

PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by

Jack Morris on 30 May 2023

Application reference: 23/0436/HOT

TEDDINGTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
20.02.2023	28.02.2023	25.04.2023	25.04.2023

Site:

24 Victoria Road, Teddington, TW11 0BG,

Proposal:

Demolition of existing rear extension and replacement with side and rear extension

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

APPLICANT NAME

Allan

24 Victoria Road

Teddington

Richmond Upon Thames

TW11 0BG

AGENT NAME

Mr Matthew Wood

2

overcliff road

LONDON

SE13 7TZ

United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on 28.02.2023 and posted on 10.03.2023 and due to expire on 31.03.2023

Consultations:
Internal/External:
Consultee

14D Urban D

Expiry Date

01.05.2023

Neighbours:

23A Clarence Road, Teddington, TW11 0BQ, - 28.02.2023

25 Clarence Road, Teddington, TW11 0BN, - 28.02.2023

22 Victoria Road, Teddington, TW11 0BG, - 28.02.2023

26 Victoria Road, Teddington, TW11 0BG, - 28.02.2023

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

Status: RNO

Application:23/T0101/TCA

Date:17/03/2023 : (T1) Crab Apple (Malus Sylvestris) - Remove secondary stem to reduce crown by 3m in width, leaving a canopy spread of 3m and height of 5-6m. No change in canopy height. - Due to excessive shading of property (24 Victoria Road) and contact with roof and guttering of neighbouring property (23a Clarence Road). - Remove dead branches to preserve tree health.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:23/0436/HOT
 Date: Demolition of existing rear extension and replacement with side and rear extension

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:23/0890/HOT
 Date: Construction of 2No. dormer windows in rear roof slope and conservation style skylight to front & rear elevations.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 01.07.2010 Installed a Gas Boiler
 Reference: 10/FEN02114/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 13.12.2010 Circuit alteration or addition in a kitchen/special location House Dwelling Other (Work Quality Guarantee) House Dwelling One or more new circuits House Dwelling Upgrade or alteration to means of earthing House Dwelling Circuit alteration or addition in a kitchen/special location House Dwelling
 Reference: 11/NAP00329/NAPIT

Building Control

Deposit Date: 27.08.2019 Single storey first floor rear extension and reconfiguration of layout at FF. Works include removal of load bearing walls and alterations to fixed services and fittings. Removal of chimney breast at first floor.
 Reference: 19/1415/IN

Application Number	23/0436/HOT
Address	24 Victoria Road Teddington TW11 0BG
Proposal	Demolition of existing rear extension and replacement with side and rear extension
Contact Officer	JMO
Target Determination Date	25/04/2023 EoT:

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

24 Victoria Road is an 1870s end terrace house within the Park Road Teddington Conservation Area. It was designated as a building of Townscape Merit (BTM) in June 1993. It is two storeys, in stock brick, under a pitched roof. To the front is the recessed entrance door (paired with no.26) under an open porch with simple, white painted surround with bracketed lintel, and windows with similar white painted surrounds and bracketed lintels. To the rear is a two-storey original outrigger and further small single storey extension. The first floor of the outrigger is visible from Clarence Road.

No.24 is at the end of a short terrace of three and forms part of a small group of five (nos.20 - 28) on Victoria Road between Albert Road and Clarence Road. Victoria Road is generally late Victorian in character (this group are some of the earliest development on the street) and there is a mix of styles and materials, with gault, stock, and red brick all featuring alongside painted brickwork. The overall scale and form is consistent, comprising two storey detached, semi-detached, or short terraces. Overall, Victoria Road is an architecturally varied street and a key approach to Teddington Station from the south.

The significance of no.24 as a BTM is derived from its architectural style and surviving original features, visual relationship, and group value with nos.20, 22, 26 & 28, and contribution to the streetscape and character of Victoria Road and the wider Conservation Area.

The application site is situated within Teddington and is designated as:

- Archaeological Priority (English Heritage) (Site: Teddington - Early Medieval settlement)
- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 179)
- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 336)
- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Building of Townscape Merit (Site: 24 Victoria Road Teddington Middlesex TW11 0BG)
- Conservation Area (CA22 Park Road Teddington)
- Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency (Teddington [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_006 /)
- Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater (GLA Drain London)
- 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 seeks to replace an existing lean to extension with a single storey side and rear infill extension. The submitted drawings also show new roof tiles to the existing roof and replacement windows.

Application:23/0890/HOT- proposing the construction of 2No. dormer windows in rear roof slope and conservation style skylight to front & rear elevations is under consideration

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of representation were received.

