

Application reference: 06/3890/FUL
SOUTH TWICKENHAM WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
10.11.2006	18.12.2006	19.03.2007	12.02.2007

Site:

37 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 6SN

Proposal:

Part Demolition And Part Refurbishment Of The Site To Provide 31 No. Residential Units, 1 No.B1 Work/Live Unit And 32 Car parking Spaces.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Hamilton Lofts LTD
20 Mortlake High Street
London
SW14 8JN

AGENT NAME

A Canthus LW
Voysey House
Barley Mow Passage
London
W4 4PN

DC Site Notice: printed on 03.01.2007

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee	Expiry Date
Environment Agency	24.01.2007
LBRUT Non-Commercial Environmental Health	17.01.2007
LBRUT Trees Preservation Officer	17.01.2007
LBRUT Environment Policy And Design	17.01.2007
LBRUT Urban Design	24.01.2007
LBRUT Transport	17.01.2007
Thames Water Development Control Department	24.01.2007
Network Rail (Southeast)	24.01.2007
LBRUT Environmental Operational	17.01.2007
Teddington Police Station	24.01.2007
LBRUT Trees Preservation Officer	17.01.2007

Neighbours:

31 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 33 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 35 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 37 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 39 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 41 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 43 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 45 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 47 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 51 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 49 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 53 Talbot Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SJ, - 03.01.2007
 30 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
 31 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
 32 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
 33 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
 35 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007

34 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
36 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
27 Warwick Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SW, - 03.01.2007
28 Warwick Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SW, - 03.01.2007
29 Warwick Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SW, - 03.01.2007
38 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
39 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
40 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
41 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
43 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
42 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
Twickenham Electricity Sub Station, Warwick Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 - 03.01.2007
37A Hamilton Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 6SN, - 03.01.2007
Twickenham Rifle Club, Marsh Farm Road, Twickenham, Richmond Upon Thames, TW2 7SY, - 03.01.2007
EDF Ltd, C/o 51 Degrees, 49 Southwark Bridge Road, Southwark, London, SE1 9HH - 03.01.2007
Mrs M. Lacey, 29 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Catherine Cooper, 49 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Gillian Lawson, 18 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Simon James, 28 Norcutt Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SR - 03.01.2007
Alison Kennedy, 18 Warwick Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SW - 03.01.2007
Stuart Storey, 17 Warwick Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SW - 03.01.2007
Peter Lineham, 51 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Gillian Lawson, 18 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Mr B. Hall, 58 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Mrs Johns, 57 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Nicki Hoare, 55 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Julie Walker, 54 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Janet Sinclair, 51 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Brian Ainge, 62 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Carol Barnshaw, 49 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Euan MacDonald, 53 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
M Hollin, 15 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Cameron Lawrence, 31 Warwick Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SW - 03.01.2007
The Beckmann Family, 52 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Reinhard Weiss, 3 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Peter And Nadia Swann, 6 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Mrs CP Price, 38 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Neil Hamilton, 1 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Aristodemos Strouthos, 11 Marsh Farm Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SH - 03.01.2007
Margaret And Ian Hampton, 'Holm Oak', 32A Wensleydale Road, Hampton, TW12 2LW - 03.01.2007
Fiona Leech, 51 Warwick Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SW - 03.01.2007
Jamie Mackay, 1 Lion Avenue, Twickenham, TW1 4JG - 03.01.2007
Marilyn Cowking, 45 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Jane Taylor, 15 Marsh Farm Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SH - 03.01.2007
Patrick Randell, 24 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Miss Lynne Feaver, 23 Warwick Road, Twickenham, Middx TW2 6SW - 03.01.2007
Louise Misso, 21 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Gareth And Elizabeth Hughes, 13 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Kate Holdsworth, 50 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Demos Strouthos, Jane Taylor, 15 Marsh Farm Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SH - 03.01.2007
Ruth Thomson, 48 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
M Shepherd, 13 Warwick Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SW - 03.01.2007
Amanda Morrison, 8 Albert Road, Twickenham, TW1 4HU - 03.01.2007
Elaine O'Hara, Rachel Middleton And Elaine Hodgson, 25 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Miss Eugenie H. Chaplin, 16 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Tom Meldon, 44 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Rick Meldon, 30 Warwick Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SW - 03.01.2007
Mr B. Chin, 6 Marsh Farm Road, Twickenham, TW2 - 03.01.2007
Sabine Grocholski, 6 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Pandie Bronsdon, 46 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Delyth Hughes, 21 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
W. V. Driver, 7 Albert Road, Twickenham, TW1 4HU - 03.01.2007
Mrs Mary Rouse, 10 Astral Row, Helmdon Road, Greatworth, Banbury Oxon, OX17 2DL - 03.01.2007
C. Hazel, 5 Hamilton Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
Mr J. Maiden, 31 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
Mark Evans, 17 Talbot Road, Twickenham, TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007

