LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES
ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE

PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by
Alice Murphy on 28 July 2022

Application reference: 21/3010/HOT

FULWELL, HAMPTON HILL WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
24.08.2021	24.08.2021	19.10.2021	19.10.2021

Site:
31 Kings Road, Teddington, TW11 0QD,
Proposal:
Retrospective application for addition of external wall insulation, and proposed application of rough render and re-instatement of pre-existing porch (amended).

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

APPLICANT NAME
-
8 Waldegrave Road
Teddington
TW11 8GT

AGENT NAME
Ms Lucy Arrowsmith
4 Eel Pie Island
Twickenham
TW1 3DY
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	Expiry Date
14D Urban D	08.02.2022
14D Urban D	08.09.2021

Neighbours:

16 Mays Road,Teddington,TW11 0SQ - 25.01.2022
3 Mays Road,Teddington,TW11 0SQ, - 25.01.2022
96 Connaught Road,Teddington,TW11 0QH, - 25.01.2022
58B Kings Road,Teddington,TW11 0QD, - 25.01.2022
58A Kings Road,Teddington,TW11 0QD, - 25.01.2022
66 Kings Road,Teddington,TW11 0QD, - 25.01.2022
60 Kings Road,Teddington,TW11 0QD, - 25.01.2022
64 Kings Road,Teddington,TW11 0QD, - 25.01.2022
62 Kings Road,Teddington,TW11 0QD, - 25.01.2022
33 Kings Road,Teddington,TW11 0QD, - 25.01.2022
29 Kings Road,Teddington,TW11 0QD, - 25.01.2022
23 Mays Road,Teddington,TW11 0SQ -

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

Development Management

Status: PDE	Application:21/3010/HOT
Date:	Retrospective application for addition of external wall insulation, and proposed application of rough render and re-instatement of pre-existing porch (amended).

Building Control
Deposit Date: 18.06.2013 Level access shower alterations
Reference: 13/1200/FP

Application Number	21/3010/HOT
Address	31 Kings Road Teddington TW11 0QD
Proposal	Retrospective application for addition of external wall insulation, and proposed application of rough render and re-instatement of pre-existing porch (amended).
Contact Officer	Alice Murphy
Target Determination Date	12/08/2022

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 subject site consists of a two storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse in the west side of Kings Road, Teddington.

The application site is situated within Character Area 17 of the Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Planning Guidance and is designated as:

- Conservation Area – CA42 Mays Road Hampton Hill
- Critical Drainage Area – Environment Agency
- Article 4 Direction – restricting basement development.

The property forms a group of 8 semi-detached groups on the west side of Kings Road. Many have undergone alterations such as changes to the external materials and colour including smooth render and mock tudor cladding, porch extensions and alterations to fenestration. Notwithstanding this, the semi-detached pairs are largely characterised by tiled roofs, and white rough cast render with cat slide side roofs and larger roof overhangs.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The application seeks retrospective application for addition of external wall insulation on the property. In addition, the application of rough render on top of this is proposed and the re-instatement of pre-existing porch.

There is no relevant planning history for the subject site.

In addition to the above, it is also noted that this application forms one of six applications on Kings Road for the same retrospective works. This includes application reference 21/3008/HOT (27 Kings Road), 21/3011/HOT (35 Kings Road), 21/3014/HOT (39 Kings Road), 21/3015/HOT (41 Kings Road), and 21/3016/HOT (47 Kings Road).

Following a site visit with Council officers, the applicant submitted revised plans showing the reinstated pre-existing porches and the application of rough render over the exterior to maintain a visual continuity. Revised plans were received 24th January 2022, the description of development was also updated and neighbours were reconsulted for the full notification period.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

Four representations were received, two support, one observation and one objection. These outlined the

following matters:

- Energy efficient
- Support for CO2 reduction
- Smooth render finish is unsympathetic development
- Damage and visual harm to CA and BTMs
- Window cills and character lost
- Alteration of porches removed original feature
- Porches key features outlined in the CA statement.

