

Application reference: 06/3303/LBC
HAM, PETERSHAM, RICHMOND RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
27.09.2006	27.09.2006	22.11.2006	22.11.2006

Site:

34 Richmond Hill, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 6QX

Proposal:

Erection of single storey rear garage, replacement of rear conservatory, corner infill to 1st floor bathroom, refurbish existing roof with casement window into existing dormer, air conditioning internally with associated vents, replacement of existing rooflights, alterations to external fenestration and widening existing stairway at front of property and internal alterations.

Present use:

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr S Duffy
34 Richmond Hill
Richmond
Surrey
TW10 6QX

AGENT NAME

Englishhaus Architects
30 Lawrence Road
Hampton
TW12 2RJ

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRUT Urban Design 21 Days

Expiry Date
06.11.2006

Neighbours:

-

History:

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
89/1098/S94	• Use As Maisonette & Flat.	PCO	
90/0843/FUL	• Retention Of Satellite Dish On Rear Roof Dormer.	REF	
94/1706/LBC	• Erection Of Rear Conservatory.	GTD	07/09/1994
95/0045/FUL	• Erection Of Rear Conservatory	GTD	16/03/1995
94/1706/DD01	• Details Pursuant To Condition Lb08 (joinery Details) Of Listed Building Consent 94/1706/lbc Dated 7/9/94.	GTD	30/05/1996
06/1473/HOT	• Demolition of rear conservatory and replacement. Single storey double garage to rear. First floor extension infill. Refurbishment of roof and dormer casement window.	WDN	26/09/2006
06/1553/LBC	• Demolition of rear conservatory and replacement. Single storey double garage to rear. First floor extension infill. Refurbishment of roof and dormer casement window.	WDN	26/09/2006
06/2589/HOT	• Replacement of rear conservatory, single storey rear double garage, corner infill to 1st floor bathroom, refurbish roof and dormer casement window, install air conditioning and internal vents,	INV	

06/3303/LBC

- replace existing rooflights, alterations to rear fenestration, widening of existing front basement external stair, internal alterations.
- Erection of single storey rear garage, replacement of rear conservatory, corner infill to 1st floor bathroom, refurbish existing roof with casement window into existing dormer, air conditioning internally with associated vents, replacement of existing rooflights, alterations to external fenestration and widening existing stairway at front of property and internal alterations. PCO

Constraints:

Recommendation:

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

YES / NO

I therefore recommend the following:

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

Case Officer (Initials): *ASP*

Dated: *10/4*

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

Dated: *[Signature]* *11/4/2007*

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:

REASONS:	<i>See CRPS</i>
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:

**06/3442/HOT and 05/3443/LBC
34 Richmond Hill, Richmond.**

Proposal: Replacement of rear conservatory, single storey rear double garage, corner infill to 1st floor bathroom, refurbish roof and dormer casement window, install air conditioning and internal vents to new garage and attic, replace existing rooflights, alterations to rear fenestration, widening of existing front basement external stair, internal alterations.

Main Development Plan Policies:

UDPF 2005: BLT 2, 3, 11, 15 and 16, supplementary planning guidance for house extensions and supplementary planning document for design quality.

Site, proposal and history:

The application site is situated on the eastern side of Richmond Hill and lies within the Richmond Hill Conservation Area (CA5). A substantial three storey terraced house with rooms in the roofspace that is classified as a Grade II Listed Building occupies the site. A modest rear garden and off street car parking is to the rear. Beyond is the mews development of Lancaster Mews accessed by a private road.

An earlier application for planning permission and listed building consent was withdrawn by the applicant in May 2006 (06/1553/LBC and 06/1473/HOT). This withdrawn given Officer concerns relating to the paucity of information submitted and:

- Impact of increased size of front rooflight.
- Relocation of existing doorway to second floor to form ensuite
- Impact of services to house (underfloor heating and air conditioning system).

The re-submitted scheme alters in that the size of the two front rooflights has been reduced, re siting of front vent below parapet, retention of original door and architrave to second floor, omission of rear vent and the required detail of the proposals has now been submitted in order to assess the impacts of the proposal in regard to the Listed Building.

It is proposed to replace rear conservatory, erect a single storey rear double garage, corner infill to 1st floor bathroom, refurbish roof and dormer casement window, install air conditioning with one external vent to the roofspace and garage, replace existing rooflights, alterations to rear fenestration, widening of existing front basement external stair and internal alterations.

Public and other representations:

None received as result of site notice and neighbour consultation letters.

Amendments:

Omission of total air conditioning system to internal rooms. Air conditioning would now include a stand alone unit in the attic and new garage.

Removal of extract vent to rear slope

Re siting of cowl extract duct to front roofslope

Correction of errors in terms of rear roof dormer, front chimney and rooflights to garage. Further detail of refurbishment of windows to upper floors.

Re consultations:

No comments received

Professional comments:

It is considered that the main issues relating to this application is the impact of the proposals on the historic interest, integrity, character and setting of the Listed Building, those surrounding, the Conservation Area and neighbouring residential amenities.

Impact on Listed Building and Conservation Area.

The final set of amendments to this scheme have now remedied errors and concerns raised throughout the course of this application. The extensions and alterations would be acceptable and would not harm the special interest of this listed building.

Internal alterations:

In terms of the internal alterations, no objection would be raised to the forming of a new opening between bathroom and bedroom on the second floor. The original door and architrave between bathroom and hallway would be retained locked to illustrate the historic plan form of this floor. A condition to secure large-scale joinery details, including cross-sections, of new door and architrave will be requested. This will result in the replication of the existing door and architrave between bathroom and hallway.