Nick Wilcox And Marie Banks,25 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Michael Sinclair ,26 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Andrew Northover,8 Clive Road,Portsmouth,PO1 5JE - 03.01.2007
 Richard McWilliam And Clare Grenham,26 Hamilton Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
 Aubrey Thomas,42 Warwick Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SW - 03.01.2007
 Mr CC Pilgrim,27 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Mrs M. Baker,18 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Laura Giuffrida,1 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Neil Bennett And Joyce Reynard,47 Edwin Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SP - 03.01.2007
 Elizabeth Miller,8a Marsh Farm Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SH - 03.01.2007
 Carla James,2 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Pandie Bronsdon,46 Hamilton Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
 John Wilkinson,232 Staines Road,Twickenham,TW2 5AR - 03.01.2007
 Gerhard Schellberg,4 Kilmorey Gardens,Twickenham,TW1 1PY - 03.01.2007
 Kirsten Marley,23 Hamilton Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
 Mr And Mrs D Price,38 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Andrew And Caroline Clarke,64 Hamilton Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SN - 03.01.2007
 Mr And Mrs Chowings,34 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Ian And Jane Burbage,10A Marsh Farm Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SH - 03.01.2007
 Mr JC Taylor,16 Talbot Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SJ - 03.01.2007
 Nicola McWilliam,42 Turner Close,Basingstoke - 03.01.2007
 Catherine And James Reed,23 Marsh Farm Road,Twickenham,TW2 6SH - 03.01.2007

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
02/2983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erection Of A Two Storey Dwelling House At The End Of The Terrace. 	GTD	26/11/2002
03/0288	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erection Of A Dwelling House At End Of Terrace (amendment To Planning Permission 02/2983/ful). 	GTD	21/03/2003
05/3089/FUL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Redevelopment Of The Site To Provide 29 No. Residential Units, 6 No. Work/Live Units And 34 Car parking Spaces. 	REF	16/03/2006
06/0548/CAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demolition Of Two Main Buildings On Site And Maintain The Third Remaining Building. 	WDN	22/05/2006
06/3890/FUL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part Demolition And Part Refurbishment Of The Site To Provide 31 No. Residential Units, 1 No.B1 Work/Live Unit And 32 Car parking Spaces. 	PCO	

Constraints:

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

Case Officer (Initials):

Dated:

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/~~Development Control Manager~~

Dated: 19/03/07

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Development Control Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Development Control Manager:

Dated: 19/03/07

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:	

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:

Notes of Telephone calls/discussions/meetings

DATE

ACTION

05/3890
37 Hamilton Road
Twickenham

Proposal

Redevelopment Of The Site To Provide 31 No. Residential Units, and conversion of Building 1 to provide 184sqm of B1 office space and 32 car parking spaces

Main Development Plan Policies

UDP - First Review: STG 3, STG 5, STG 6, IMP 1, IMP 2, IMP 3, ENV 1, ENV 4, ENV 5, ENV 7, ENV 20, ENV 37, BLT 2, BLT 3, BLT 4, BLT 5, BLT 11, BLT 12, BLT 14, BLT 15, BLT 16, BLT 17, BLT 27, HSG 1, HSG 5, HSG 6, HSG 7, HSG 8, HSG 11, HSG 12, HSG 18 TRN 1, TRN 2, TRN 4, EMP 4, EMP 6, CCE 8, CCE 24, Planning Policy Guidance 15

Site

The application site is prominently located at the head of Hamilton Road cul-de-sac. The road is characterised by relatively small two-storey Victorian terraced properties. Access to the site can only be obtained via Hamilton Road which is relatively narrow and further restricted in width by the parking on both sides of the road. To the north lies the railway, which is designated as a Green Corridor within the Unitary Development Plan, with an expanse of playing field beyond, which is designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Adjoining the site to the east lie the modest rear gardens of the residential properties on Talbot Road and to the west is an electricity sub-station. Important views of the site which is within a designated Conservation Area are northwards along Hamilton Road, eastwards from the properties in Talbot Road, the view from the railway line and the MOL beyond and also from the footbridge across the railway.

The site was originally developed in 1901 as a power station and contains 3 main buildings, 2 to 3 storeys in height, and some outbuildings, which have been used for storage and small workshops (B1). A new substation was constructed in the 1960's in western part of the site and at that time the Victorian buildings became redundant for their original purpose. The 3 main buildings are attractive with careful brick detailing and have been designated Buildings of Townscape Merit. The area was designated a Conservation Area on the 16th January 2006. The exterior façade of the 3 BTM's contribute positively to the Conservation Area which is otherwise characterised by small-scale terraced housing.

Since the electricity generating company vacated the site it has primarily been used for relatively low-grade general industrial and storage uses.