It is noted that only material planning matters can be considered in the assessment of this application. Design, neighbour amenity and heritage concerns are discussed in section 6 below.

Once revised plans were received, the description of development was updated and as mentioned the application went out for renotification.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2021)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

4. Decision-making
12. Achieving well-designed places
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/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf

London Plan (2021)

Policy D4 – Delivery good design
Policy D12 – Fire Safety
Policy HC1 – Heritage Conservation and Growth

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 Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	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
Hampton Wick and Teddington 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:
Mays Road (CA42) 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 Fire Safety

Issue i - Design and Impact on heritage assets

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states ‘When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states ‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal’.

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.

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes:

- *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 overall shape, size and position of rear and side 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 is made to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure.*

This proposal is a retrospective application for addition of external wall insulation, and proposed application of roughcast render and reinstatement of pre-existing porch.

The subject site, no.31 Kings Road is located within the May's Road Conservation Area. As mentioned, the house accompanies five other retrospective applications that are architecturally distinct from those located along Mays Road, with the roughcast render identified in particular as a defining element in its special

interest. Mays Road Conservation Area (CA42) Statement identifies Mays Road conservation area as a distinctive cohesive planned estate of public housing, designed in accordance with Garden City principles and therefore its significance arises largely from its social and economic significance in the borough. The area was developed as a single residential estate in the 1930.

The conservation area, specifically Kings Road, is visually distinct from the tight knit, unaltered streetscape of Mays Road. Specifically, Kings Road exhibits a variety of alterations to the frontages of properties, overall diluting the architectural interest and visual continuity in features along the street. Many properties have constructed porches, changed fenestration and external finishes, many altering only half of a semi-detached property. The visual form/typology and integrity of architectural features are different from the adjoining Mays Road.

The proposed reinstatement of the rough render and also original pre-existing porches establishes visual continuity along the street. Whilst the proposed external insulation adds an element of visual bulk to the frontages of the buildings, the rough render will remain the external finish and as noted the significance of the Conservation Area derives from the layout and character of the sites themselves in line with Garden City principles, and this will not be impacted by the proposed changes. Design features such as the rough render and generous roof overhang will remain. It is noted that the semi-detached pair exhibits a replacement porch which is out of character with the originals and appears visually bulky on the front elevation. Therefore, on balance, when considering the above, in this instance the proposed works are considered to have a neutral impact on the Conservation Area.

It is noted that the insulation added to the exterior will have energy consumption benefits which can also be recognised as a public benefit as regards to climate change and sustainable solutions, however it has not been demonstrated that this could not have been achieved with only internal alterations. Notwithstanding this, measures have been applied to minimise the external impact.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'. In this instance, the proposal would overall result in a neutral impact on the setting, character and appearance of the property and the conservation area given the retention of key architectural features and the existing quality of the semi-detached pair and the Kings Road conservation area street scene.

The proposal is considered consistent with the aims and objections of policies LP1 and LP3 the Local Plan or the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD.

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.

The proposed external cladding and reinstating the porch is not considered to have a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties and no objections were raised in this regard giving the nature and siting of the proposal. Overall the scheme proposed complies with LP 8.

Issue iii - Fire Safety

London Plan policy D12 requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all planning applications.

Fire Safety Information was submitted with the Supporting Statement prepared by Clive Chapman Architects. A condition will be included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. The materials proposed are to match existing and will need to be Building Regulations compliant. 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. 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

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process.

In making this recommendation consideration has been had to the statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the requirements set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains how the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. For the reasons set out above, this application falls to be determined in accordance with the test under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the proposal is in general conformity with the Development Plan overall and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify refusal.

Grant planning permission with conditions

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): …AMU…… Dated: ……28/07/2022……

I agree the recommendation: CTA

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated: ……28/07/2022……..

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	
U0058834	NPPF APPROVAL - Para. 38-42
U0058835	Composite Informative