

Application reference: 23/0205/HOT TEDDINGTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
24.01.2023	26.01.2023	23.03.2023	23.03.2023

Site:

15 Grove Gardens, Teddington, TW11 8AR

Proposal:

Replacement of one-storey rear extension, new window to front facade and new roof lights to main roof.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Kevin Culhane
15 Grove Gardens
Teddington
Richmond Upon Thames
TW11 8AR

AGENT NAME

Mr Andrew Dobson
Studio 316 Metal Box Factory
30 Great Guildford Street
London
SE1 0HS
United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on 27.01.2023 and posted on 03.02.2023 and due to expire on 24.02.2023

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRUT Transport
14D Urban D

Expiry Date

15.03.2023
15.03.2023

Neighbours:

65 Twickenham Road, Teddington, TW11 8AL, - 27.01.2023
67 Twickenham Road, Teddington, TW11 8AL, - 27.01.2023
13 Grove Gardens, Teddington, TW11 8AR, - 27.01.2023
17 Grove Gardens, Teddington, TW11 8AR, - 27.01.2023

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

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:94/0369/CON
Date:08/03/1994 Siting Of Telecommunications Cabinet

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:85/1090
Date:11/09/1985 Demolish existing garage, rebuild garage. First floor extension for residential use of single residence.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:08/1684/HOT
Date:06/08/2008 Single storey rear extension to semi - detached house

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:23/0205/HOT
Date: Replacement of one-storey rear extension, new window to front facade and new roof lights to main roof.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 04.09.2008 Single storey rear extension
Reference: 08/1825/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 01.03.2023 Replacement of one storey rear extension, structural alterations, new window to front facade and new roof lights to main roof
Reference: 23/0317/IN

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 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 has considered 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 property is a two-storey, semi-detached house on the east side of Grove Gardens.

The application site is situated in Teddington in the The Grove Conservation Area. It is also designated as:

- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 50%)
- Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency (Teddington [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_006 /)
- Main Centre Buffer Zone (Teddington Town Centre Boundary Buffer Zone - A residential development or a mixed use scheme within this 400 metre buffer area identified within the Plan does not have to apply the Sequential Test (for Flood Risk) as set out in Local Plan policy LP21.)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposal is to replace the windows on the front elevation with similar units, to replace the doors to the already partially converted garage with a window and to add two rooflights to the front roof slope. The existing rear extension with pitched roof would be rebuilt as a flat-roof extension with parapet and coping. The rear doors would be replaced with three sets of steel doors, the rear first floor windows replaced, and a rooflight placed on the rear roof slope. On the side elevation a new window opening would be created at ground floor level and a rooflight added to the side roof slope.

The most relevant planning history is as follows:

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:85/1090
Date:11/09/1985 Demolish existing garage, rebuild garage. First floor extension for residential use of single residence.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:08/1684/HOT
Date:06/08/2008 Single storey rear extension to semi - detached house

4. AMENDMENTS

The original submission was received on 24th January 2023

A revised front elevation and second floor plan showing adjustments to the proposed rooflights on the front

roof slope were received on 22nd March 2023.

5. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of representation were received.

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
- 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)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency
- D12 Fire Safety
- HC1 Heritage conservation and growth

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

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	
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	Yes	
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	
Sustainable Travel Choices	LP44	Yes	
Parking Standards and Servicing	LP45	Yes	

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
Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Plan

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:

The Grove Conservation Area Statement
The Grove Conservation Area Character Appraisal

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.

7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i. Design and impact on heritage assets
- ii. Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii. Flood Risk
- iv. Fire Safety
- v. Transport and Parking

i. Design and impact on heritage assets

Policy Context

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF advises that poorly designed developments should be refused, especially where designs do not reflect local design policies, guidance and supplementary planning documents. It also says that significant weight should be given to designs which reflect local character, or to ones which are innovative designs in achieving high levels of sustainability, or which help improve the general standard of design in an area and fit in with the 'overall form and layout of their surroundings'.

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.

Policy D4 of the London Plan states that the 'design of development proposals should be thoroughly scrutinised' and that 'design quality development should be retained through to completion'.

Policy HC1 of the London Plan states that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings'

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.

Policy LP3 states that development should conserve and, where possible, take opportunities to make a positive contribution to, the historic environment of the borough, particularly in relation to designated heritage assets.