Proposal

The proposal is for the redevelopment of the site to form 31 No. Residential Units, and one B1 unit (184sq m) and 32 Car parking Spaces. This would involve the retention of Building 1 (the centrally located BTM at the front of the site) and its conversion to B1 use. The erection of a new building to replace Building 2 including rebuilding and retaining the general character and form of the front facade (adjacent and to the west of Building 1) to accommodate 11 units of residential accommodation. Residential accommodation would also be provided in 6-7 two storey 'mews' style units along the east (Talbot Road) frontage. The remaining 13 units of accommodation would be provided in a 3-4-storey building in place of the Building 3 (the large building to the rear of the site) adjacent to the railway, MOL and

substation to the west. The overall height of the rear building is 12.5m above ground floor level, which is approximately 1m higher than the ridge of the existing rear building (precise comparison is not available on the submitted plans, as the existing ground level is not clearly shown)

The house types as originally submitted were proposed to be split into 10 one-bed flats (4 Shared ownership) and 21 two-bed flats (7 Shared ownership). 5 units are suitable as Disabled units. The application was revised on 15th March to provide 3 social rented one-bed units, 5 shared ownership one-bed units, and 4 social rented 2 bed units. No revised floor plan has been submitted and it has been assumed that the total proportion of 1 bed and 2 bed units is unchanged. Parking provision is for 32 cars, 23 of the spaces are located in under ground parking under the main 3-4-storey block. In addition there is some space for operational parking. A turning head would be located to the front of the site.

In terms of design the main alteration to Building 1 would be the addition of dormer window to each side of the main ridge. Otherwise this building would be primarily unaltered other than through the refurbishment required for its conversion to B1 use. The main styling, material and form of the existing front elevation of the existing Building 2 would be reconstructed as the front face of a 'replacement' Building 2 and this would be used as residential accommodation. This will include a reconfiguration of the main front elevations including increasing the floor to ceiling heights and introducing balconies on the front elevation.

Building 3 will be demolished and replaced by a 4 storey building in an L shaped configuration. The main element of this building will be located parallel with the railway with an inset providing the principal access (lift and stairs) and a further four storey section along the west (sub station) boundary. The design of this would be contemporary in form with 3 storeys clad in buff stock brick and the fourth storey finished with zinc panels. The extensive areas of glazing would be finished in grey aluminium. 9 units would have balconies on the north (railway) elevation. Decked walkways provide external access to the rear of the main block. Extensive areas of solar panels would be provided on the flat roof of this new building

The last element of the application is the construction of 2 two-storey blocks of accommodation along the eastern boundary of the site. The southeast block would provide 4 houses, and have an asymmetrical roof form covered in slate to the rear and an extensive living green roof. The northeast two-storey block is linked to the larger rear building and would provide three flats. These would also have an extensive green roof.

A Sustainable construction checklist has accompanied the application and the development achieves an excellent rating.

History

A previous application (05/3089/ful) on the site to provide 29 residential units, 6 Work/Live Units and 34 Car parking spaces was refused on 16 March 2006 for the following reasons:

1 - Scale of Development

The proposal, by reason of its scale, height, bulk and design represents overdevelopment of the site and would neither enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation, thus would be an obtrusive form of development detrimental to the visual amenities of the Conservation Area and Metropolitan Open Land. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies STG2, ENV1,

BLT2, BLT4 and IMP3 of the Richmond Upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005.

2 - Overbearing and Unneighbourly Development

The proposal, by reason of its height and the siting of windows, would be an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development which would be detrimental to the privacy and amenities of the occupiers of the residential properties on Talbot Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies BLT11, BLT16, HSG4 and HSG11 of the Richmond Upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005.

3 - Demolition of Buildings of Townscape Merit

In the absence of a suitable justification and replacement for the demolition of the Buildings of Townscape Merit proposal, the proposal to demolish would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Building of Townscape Merit in particular and Hamilton Road Conservation Area in general and would not seek the to conserve energy and resources, thereby contrary to policies STG2, STG 3, IMP 1, BLT2 and BLT4 of the Unitary Development Plan: 2004 First Review

4 - Loss of employment land

The proposal would result in a significant reduction in the amount of employment floor space within the site, which would reduce employment opportunities in the locality contrary to the aims of the Councils employment policies. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy EMP 4 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005 and 3B.1 of the London Plan.

5 - Affordable Housing

The proposed level of affordable housing does not meet the criteria set out under Policy EMP 4 were the site to be found no longer suitable for employment use and would therefore be contrary to policy EMP 4 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005 and 3A.8 of the London Plan.

6 - Education

By reason, of the development being likely to generate the need for additional primary and secondary school places, the sites location within Area 3 "West and South Twickenham" which has a projected shortage of school places, and the absence of an appropriate undertaking to provide a financial contribution towards education, the scheme would place unreasonable demand on existing education facilities. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies IMP3, HSG18 and CCE8 of the adopted Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan: First Review 2005.

