McLaughlin
Target Determination Date	07/02/2022

1. INTRODUCTION

This application is of a nature where the Council's Constitution delegates the authority to make the decision to Officers rather than it being determined by the Planning Committee.

Before preparing this summary report the planning officer has considered any relevant previous planning applications in relation to the development and considered any comments made by those interested in the application such as consultees with specialist knowledge and nearby residents.

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant Local Plan Policies, the planning officer is taking into account the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, any comments received in connection with the application and any other case specific considerations which are material to the decision.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The proposal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling, located on the southern side of Ashfield Close.

The application site is subject to the following planning constraints:

Archaeological Priority (English Heritage)	Site: Petersham - Early Medieval settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency	Petersham [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_005 /
Floodzone 2	Fluvial Models
Protected View (Indicative Zone)	N_View_004 View from near Ham House to Orleans House
Protected View (Indicative Zone)	N_View_005 View to Marble Hill House (north)
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Zone 2 Medium Probability	
Village	Ham and Petersham Village
Ward	Ham, Petersham and Richmond Riverside Ward

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

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

Ref	Proposal	Decision
21/1812/FUL	Two-storey replacement dwelling.	Refused Permission

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

1 letter of observation has been received. This comment is summarised as follows:

- Support proposal, however, the north-east elevation should remain as the existing brick finish and should not be smooth rendered, which would make the building much more obtrusive.

The rendering as shown on the submitted drawings is discussed in 'Other Matters' of section 7 below.

5. AMENDMENTS

None.

6. 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:

- Policy D4 - Delivering Good Design
- Policy D12 - Fire Safety
- Policy S112 - Flood Risk Management

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

Richmond Local Plan (2018)

The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated Local Plan policies are:

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1	Yes	No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	No
Impact on Highways and Transport	LP45	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

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

Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan (2019)

These policies can be found at

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

Supplementary Planning Documents

These policies can be found at:

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

7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

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

Issue i - Design/Visual Amenity

Policy LP1 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area. Proposals should demonstrate an understanding of the site and its context when considering the design including layout, siting and access and the compatibility of the works to the neighbouring uses.

The Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. It should harmonise with the original appearance, either by integrating with the house or being made to appear as an obvious addition.

The councils 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) SPD advises that extensions should be designed to appear an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure, so that the original form can still be appreciated. In such circumstances, the ridge of the extension should be set lower than that of the main house. Further, two-storey side extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building, to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the buildings original scale and character. The SPD further advises it is desirable to set back two-storey side extensions by at least 1m behind the front elevation.

Ashfield Close is characterised by spacious two-storey family dwelling houses, however there is no overriding characteristic to the design or materials of the dwellings within the locality, with all nearby dwellings featuring their own form style.

The proposal forms a cluster of properties around the cul-de-sac which are all sited sufficient distance from the front to retain a spacious appearance.

The proposed two-storey front extension is excessive and when compared to the existing, it appears as a dominant, congested and cramped form of development which is at odds with the existing simple and modest form of the dwelling. Further, it would unbalance the set back evident to this part of the close.

The proposed two-storey front extension does not comply with the relevant SPD guidelines. It would not be set back from the front elevation, but instead add significant bulk, extending a max. depth of 4.86m from the original front elevation, further, it would also cover the entire width of this elevation, far exceeding half the width of the original dwellinghouse. The overall result would be an extension which, by virtue of its combined excessive width, depth, lack of subordination from the front, overall bulk and siting, would result in a visually dominant form of overdevelopment which fails to appear as a proportionate and subordinate addition to the main dwelling, and would greatly disrupt the principal elevation, losing the original design and proportions of the building. In turn, causing harm to the character and appearance of the visual amenities of the locality.

Context with the adjoining properties has not been shown within the submission in terms of scale. However, concerns are raised that the scheme would result in an unnecessarily congested and cramped form of overdevelopment on the plot. As existing the overall siting, layout and design of the properties in Ashfield Close reflect its suburban character and collectively the properties contribute positively to the character of the area, providing clear visual gaps between buildings through to landscape beyond. The scheme as proposed with its combined two storey height and forward projection would result in loss of spacious front garden to the detriment of the open nature of the plot.

The proposed development, by reason of its combined siting, design and proportions would result in an unsympathetic, cramped and congested form of overdevelopment, eroding the overall open nature of the locality, harming the character and appearance of Ashfield Close. The scheme is therefore contrary to, in particular, the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) as well as the Supplementary Planning Documents 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015).

Notwithstanding the above, no objections are raised to the replacement single-storey garage or replacement roof of the two-storey rear extension, which are considered to be in keeping, subordinate and proportionate to the original dwellinghouse.

Proposed materials are discussed under 'Other Matters' below.

Issue ii - Neighbour Amenity

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

The property would remain solely in residential use as a result of the proposal. An undue increase in noise or pollution would not occur as a result of the proposal.