Further clarification has been provided in relation to the scope of works in relation to the air conditioning units. Changes have been made to address concerns raised regarding the impact of the installation of A/C services and alterations to the roof of this house. It is now considered that the stand alone A/C unit in the attic and garage, the proposed front conservation-style rooflights and cowl extract would be acceptable. They would replace the large existing rooflight and would occupy a discreet position set back behind the front brick parapet. This would not result in the loss of significant listed fabric.

One internal alteration are considered acceptable.

Replacement rear conservatory and corner infill.

The Councils guidelines state that extensions should harmonise with the original appearance of the house; to achieve this aim such extensions should be made to appear as an obvious addition that is subordinate to the main structure. The proposed replacement conservatory and infill first floor extension would be modest in size and remain subordinate to the main body of the house. The replacement conservatory would not project greater in depth than the existing and in certain sections would stand lower. Due to the use of glazed rear fenestration and glazed rooflight it would appear distinct from the original house and would be also sympathetic to its character and those surrounding. The property experiences an existing first floor addition that appears to be original. Many adjacent properties have extended at this level. The enlargement would be appropriate and would not appear unduly dormant to the rear elevation and would not appear out of character in relation to surrounding houses. In addition the scheme would be discreetly located from public views and would not utilise a disproportionate amount of garden space.

Adjacent properties either side of this terrace house all experience single storey garage structures in the rear garden. At present the host property utilises this rear section of garden space as off street parking. The proposal is for a single storey building, which is a stand alone extension of the main house to provide parking for one car. The proposed modest design therefore complements the intended use, and it is considered to be inkeeping with the host property and area (most notably Lancaster Mews), whereby the size and design of adjacent garages is respected.

This addition would ^{not} appear unduly incongruous and would not utilise a disproportionate amount of rear garden space.

No objection is raised to the modest widening of the existing stairway at the front of the property to gain entry to the front lightwell and an associated shortening of existing railings.

The refurbishment of the rear roof and dormer casement window raises no objection. The existing rear roof dormer would not alter in size and the revised fenestration design would respect that of the fenestration design below.

In terms of the rear garden a condition will be attached to secure materials of hard landscaping to rear courtyard and winter garden.

Overall, it is considered that this scheme would represent an acceptable standard of design and so would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area, nor harm the special interest of the listed building and those surrounding (Policy BLT11, BLT2 and BLT3).

Neighbour Amenity.

The adjacent neighbour of no.36 to the south benefits from a full width ground floor and two storey rear extension. The replacement rear conservatory would minimally project past this for a distance of approx 100mm. Given this, it would be marginally visible (if at all) and would not result in an overbearing or visually intrusive form of development. The increase in size of the first floor element would not project past the existing addition therefore would be scarcely visible. The first floor existing window to this addition would be enlarged. However given that it would face this neighbour's blank flank wall, the presence of the ground floor extension and distances involved to this garden, it is not considered necessary to secure obscure glazing.

The adjacent neighbour of no.32 to the north is shown to have one window serving an open plan kitchen. This rear window fronts a yard which leads onto the rear garden. The ground floor rear addition of this property is used as a study and is served by glazed doors to the rear garden and a side window fronting the host site. The replacement conservatory would project the same distance as existing (approx 6m). However the single storey rear elements would be lower in places. The section adjoining the host property would infill the first floor to a further 2.1m over the existing height and would project rearwards for a further 1.3m. Whilst this element would be visible from the rear kitchen window and side window, given the existing situation of the first floor addition to the host site and the tight knit fabric of these houses, on balance, the increase is not considered to be significantly overbearing to these particular windows. The scheme would pass the second stage Building Research Establishment Test for light in relation to the kitchen window. Given that the side window to the rear addition is secondary and that this room is also served by a patio door it is not considered necessary to analyse this window in terms of the BRE. The proposed first floor infill would also be viewed from a first floor side window, however given its relatively modest increase over the existing and relationship it is not considered to appear unduly intrusive. This element would pass the BRE first stage test.

The presence of the garage addition would not project rear or forward of adjacent garages. Given that it would respect these building lines and its acceptable height, it is not considered that undue negative impacts in terms of visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of privacy would result to properties located in Lancaster Mews. The

scheme would be compliant to the BRE first stage test to the kitchen window of no.10.

Given the lower level nature of the alterations to the front steps no significant un neighbourly impacts would result. The front rooflights would be at an oblique angle and would not be so dissimilar to that existing; therefore no objection is raised in terms of loss of privacy.

Air conditioning units

The Environmental Health Officer has advised that the predicted noise level of the plant would not result in any unacceptable noise nuisance to nearby residential occupiers, nor the office premises. However, a condition would need to be attached to secure that the noise emitted from the unit shall be lower than the existing background noise level by at least 5d B (A) or (10d B (A) below if there is a particular tonal component to the noise) at all times that the ventilation /extraction system operates.

Transport

The Councils Transport Officer raises no objections to this application for a garage. The site currently benefits from one/two off street parking spaces located in the rear. The maximum parking standards for this three/four bedroom property, in a CPZ would be two spaces. The garage would serve one car parking space. Therefore the scheme would not exceed this requirement. The width of these car parking spaces are sufficient as they currently exist, but their depth is not enough at present. This point will be rectified as per the proposed garage. It is noted that the garage should be used as a single space because the width does not meet the Councils suggested width of 5.5m for garages. This is to allow sufficient room for side doors to be opened and for movement around the car.

Conclusion

The proposal would comply with the relevant policies and would not cause undue detriment or impacts to local residential amenity, or detract from the architectural or historic interest, integrity, character and setting of the Grade II Listed Building, nearby Grade II Listed Buildings and Conservation Area.

I therefore recommend PERMISSION, subject to the following conditions and informatives.