7 - Other Planning Obligation

Without a binding obligation to provide an appropriate contribution towards health, public realm and open space, playing pitches and transport facilities within the borough, the proposal would be contrary to policies IMP3 of the adopted Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan: First Review 2005

8 - Lack of Flood Risk Assessment

The applicant has not provided a Flood Risk Assessment in accordance with PPG 25, therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies ENV 37 of the adopted Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan: First Review 2005.

9 - Contaminated Land

The applicant has failed to provide a detailed intrusive land contamination investigation study to ascertain if soil clearance of the site is required, therefore the

proposal would be contrary to policies ENV7 and BLT 31 of the adopted Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan: First Review 2005.

10 - Disabled Housing

The proposed doorways, in the wheelchair units and the doorways between the lifts and entrances to the flats, are shown at less than the minimum 850mm clear opening required and is therefore contrary to policies HSG 8 of the Richmond Upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005.

11 - Parking and Traffic Management

The proposed development, through the provision of inadequate vehicular and cycle parking facilities, lack of traffic management system, and poor visibility would interfere with the free flow of traffic which would result in detriment to users of the site and Hamilton Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies TRN2, TRN4 and HSG11 of the Richmond Upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005.

The associated Conservation Area Consent application for the proposed demolition works was withdrawn on 22 May 2006

Public and Other Representations

Environment Agency A flood risk assessment submitted for the previous application 05/3089/FUL demonstrated that this site is not at risk of flooding and this is relevant for the current application. However, measures should be taken to prevent pollution to controlled waters and conditions must be imposed on any permission granted.

Network Rail Construction works must not endanger the safe operation of the railway, or stability of Network Rail structures. Conditions are necessary to ensure that secure fencing is provided, all buildings and structures set back from the boundary. A method statement must be agreed for any excavations within 10m of the operational railway. Landscaping would also need to be agreed with Network Rail. Potential for noise and vibration impact needs to be resolved.

Thames Water – Public sewers cross the site and no buildings works will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without Thames Water's approval.

Richmond Design Panel The development of this site has been presented to the Design panel on two occasions. The first was concerned with the previous (refused) application but still has some relevance to this application. Comments made included the following:

- No convincing case has been made for the demolition of BTM's
- No attempt has been made to attempt a scheme involving a conversion of the buildings
- The new elements will dominate over the remaining BTM and there are concerns regarding the overall massing and height with respect to the impact upon the BTM and area.
- Concerns over density proposed for site and constraints of site (BTM's, height of adjoining development etc)

The Design panel considered (at pre application stage) a scheme that is in many respects the same as that which has now been submitted and came to the following conclusions.

- The general approach to the development of the site was considered to be the correct one, giving the existing constraints of the site.
- The retention and rebuilding of the façade of building 2 was considered to be acceptable and pragmatic.
- There was concern from a minority of the panel regarding the following two aspects of the proposal: a. the large scale and height of the new build block of flats; and b. the impact of the new build live/work units on the eastern edge of the site and their relationship with the historic buildings.

Recycling Officer Space/provision needs to be provided for two bin stores for paper, cans and glass recycling (5 x 625mm x 860mm)

Ecology – A bat survey has been submitted with the applications and has found no evidence of bats. It recommends that ideally provision should be made in the development for bat boxes. Also that contractors should be aware of the legal requirements in connection with any statutory protected species.

Public and other representations

64 Letters of objection have been received from neighbouring property, including the three ward members and the MP. These have raised concerns about traffic, design and density and impact on adjacent property. More particularly, the following points have been raised.

HERITAGE AND DESIGN

The existing buildings are an important part of local heritage/history
 Development should complement existing (Victorian) building style
 Out of scale with primarily small-scale Victorian streets.
 Not acceptable to demolish any of the BTM's (Keep building 3)
 Will make a mockery of the Conservation Area status and will reduce quality.
 Skyline will be dominated by mass of the new building
 View from Metropolitan Open Land will be dominated by bulk of rear building.
 The arches folly is hideous/inappropriate
 Little improvement/change from previous refused scheme.
 New building is too bulky and blocky particularly at roof level.

DENSITY

Density of development is too high for the area and out of character
 Increase of 50% of properties accessed through narrow Hamilton Road
 Typical character of area housing with gardens not apartments
 Overdevelopment of site
 High density will lead to significantly increased levels of activity, noise, lighting and visual intrusion much of which is at high level and will affect bedrooms of existing property.
 Number of units has only reduced in scale from refused scheme by 4 units.
 Seriously inappropriate scale
 Too much mass at 3rd and 4th level.

TRAFFIC ISSUES

Parking is already difficult/impossible in area.
 Traffic and roads are severely congested
 Access for emergency and service vehicles very restricted.
 Hamilton Road is currently a relatively quiet cul de sac and could not cope with a 50% or more increase.
 Will lead to danger to children playing
 Traffic will spill onto adjacent congested streets
 Totally inadequate/unrealistic parking provision

Turning area in site must be available for public use
Must not impact on existing site lines.