Part of the determination of the application, the Council's conservation officer was contacted to comment on the acceptability of the scheme. Their comments have been summarised below:

- **REAR EXTENSION**
The rear extension is considered to be acceptable. It would be subservient to the main building and integrate well through the proposed use of stock brick. It is of a simple, contemporary design which would not detract from the overall appearance of the building.
- **WINDOWS**
The proposed replacement windows are considered to be acceptable. The ones to the front would match the existing and would preserve the appearance of the building. The ones to the rear would have a positive impact on the appearance of the building as they would replace the existing unsympathetic uPVC windows. They would be in an appropriate material (timber) for both the building and the Conservation Area. Double glazing is acceptable; spacing bars and seals should be white to blend in with the frames.
- **ROOF**
The proposed recovering of the roof is acceptable. The replacement of the existing composite roof tiles with slate would have a positive impact on the building as it would be a more appropriate material for the building and the Conservation Area.
- Overall, the proposed works would cause no harm to the significance of no.24 as a BTM, and the replacement rear windows and roof covering would enhance its appearance. The proposed works would also cause no harm to the character and appearance of the Park Road Teddington Conservation Area.

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

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
- 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	No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	Yes	No
Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets	LP4	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
 Village Plan - Teddington

These policies can be found
 at: https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance

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 Risk

i Design and impact on heritage assets

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.

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.

The proposal seeks to erect a single storey side and rear infill extension, install replacement windows, and, replace the roof slates. The extension would involve the demolition of a small lean to extension adjoining the rear elevation of the original two storey outrigger. The extension would have a total depth and width of approximately 6.3m and 5.4m respectively projecting away from the outrigger's rear and side elevations by approx. 3.4m and 2m respectively. The extension would be covered by a partial mono-pitched, partial flat roof. The eaves of the pitched roof would be approximately 2.4m raising to its overall flat roof height of approx. 3m. The exterior would be finished in brickwork to match, and fitted with a large set of glazed crittall style patio doors, two rooflights and a glazed pitched roof.

It is considered that the extension would be SPD compliant in that it would appear as a modern and subservient addition to the host dwelling while integrating to the established character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider neighbouring area. Given the extension would be sited to the rear of the host dwelling it would not be visible from the streetscape of Victoria Road. It is noted that the rear of the property is partially visible from Clarence Road, running adjacent. While so, it is

not considered that the extension would erode the integrity of this streetscape due to its use of materials to match.

Further to the above the scheme also seeks to install new timber sash windows to the front and rear to replace the existing PVC fixtures, along with new slates across the roofline. These alterations are greatly supported by the LPA by virtue of these works improving the degree to which the property integrates to the wider streetscape and conservation area. The Council's conservation officer notes that the window's spacing bars and seals should be white to blend into the frames.

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'. In this instance, the scheme would have a neutral impact upon the conservation area.

Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states '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'.

As outlined above, the proposed extension would be sited to the rear of the host dwelling and therefore have a neutral impact upon the BTM when viewed from the streetscape of Victoria Road. While the extension may be partially visible from the streetscape of Clarence Road, the use of materials to match existing are considered to preserve the integrity of the BTM. Furthermore, it is considered by both the planning & conservation officer that the proposed timber sash windows and roof slates would amount to an improvement of the BTM as these materials are considered to better reflect contemporary materials and appearance.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objections of policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Local Plan.

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 terrace property will be acceptable. Where the proposed extension seeks a larger depth, the eaves should be reduced 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.

Immediately adjoining the host dwelling are number 22 and 26 Victoria Road to the north and south respectively. Furthermore, the side elevation of number 23 & 23a Clarence Road to the west. Given their proximity to the host dwelling, it is considered that any addition to this property would likely impact these neighbours most. However, where appropriate the wider neighbouring area will also be assessed.

Given the proposal would exceed the near-most rear elevation of the adjoining neighbour at n.26 by approx. 0.10 there is no objection with regard to the proposal being unneighbourly or overbearing. With regard to n.22, it is noted that the proposed extension would not meet SPD guidance in being greater than 3m in depth and maintaining an eaves height of approx. 2.4m. However SPG states that every application needs to be assessed based on the particular on-site circumstances. In this case, it is noted that this neighbour is detached from the host dwelling, and its adjoining garage further

increases the separation between the near most elevation of the proposed extension to a habitable room window by approximately 3.4m. The side elevation would be partially glazed, giving it a 'lighter' appearance when viewed from no.22. As such, the impact of the proposal is considered acceptable upon n.22.

Finally, given all the proposed windows would be set behind the existing boundary treatment and would be high level, it is not considered that there would be any increased sense of overlooking introduced as a result of the development.

As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the aims and objections of policies LP8 of the Local Plan.

iii Fire Risk

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

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 YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): JMO

Dated: 30/05/2023

I agree the recommendation: A Vedi

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated: ...31/05/2023.....

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

U0078983	Composite Informative
U0078984	NPPF APPROVAL - Para. 38-42