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.

Section 5.5 of the Council's SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that windows are important features, that an inappropriate choice can easily spoil an otherwise satisfactory design and that new windows should maintain a consistent style and detail with those on the existing house.

Analysis

The existing rear extension is the width of the house, approximately 3.5m deep, 2.7m high at the eaves and 4.1m high where the pitched roof meets the house. The proposed rebuilding would reduce the height of the extension overall to 3.5m. This would bring the extension away from the first-floor windows and help the extension sit better with the original house. The width and depth would remain the same. The treatment of the rebuilt extension is felt to be acceptable. The flat roof with parapet and coping would sit well with the house. The extension would present as brick to the rear, the same as at present, and have render to the sides with brick quoins on the corners. While the proposed doors would increase the amount of glazing to the rear, the doors are not out of proportion with the rest of the house and would be broken up by brick piers. They would be in steel which is an appropriate material. The other proposed changes to the rear elevation are relatively minor interventions. The existing uPVC windows would be replaced with metal ones of the same proportions, which would be an improvement in the appearance of the house. The proposed rooflight would be quite large, but in a conservation style and located well in the roof. As such it would not detract from the overall appearance of the roof at the rear. Being at the rear of the house, it is not considered these parts of the proposals would significantly affect the character of the Conservation Area.

The side elevation is not especially visible and presents as an informal façade. The proposed changes involve blocking up two windows and forming a new window at ground floor level as well as minor changes to pipework. These changes are relatively minor and would not detract from the character of the house or the area.

At the front, it is proposed to replace the existing windows at first floor level with 'new painted metal windows to match the existing'. The existing windows appear to be steel casements with leaded lights. These form an important part of the character of the house and its contribution to the conservation area. While the principle of their replacement is acceptable, any replacement would have to replicate these windows very precisely to ensure the character is retained. It is considered that this should be ensured by condition.

It is proposed to add two rooflights to the front roof slope and one on the side roof slope. These rooflights would be clearly visible from the street. It should be noted that several other houses in the street have one or two rooflights on their front elevation. As such rooflights are not out of character in the street. The proposed rooflights would be small enough so as not to dominate the roof and located in positions so as not to detract from the form of the roof. They would be conservation-type, meaning they would be on the plane of the roof slope and not 'pop' out of it being more noticeable. As such the rooflights proposed are considered to be acceptable.

The proposal includes replacing the garage door with a window. The urban Design Officer has not raised any objections to this aspect of the proposals. Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Plan and the Conservation Area study identifies as a problem the 'loss of traditional architectural features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations' and as an opportunity "preservation, enhancement and reinstatement of architectural quality and unity". Many of the houses in the street have driveways and garage doors integrated into the front of the house. These are often the result of later side extensions to the houses. However, many garage doors along the street have been replaced with windows over time, including No.11 and No.13 immediately adjacent. The adjoining house, No.17 has not replaced the garage door. No.15 is viewed more closely in connection with No.13 than No.17 with the driveways and front doors closer to each other. No.15 and No.17, while adjoining houses are not identical, No.15 having white, painted render across the entire front elevation and two oriel windows at first floor level. As such in this section of the street there is no established pattern of fenestration and a slight variety in the treatment of the front elevations.

The proposed front window would not match the window at No.13 as it would line through with the bay window. However, the treatment of the houses is different in any case. No.13 has brick work at ground floor level and half-timbering above the level of the head of the bay which prohibits a taller window in this location. No.15 has a stringcourse at higher level and rendered façade which can better incorporate a window of this size. The proposed window is of a suitable design, 4-casements wide with transom, mullion and leaded lights, arranged to line through with the head of the nearby bay and centred on the window above. As such the specific design of the window is felt to be acceptable subject to submission of construction details. This could be secured by condition.

As such, in this particular instance where there is no clear established pattern or unity in the immediate group of houses, and no way of reinstating it without relatively extensive works, it is considered that the replacement of the garage door would not unduly disrupt the visual cohesion of the street or the architectural integrity of the houses and consequently that the character of the Conservation Area would not be harmed.

This may not be the case for other houses in the street and should not necessarily be viewed as a precedent.