IMPACT ON ADJACENT PROPERTY

Over dominant impact on Talbot Road terraced housing
Rear building will result in significant overshadowing in winter months of Talbot Road
Main outdoor space will be elevated walkways and balconies which will result in a severe loss of privacy.
Outlook to back of mews properties will be oppressive.
Rear building will dominate outlook
Screening shown on plans inaccurate and outside of applicants control
Hard surfaces, elevated living spaces and lack of soft landscaping will accentuate noise transmission
No overlooking of modest Talbot Road gardens at present and development will lead to a significant reduction in quality of life

MISCELLANEOUS

Should be building family housing not small apartments
Underground parking in flood plain may undermine foundations of adjoining
Infrastructure cannot cope with additional households
No need for more offices/employment
Developers have not listened to residents
Site home to protected species

Professional Comments

The main considerations, as with the previous application, material to the planning and the associated conservation area consent application relate to the acceptability of the demolition of the existing BTM's and the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Hamilton Road Conservation Area and adjacent MOL, the justification for not providing adequate levels of replacement employment floor space or failing that an appropriately high level of affordable housing, the number of small units, the design, density and impact of the proposed development on the privacy, shadowing, visual and residential amenities of neighbouring properties, effect on flood defence, traffic and parking implications, ecology and issues related to the Council's Planning Obligations Strategy. In addition it is also necessary to assess whether the revised application overcomes the 11 reasons that led to the refusal of the earlier scheme.

Demolition and impact of the alterations on the character of the Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM's)

The existing BTM's form a cohesive historical group and are some of the best examples of Victorian industrial buildings within the local area and borough and help to define Hamilton Road Conservation Area's industrial archaeology. This is identified in the Conservation Area Statement.

"37 Hamilton Road is recognised as a remarkable industrial building group of local architectural and historic interest" and "is a key landmark building for the surrounding area".

This revised application has been supported by the submission of structural engineers report and involves the retention of Building 1 and demolition of Building 3 (as previously) but proposes to substantially reconstruct the main elevation of Building 2 as the front elevation of a replacement building. The purpose of this is to retain the spirit/character of the main vista northwards along Hamilton Road, which has been identified as very important viewpoint in the Conservation Area. This revised approach has been arrived at, by the applicants due to the strong opposition by residents to the loss of the prominent frontage of Building 2. Notwithstanding this,

it is considered that this facadist approach to development is not particularly successful as it would undermine the historic integrity of Building 2 and its inexact replication with increased spacing between rows of window openings would not retain the buildings' authenticity.

Whilst the submission of the structural report is acknowledged and goes somewhat towards fulfilling the requirements of PPG15 in terms of justifying the need to demolish the BTMs it does not fully satisfy the requirements. Firstly there is no assessment of Building 3 and therefore no attempt to demonstrate that demolition is 'inevitable'. Secondly there has been no far-reaching analysis or assessment of possible alternatives to demolition and/or reconstruction in terms of physical and other economic re-use.

Despite pre application advice it is still proposed that the retained BTM (Building 1) has two large box dormers erected on either side of its roof slope. Although these have been 'lightened' in form with extensive use of glazing this will still result in a prominent and unwelcome addition to this prominent roof profile. In terms of the character of the Conservation Area, this building is particularly important as it forms the end of the vista along Hamilton Road. As a result additions to the simple traditional roof should be avoided.

Design and Impact on Conservation Area / MOL

The area is characterised by modest two storey Victorian terraces with a number of industrial developments sited along the railway and forming the southern skyline of the MOL (located to the north of the site). The bulk and height proposed on the northern boundary of the site would result in a development, which is substantially higher than any other buildings in the area. It is considered that this would disrupt the principally low-rise industrial skyline of the MOL to its detriment and to the detriment of the Conservation Area.

Although the applicant has stated that the current ridge height of building 3 "is the equivalent of a four storey building and the proposed new built form is set within this scale " this does not provide an appropriate comparison. Firstly the height of the block is approximately 1m higher but more importantly the mass of the building due to its box-like profile is significantly greater than the series of pitches on the existing building. In terms of important views from Talbot road, the railway bridge, railway line and MOL the building is going to appear to be substantially larger in mass and scale without any mitigating relief brought by the traditional pitched roof forms of surrounding development. As a result the northern face of the development is going to be substantially out of scale with the prevailing building profiles and building mass, which typify the general locality.

Furthermore the proposed massing and height of the new buildings would dominate the remaining BTM (Building 1) and reconstructed BTM (Building 2) resulting in harm to its character and setting of these two landmark buildings. This will undermine the value of the focal point they now provide to the Conservation Area. The new building is wider in form than Building 3 and occupies more of the width of the site. At present the important viewpoint along Hamilton Road northwards to the site provides a vista which is dominated by the existing BTMs. It is important to note that the existing Building 3 is located to the west of the principal ridge of Building 1 and its mass is broken up by the series of ridges. The replacement rear building will extend nearly across the full vista and given its height and form will result in a significant loss of the prevailing character, characterised at present by steep pitches. The attractive and retained Building 1 will lose its primary impact as the major nucleus of the street and Conservation Area.

