

Application reference: 23/1078/HOT TEDDINGTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
24.04.2023	27.04.2023	22.06.2023	22.06.2023

Site:

8 Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DR,

Proposal:

Replace existing conservatory with bespoke timber and double-glazed garden room; replacement double door set and change of single door to a window, all to rear elevation.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Dr Harris
8 Cambridge Road
Teddington
Richmond Upon Thames
TW11 8DR

AGENT NAME

Miss Alicia Harman
Belton Park
Londonthorpe Road
Grantham
NG31 9SJ

DC Site Notice: printed on 27.04.2023 and posted on 05.05.2023 and due to expire on 26.05.2023

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee
14D Urban D

Expiry Date
11.05.2023

Neighbours:

10 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
8 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
6 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
4 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
2 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
9 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
7 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
5 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
3 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
1 Cambridge House, Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DU, - 27.04.2023
15 St Albans Gardens, Teddington, TW11 8AE, - 27.04.2023
Tay House, 19 St Albans Gardens, Teddington, TW11 8AE, - 27.04.2023
6 Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DR, - 27.04.2023
10 Cambridge Road, Teddington, TW11 8DR, - 27.04.2023

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:03/1605/ES191
Date:04/06/2003 Erection Of Conservatory At Rear.

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:58/0338
Date:23/06/1958 Conversion of front room into a garage.

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:19/T0839/TCA
Date:11/11/2019 T1 - Hawthorn - Reduce crown to the most recent previous reduction points, removing approx. 1.5m of new growth. Final height 4m and final overall spread 3m.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:23/1078/HOT
Date: Replace existing conservatory with bespoke timber and double-glazed garden room; replacement double door set and change of single door to a window, all to rear elevation.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.01.2013 1 Door
Reference: 13/FEN00264/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 25.06.2019 Install a gas-fired boiler
Reference: 19/FEN02034/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 20.10.2021 Poujoulat (UK) Ltd: Starflex 2012 with Descriptor Install a flue liner
Chesneys: Salisbury 5ws with Descriptor Install a solid fuel dry fuel room heater stove or cooker
Reference: 21/HET00154/HETAS

Building Control

Deposit Date: 04.03.2022 Install one or more new circuits
Reference: 22/NIC01573/NICEIC

Proposal	Replacing the existing single storey conservatory, of the issue certificate reference: 03/1605/ES191 , with another single storey conservatory presenting approx. the same width, depth and height (highest point - top of the ridge as per submitted drawings). Fenestration alterations are proposed to the ground-floor rear openings.
Site description / key designations	<p>The host semi-detached two-storey dwelling is a locally listed building (BTM), part of a row of BTMs, located in the conservation area CA37 High Street Teddington. This is situated to the east of Cambridge Road.</p> <p>The application site is located in an Area of Archaeological Priority (Site: Teddington - Early Medieval settlement), Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flood and Critical Drainage Area sited in Teddington Village, Teddington Ward.</p> <p>Given the relatively minor extent and replacing nature of the scheme, such scheme is not considered to exacerbate current impacts on the Area of Archaeological Priority.</p>
Relevant Planning History	03/1605/ES191 - Erection Of Conservatory At Rear - Granted 04/06/2003.

<p>Policies</p>	<p>The proposal has been considered having regard to the policies within the London Plan and the Council's Local Plan, in particular:</p> <p>London Plan (2021):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D12 Fire Safety <p>Local Plan (2018):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP 1 Local Character and Design Quality • LP 3 Designated Heritage Assets • LP 4 Non-Designated Heritage Assets • LP 8 Amenity and Living Conditions • LP 21 Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage <p>Supplementary Planning Documents / Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015) • Hampton Wick & Teddington Village Planning Guidance SPD (2017) • Buildings of Townscape Merit SPD (2015) • Conservation Area Study / Statement - High Street (Teddington) Conservation Area 37
<p>Local Plan (Regulation 19 version)</p>	<p><i>The Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) and its supporting documents, including all the Regulation 18 representations received, was considered at Full Council on 27 April. Approval was given to consult on the Regulation 19 Plan and, further, to submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for Examination in due course. The Publication Version Local Plan, including its accompanying documents, have been published for consultation on 9 June 2023. Together with the evidence, the Plan is a material consideration for the purposes of decision-making on planning applications.</i></p> <p><i>The weight to be given to each of the emerging policies and allocations will depend on an assessment against the criteria set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF. As the Council considers the emerging Local Plan to be sound and legally compliant, officers and Councillors should accord relevant policies and allocations weight in the determination of applications taking account of the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. Note that it was agreed by Full Council that no weight will be given to Policy 4 in relation to the increased carbon offset rate, and therefore the existing rate of £95/t will continue to be applied; in addition, no weight will be given to Policy 39 in relation to the 20% biodiversity net gain requirement at this stage; all other aspects and requirements of these policies will apply.</i></p> <p><i>In this regard, the following Policies are considered Material Planning Considerations in this instance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Policy 28 Local character and design quality</i> • <i>Policy 29 Designated Heritage Assets</i> • <i>Policy 30 Non-designated Heritage Assets</i> • <i>Policy 46 Amenity and Living Conditions</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Policy 8 Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage</i>
Internal Consultee	Urban Design: does not object to the proposal (comments summarized in the main body of this report).
Material representation/s	None received.
Amendment/s	None requested or received.
Professional comments	<p>The proposal has been assessed in relation to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and Visual Amenity/Conservation Area/BTM • Neighbour Amenity • Flooding • Fire Safety <p>Design and Visual Amenity/Conservation Area/BTM</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) states '<i>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</i>'.</p> <p>Paragraph 202 of the NPPF (2021) mentions '<i>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</i></p>