All proposed works are sited a sufficient distance from No.5 Ashfield Close so as not to be overbearing or result in loss of sunlight.

Given siting and nature the replacement roof of the two-storey rear extension will have a neutral impact on neighbouring amenities.

1 Ashfield Close

Two-Storey Front Extension

It is noted No.1 currently benefits from 1x ground flank facing window towards the development site. As this window is not a sole window serving a habitable room any impact as a result of the two-storey front extension will be limited.

Single-Storey Side Extension

With regard to the rear elevation of No.1. The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 4m in depth for a detached property will be acceptable. Where the proposed extension seeks a larger depth, the eaves should be reduced to 2.2m at the shared boundary to mitigate detrimental impact on neighbours such as sense of enclosure or overbearing. However, the final test of acceptability is dependent on the specific circumstances of the site which may justify greater rear projection.

The scheme proposes a replacement single-storey garage extension adjacent to the shared boundary line. The proposed garage would project no more than 4m beyond the rear elevation of No.1, this is considered an acceptable projection which would satisfy the guidelines set out in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD.

The scheme is in compliance with the 45-degree test from the Building Research Establishment (BRE) standards against the adjacent fenestration on the ground floor rear elevation of No.1, this confirms the scheme will not result in any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms or gardens in any neighbouring properties.

It is considered that the proposed single-storey side extension will not result in overbearing, loss of light, visual intrusion or create a sense of enclosure to this property.

Notwithstanding the above, the proposal is considered to be visually obtrusive to nearby occupant.

The proposed scheme is therefore not considered acceptable in terms of neighbour amenity. Whilst the proposal may not impact on the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers however, it would appear visually obtrusive and therefore, is not in line with policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018) and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance.

Issue iii - Flood Risk

Policy LP 21 of the Local Plan states 'All developments should avoid or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.'

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been provided as part of this application to comply with the requirements of LP21, which demonstrates the works comply with the Environment Agency's standing advice on minor developments in flood risk zone 2.

Issue iv - Transport

Policy LP 45 of the Local Plan states 'The Council will require new development to make provision for the

accommodation of vehicles in order to provide for the needs of the development while minimising the impact of car based travel including on the operation of the road network and the local environment, and ensuring making the best use of the land.'

The ground floor layout proposals show the loss of a single parking space with the other space being in the garage. The site has a PTAL score of 2, and given the number of bedrooms, this is acceptable.

Other Matters

Fire Safety

The applicant has submitted the following documentation as required under Policy D12 Of the London Plan (2021):

- 'Planning Fire Safety Strategy' confirming compliance with the following requirements:
 - 1) *identify suitably positioned unobstructed outside space: a) for fire appliances to be positioned on b) appropriate for use as an evacuation assembly point*
 - 2) *are designed to incorporate appropriate features which reduce the risk to life and the risk of serious injury in the event of a fire; including appropriate fire alarm systems and passive and active fire safety measures*
 - 3) *are constructed in an appropriate way to minimise the risk of fire spread*
 - 4) *provide suitable and convenient means of escape, and associated evacuation strategy for all building users*
 - 5) *develop a robust strategy for evacuation which can be periodically updated and published, and which all building users can have confidence in*
 - 6) *provide suitable access and equipment for firefighting which is appropriate for the size and use of the development.*

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.

Other Works

It is noted the proposed drawings are showing works above that stated within the description of proposal, i.e., Replacement roof slates. Rendering of façade of house. Replacement boundary fence. Replacement fenestration, with aluminium framed factory finished anthracite throughout.

Planning permission is required for the rendering of this dwelling, planning permission may also be required for the replacement roof slates and replacement fenestration depending on colour/finish.

These works have not been assessed as part of this application due to the omission from the description of proposal. Had the scheme have been found acceptable in all other matters council would have sought amendments to either the description of proposal or proposed drawings to reflect one another.

8. LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker. The Mayor of London's CIL and Richmond CIL are therefore material considerations.

On initial assessment this development is not considered liable for the Mayoral or Richmond CIL however this is subject to confirmation by the CIL Administration Team.

9. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons

Reason for Refusal - Design

The proposed two-storey front extension by reason of its excessive depth, height, scale, bulk, form and inappropriate design, would represent an unsympathetic, visually intrusive and dominant form of overdevelopment that would harm the character and appearance of the host property, eroding the overall open character of the application site and thus harming the character and appearance of Ashfield Close and the visual amenities of the locality. The scheme is therefore contrary to, in particular, policies LP1 and LP8 of the Local Plan (2018) as well as the Supplementary Planning Documents 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015).

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - **YES** / NO

I therefore recommend the following:

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

This application is CIL liable YES* NO
(*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement YES* NO
(*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online (which are not on the file) YES NO

This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): KM

Dated: 20.01.2022

I agree the recommendation:

Principal Planner

Dated:WWC.....20/1/22.....

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

U0057693	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42
U0057694	Decision Drawing Numbers