On this basis, although some progress has been made in order to preserve the character of the Conservation Area, the partial loss of Building 2 and total loss of Building 3 would still result in harm the character and setting of the Conservation Area which would be contrary to Policies BLT2, BLT4 and PPG 15. As a result it is not considered that the revised application overcomes the conservation related reasons for refusal of the previous application.

Land use/Loss of employment floor space/affordable housing

The historic use of the site has always been for employment related purposes and there is a clear policy preference in the UDP (EMP4) for the retention of employment on such sites. The loss of employment land is only acceptable in exceptional circumstances.

Such circumstances include when the existing premises has severe site restrictions in terms of access and servicing arrangements which would make its continued employment use inappropriate. The site is not very accessible, being located at the end of a cul-de-sac in an area of narrow streets identified in the UDP Review as "an area of older, improved housing in which are interspersed industrial and commercial uses. The proximity of these uses creates problems of noise and disturbance from lorries and on-street parking."

However in a recent appeal case for Norcutt House, planning ref; 05/1797/FUL, which is an adjoining employment site and includes a road with similar characteristics and constraints (narrow streets with residential terraced houses with on street parking on both sides), the inspector noted that because the road was a "*relatively short, straight road of reasonable width*" (similar to that of Hamilton Road), that he did "*not consider the access and servicing arrangements to be severely restricted for a redevelopment for the preferred B1 purposes*" (for an alternative B1 employment use) and found the appellant's argument for loss of employment space (approx 800sqm) at this site unconvincing, "*any employment floor space would be poorly situated, with restricted access and thereby economically unattractive*".

Under this scheme the applicant is also stating that the site cannot be retained for employment use in accordance with EMP 4 as the site is very restricted in terms of access and suffers from poor accessibility by public transport. It is the Council's view that, although access to the site is restricted somewhat, that the use of the site for small workshops (B1 use) would not be likely to result in detriment to the amenities of the area, as these types of businesses do not normally generate significant numbers of vehicular trips and generally only require deliveries by smaller vehicles such as cars and vans. Normally the Council would seek, as the preferred option to achieve an equivalent level of employment floor space in any redevelopment scheme. In this proposal, the site of 0.233 hectares currently provides 1032 sqm of employment floor space; the proposed 'new' floor space amounts to 184sqm, which represents a considerable and unacceptable reduction.

Even where the Council does accept a reduction in employment floor space (for environmental reasons) it would be contrary to the requirements of Policy EMP 4 to accept, without significant justification and marketing evidence, residential development. There is a requirement for the applicant to test alternatives.viz "*where continued employment use is not practicable, proposals for alternative employment generating uses, such as health, leisure, tourism, childcare or hotels will be considered in accordance with other policies in the Plan. Retail uses may also be*

an acceptable alternative on town centre sites where they would enhance the retail function". It is noted that the applicant has provided a report on the potential for employment uses as supporting evidence, however this primarily considers B1 uses rather than the 'other' employment referred to in the adopted policy. In any event the conclusions of the Martin Campbell report (July 2006) are at variance to the conclusion of the Employment land availability study of June 2006 which has looked at the Borough wide land availability and has concluded that there is a significant shortage of such land.

The final section of policy EMP 4 does make provision for (affordable) residential development where employment use cannot be secured. viz
"Where none of these is practicable the Council may permit residential development in the form of permanently affordable housing."

If it is considered that the alternative non-residential uses listed above are not appropriate in this area due to the restricted accessibility of site, the Council will seek to achieve 100% affordable housing.

On this site there is a low offer of replacement employment floor space and thus some possibility of reducing the levels to less than 100%. A late amendment to the application proposes an improvement to the affordable housing offer from 35% to 39%, which is still well below that sought in policy EMP 4 but would nearly meet the HSG 6 Borough-wide target of 40% (which is applicable to sites other than employment sites). This improved offer includes 7 social rent flats and 5 shared ownership flats (42%) , (58%)

With respect to the applicant's justification for the failing to provide 100% affordable housing, it is argued that such a level of provision would render the development financially unviable. The financial assessment was based on 11 shared ownership units and has not been adjusted to take into account the improved offer. Indeed on the basis of the GLA Three Dragons toolkit assessment provided by the applicants, the financial appraisal concludes that the provision of any social rent units would make the scheme unviable.

As the scheme was deemed unacceptable in terms of policy and design, the Council has not undertaken an independent financial study to assess the applicant's viability assessment. However it should be noted that the toolkit is primarily concerned with levels of affordable housing and not with considering alternative mixes of employment and residential development (which may better meet the policy requirements for this site) For this reason its viability assessment of this site is of limited value.