	<p><i>the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.</i></p> <p>Paragraph 203 of the NPPF (2021) underlines <i>'the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.</i></p> <p>Policy LP 1 'Local Character and Design Quality' of the Local Plan requires all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality. The high-quality character and heritage of the borough and its villages will need to be maintained and enhanced where opportunities arise.</p> <p>Policy LP 3 'Designated Heritage Asset' of the Local Plan encourages to give great weight to the conservation of the heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of the asset. The significance (including the settings) of the borough's designated heritage assets, encompassing Conservation Areas, listed buildings, Scheduled Monuments as well as the Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, will be conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Policy LP 4 'Non-Designated Heritage Assets' of the Local Plan underlines that the Council will seek to preserve, and where possible enhance, the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets, including Buildings of Townscape Merit, memorials, particularly war memorials, and other local historic features. There will be a presumption against the demolition of Buildings of Townscape Merit.</p> <p>The House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2015) states that the overall shape, size and position of 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.</p> <p>The SPD (2015) underlines that it is preferable to use the same kind of window throughout, with the proportions and sizes of new window openings generally echoing those of the main house.</p> <p>The proposed single storey conservatory would replace the existing single storey conservatory, sited to the rear of the host BTM, and would not be appreciated from the street scene. The proposal would be modest in form and scale. Alterations to the existing ground-floor rear openings would result in openings echoing the design of those of the main house.</p> <p>As such, the proposals would have a neutral impact over the character and appearance of the conservation area, host BTM and their settings, complying with Policies LP 1, LP 3 and LP 4 of the</p>
--	---

	<p>Local Plan (2018) and the SPD on Housing Extensions and External Alterations (2015).</p> <p>Neighbour Amenity</p> <p>Policy LP 8 'Amenity and Living Conditions' requires all development to <i>"protect the amenity and living conditions for the occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties"</i>. The policy also seeks to <i>"ensure that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting, including through creating a sense of enclosure"</i>.</p> <p>The House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (2015) advises that extensions that create <i>"an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted"</i>.</p> <p>The SPD (2015) on House Extensions and External Alterations (2015) states that in the case of a semi-detached dwelling, single storey extensions should not exceed 3.5 metres in depth in order to mitigate detriment to neighbour amenity in terms of overbearing, visual obstruction and loss of daylight/sunlight. However, it states that the final test of acceptability will be based on the circumstances of the subject site itself.</p> <p>The property likely to be impacted by the proposal would be the attached neighbour at No. 10 Cambridge Road. No. 6 Cambridge Road, the other adjacent neighbouring property, would not be affected by the proposed conservatory, given its relatively considerably setback from the shared boundary with this neighbour.</p> <p>The solid wall of the extension at No. 10, would screen this neighbour from the proposed extension, which, therefore, would not experience adverse loss of light, un-neighbourliness or overbearing issues.</p> <p>Given the ground-floor nature of the alterations proposed, exacerbated privacy issues beyond the ones already experienced on-site would be minimal.</p> <p>In light of the above, the proposals are considered to meet the aims and objectives of Policy LP 8 of the Local Plan (2018) and the SPD (2015) on House Extensions and External Alterations.</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>Policy LP 21 'Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage' 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.</p> <p>The submitted Flood Risk Assessment states that the scheme would be set no lower than the existing floor level and consequently such scheme would not increase flood risk. This would be in line with Policy LP 21 of the Local Plan (2018).</p>
--	---

	<p>Fire Safety</p> <p>The Fire Strategy Statement received is considered sufficient and proportionate to the amount of development proposed satisfying Policy D12 of the London Plan (2021), therefore, a compliance condition is attached.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>It is recommended that the application reference 23/1078/HOT be granted approval subject to conditions and informatives.</p>

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): GAP Dated: 15/06/2023

I agree the recommendation:-A Vedi

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated: 21/06/2023.....

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:

<p>REASONS:</p>

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