In view of the above, the proposals are considered to comply with the aims and objections of Chapter 12 and Chapter 16 of the NPPF, policy D4 and policy HC1 of the London Plan and policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan, as well as the SPDs on House Extensions and External Alterations, and The Grove Conservation Area Statement and Character Appraisal.

ii. Impact on 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 SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 3.5m in depth for a semi-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 two houses most impacted by the proposals would be No.13 and No.17 Grove Gardens. The proposed rebuilding of the rear extension would not increase the depth or width of the rear extension. It would be 3.5m high throughout, but the massing of the extension would be altered as part of the proposals, lowering the height of the extension closer to the house, and raising it further away. However, the extension as rebuilt would generally meet the guidance as set out in the SPD, being not deeper than 3.5m. As the height of the extension would be reduced, it is not anticipated that it would detract from the amenity of No.17, the adjoining house compared to existing situation. The proposed alteration would be noticeable from No.13 too, but as the extension would be set away from the boundary and no deeper than the existing extension at No.13, it is not expected to detract from the amenity of No.13.

The proposed changes to the fenestration on the side elevation may have some impact on No.13. Two existing windows would be blocked-up, but a new window would be formed at ground floor level and a rooflight placed on the side roof slope. These would look directly towards the flank of No.13 with the potential to result in overlooking. It is considered that this could be mitigated by conditioning the windows to be fixed and double-glazed.

On balance, therefore, it is considered that the proposals would not detract from the amenity and living conditions of neighbours and would comply with policy LP8 of the Local Plan.

iii. Flood Risk

Chapter 14 of the NPPF specifies that site-specific flood risk assessments are required for development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and that in Flood Zone 1, assessments should only be provided for sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use. Paragraph 168 states that minor development, including householder development, should provide flood risk assessments if required, but should not have to apply the sequential or exception tests.

Policy D11 of the London Plan states that 'development proposals should maximise building resilience and minimise potential physical risks, including those arising as a result of extreme weather, fire, flood and related hazards.'

Policy LP21 of the Local Plan states that all developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

The site is Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood and Critical Drainage Area. It is also in the Main Centre buffer Zone, meaning a sequential test does not need to be applied. No Flood Risk Assessment has been provided. However, the proposals would not involve increase the vulnerability of the site in terms of use or extend the footprint of the house or the amount of paved area. Therefore, it is not considered that the application would unduly increase flood risk on site and that the proposals would comply with Chapter 14 of the NPPF, Policy D11 of the London Plan and policy LP21 of Local Plan.

iv. Fire Safety

Policy D12 Fire Safety of the London Plan Part A requires all development to demonstrate the highest levels of fire safety. All non-major applications require the submission of a Fire Safety Strategy, unless reasonable exemption has been demonstrated.

The applicant has submitted a Fire Safety Strategy which is considered to adequately address the relevant criteria of Policy D12.

v. Transport and Parking

Policy LP44 of the Local Plan states that the Council will work in partnership to promote safe, sustainable and accessible transport solutions, which minimise the impacts of development including in relation to congestion, air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions, and maximise opportunities including for health benefits and providing access to services, facilities and employment. Policy LP45 of the Local Plan outlines that development must demonstrate an appropriate level of off-street parking to avoid an unacceptable impact on on-street parking conditions and local traffic conditions. It is further stated that in areas with a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating (1-4), it is particularly important that parking standards are met. Appendix 3 'Parking Standards' of the Local Plan. The Council's Transport SPD is also relevant.

The existing garage has already been partially converted and does not meet modern standards for a parking space (a minimum of 2.4m x 4.8m). As such, it is of no value as a parking resource to alleviate parking stress in the area and the conversion of the garage would not have an unacceptable impact in terms of parking. The Transport officer consulted on the application has made no objection.

Access would remain unchanged as would the parking provision at the front of the house which is enough for 1 car. The PTAL rating for the site is 1a which would require two off-street parking spaces for a house this size. To achieve an additional parking space would require removal of planting to the front garden. However, this would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area. As such the requirement for two off-street parking spaces should be set aside in this case

Consequently, the proposals are considered to comply with the SPD on Transport as well as policies LP44 and LP45 of the Local Plan.

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

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 subject to condition

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES

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): JPH

Dated: 22/03/2023

I agree the recommendation: SGS

Senior Planner

Dated:22/3/2023.....

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