It is therefore advised that the revised application has not overcome the reasons for refusal relating to loss of employment land and insufficient levels of affordable housing.

Density

National planning policy (PPG3) and the London Plan recommends that developments of below 30 units / hectare should be avoided. Council policy HSG 11 also recognises that for sustainable reasons, it is important that housing sites are used efficiently. It is however critical, when considering schemes, that densities and housing needs are balanced against the need to maintain the character and appearance of the local area.

An area, such as this site, with a PTAL rating of 2, is classed as suburban (as set out in the London Plan housing density and parking matrix). This recommends densities of between 50 - 80 units / hectare in areas identified as suburban. The current proposal is for 133 units / hectare, and although the existing residential density of Hamilton and Warwick Road (excluding application site) is 86.4 dwellings / hectare (62 dwellings / hectare including application site), the number of units proposed for this site, is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site and out of character with local area to its detriment. Although the proposed residential density is lower than that previously refused due to the reduction in the number of units by 4 it is still significantly higher than that prevailing in the locality and is unacceptable.

Small Households and disabled units

Policy HSG 11 expects that new developments provide a reasonable number of small units (studio or one bedroom flats) appropriate to the site and "the Council will seek to negotiate at least 25% small units on appropriate sites". 25% is a normal requirement while sites in areas of high public transport accessibility and with good access to facilities such as shops carry a higher requirement. It is considered that the site is well located with respect to public transport and local amenities in Twickenham. The number of small units provided (10) small units is in accordance with HSG 11. The number of adapted units satisfies the main requirements in terms of disabled units (Policy HSG 8) and the distribution between tenures is welcomed. Notwithstanding this, amendments would be necessary to comply with requirement for wheelchair units to have linked carports.

Neighbouring amenity

In terms of residential amenity the principal impact will be upon the properties on Talbot Road. The rear gardens of these properties are only approximately 6 metres in depth and the proposed buildings on this boundary range from 5.8 to 6.2 metres in height. Although the asymmetrical form of the roof reduces the apparent bulk perceived by the occupants of properties in Talbot Road, their very close proximity (typically 1-1.2 from the boundary, though the offset positioning of one block brings some of the new build up to 4m away from the boundary) would result in a severe overbearing impact and harm to the outlook of these properties, which is unacceptable.

With respect to the 4-storey block along the railway, which is 12 metres in height, these would be located only 14 metres from the rear of these properties. It is considered that this is too close, given the height and bulk of the new building which is adding a significant additional mass at roof level. The applicants have provided a brief statement within the Design and Access statement regarding massing, sunlight and daylight. This clearly shows that after 3pm on the 21st March the combined shadowing impact of the Mews houses and the bulky rear building would result in a total loss of mid afternoon to evening sunshine to the Talbot Road gardens and rear of the properties. Late afternoon sunshine is often of special value as residents are more likely to be home to enjoy the benefits. Earlier in the year the impact would be even more significant. Whilst the applicant contends that the new building is set within the scale of the existing building this takes no account of the significant differences in roof form that allows sunshine to shine through the lower parts of the pitched roof structure, which would not occur with the flat box profile of the new roof. It also does not take account of the closer proximity of the new building; Building 3 is located further to the west. The cumulative effect would result both in an overbearing impact and a loss of quality to the amenities enjoyed by the residents of Talbot Road.

In terms of overlooking, the properties in Talbot road abutting the site currently enjoy a high degree of privacy. Whilst there is no direct overlooking caused from the main

blocks of the development there will be a clear perception of loss of privacy due to the location of the external balconies/external living space elevated above the principal windows and bedrooms of Talbot Road and to a lesser extent above the garden area of the end properties in Hamilton Road. There will be, in addition, a considerable degree of additional activity and potential for noise. The high density of the development and the limited amount of soft landscaping to absorb sound would exacerbate this.

It is therefore considered that this revised application have not overcome the reason that led to refusal of the earlier scheme on the grounds of unneighbourly and overbearing development.

Traffic and parking

There is significant public concern about the difficulties of parking in the vicinity and anecdotal evidence about problems experienced by emergency and service vehicles. However the proposed car parking provision is set at one space per unit which is equal to the maximum allowed by current car parking standards, an appropriate allowance in this congested area. A benefit of the scheme is also the introduction of space for turning within the site. This will enable residents and visitors to existing residential properties better access arrangements than is the case within this relatively narrow, heavily parked cul-de.sac. The provision of the majority of the parking spaces in a basement below the main building is also welcomed.

Notwithstanding this, it is advised that amendments would be required to achieve better disabled parking provision and recycling facilities. As the drawbacks of the current application in terms of traffic and parking could be overcome by conditions it is considered that this should not be included as a reason for refusal of the current scheme.

Flood Defence Works

The Environment Agency has indicated that the Flood Risk Assessment is satisfactory and that no objections, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, are raised to the development. The revised application is therefore satisfactory in this respect.

Wildlife and Nature Conservation

With respect to wildlife, although the site is not a designated site of local nature importance nor afforded any special protection in terms of wildlife habitat legislation, a bat survey was undertaken on the buildings and it was found that there was no evidence of roosting bats. It is recommended that any new development should include bat boxes/bricks to be incorporated into the build.

The site is within a conservation area, however none of the trees within the site and adjacent sits are of any particular merit within the local or wider landscape, with the majority of the trees being self-sown. It is however recommended that the applicant seeks independent arboricultural advice on the future of the trees, as the building works will inevitably affect them.

Land Contamination

The current application has been supported by a geotechnical report and subject to appropriate remediation measures this has overcome a reason for refusal of the previous scheme.

Planning Obligations Strategy

As part of the GLA Three Dragons Financial Assessment accompanying the application it was indicated that there was very little capacity to provide contributions towards related infrastructure. The applicants have therefore concluded that no further value can be extracted from the scheme towards planning obligation strategy (POS) contributions, other than an offer of £70,000. The Councils' POS is currently being updated to take account of updated costs and policies however the adopted strategy would require a contribution in excess of £200,000 to fund related infrastructure costs.

It is therefore noted that the offer towards the POS is significantly and unacceptably deficient and the revised application does not overcome the reasons for refusal in terms of the sum set aside for the Councils Planning Obligation Strategy.

Conclusion

The current application has overcome some of the reasons that led to the refusal of the earlier scheme for redevelopment of this site; this is partly due to the improved quality of supporting information. However there are still significant policy, conservation and design issues that lead to the conclusion that the current proposal is unacceptable for the following reasons:

- The loss of almost 848 square metres of storage / workshop floor space is considered unacceptable and contrary to EMP 4.
- The applicant has not provided an adequate number of affordable units in accordance with EMP 4 and HSG 6.
- The development will fail to enhance, or as a minimum maintain the character of the Conservation Area and the group of Buildings of Townscape Merit
- The development will have an overbearing impact and result in a loss of amenities to adjacent property.
- Lack of sufficient or adequate Planning Obligation contributions.

I therefore recommend Refusal

1 - Scale of Development

The proposal, by reason of its scale, height, bulk and design represents overdevelopment of the site and would neither enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation, thus would be an obtrusive form of development detrimental to the visual amenities of the Conservation Area and Metropolitan Open Land. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies STG2, ENV1, BLT2, BLT4 and IMP3 of the Richmond Upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005.

2 - Overbearing and Unneighbourly Development

The proposal, by reason of its height, location, profile and bulk at roof level would be an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development which would be detrimental

to the privacy and amenities of the occupiers of the residential properties on Talbot Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies BLT11, BLT16, HSG4 and HSG11 of the Richmond Upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005.

3 - Demolition of Buildings of Townscape Merit

In the absence of sufficiently rigorous supporting evidence it has not been demonstrated that the demolition of two of the Buildings of Townscape Merit proposal is justified. The proposal to demolish would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the group of Buildings of Townscape Merit in particular and Hamilton Road Conservation Area in general and would not seek to conserve energy and resources, thereby contrary to policies STG2, STG 3, IMP 1, BLT2 and BLT4 of the Unitary Development Plan: 2004 First Review

4 - Loss of employment land

The proposal would result in a significant reduction in the amount of employment floor space within the site, which would reduce employment opportunities in the locality contrary to the aims of the Councils employment policies. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy EMP 4 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005 and 3B.1 of the London Plan.

5 – Inappropriate mix of development

The development which proposes a high proportion of market housing and does not provide a sufficient level of appropriate affordable housing does not compensate adequately for the substantial loss of employment floor space. This would provide an unacceptable mix of development and would therefore be contrary to adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Affordable Housing' and Policy EMP 4 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan First Review 2005 and 3A.6 of the London Plan

6 - Education

By reason, of the development being likely to generate the need for additional primary and secondary school places, the sites location within Area 3 "West and South Twickenham" which has a projected shortage of school places, and the absence of an appropriate undertaking to provide an adequate financial contribution towards education, the scheme would place unreasonable demand on existing education facilities. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies IMP3, HSG18 and CCE8 of the adopted Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan: First Review 2005.

7 - Other Planning Obligation

Without a binding obligation to provide an appropriate contribution towards health, public realm and open space, playing pitches and transport facilities within the borough, the proposal would be contrary to policies IMP3 of the adopted Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan: First Review 2005

For the avoidance of doubt the Drawing(s) No(s) to which this decision refers are as follows; Planning and Design Statement, and appendices. Drawings PL31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44,45.

Informative

It should be noted that no drawing of the rear of Building 1 and 2 has been submitted (North elevation within courtyard)