

### PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by

Jack Morris on 6 June 2023

###### ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE

***USTOMER SERVICES***

**Application reference: 23/0957/HOT**

TEDDINGTON WARD

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date application received** | **Date made valid** | **Target report date** | **8 Week date** |
| 12.04.2023 | 12.04.2023 | 07.06.2023 | 07.06.2023 |

 **Site:**

|  |
| --- |
| 89 Clarence Road, Teddington, TW11 0BN,  |
| **Proposal:** |
| loft conversion with side rear dormers and 2no roof lights to front roof slope. rear extension with flat roof and rooflightsStatus: Pending Consideration (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application) |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLICANT NAME**Mr & Mrs Wedderburn89 Clarence RoadTeddingtonRichmond Upon ThamesTW11 0BN |  | **AGENT NAME**Mr Lucas Docherty17 Hamilton RoadTwickenhamTW2 6SNUnited Kingdom |

**DC Site Notice:**  printed on 14.04.2023 and posted on 21.04.2023 and due to expire on 12.05.2023

**Consultations:**

***Internal/External:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Consultee** | **Expiry Date** |
|  14D Urban D | 28.04.2023 |
|  |  |

**Neighbours:**

70 Clarence Road,Teddington,TW11 0BW, - 14.04.2023

72 Clarence Road,Teddington,TW11 0BW, - 14.04.2023

10 Shaef Way,Teddington,TW11 0DG, - 14.04.2023

9 Shaef Way,Teddington,TW11 0DG, - 14.04.2023

87 Clarence Road,Teddington,TW11 0BN, - 14.04.2023

91 Clarence Road,Teddington,TW11 0BN, -

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

 Development Management

Status: GTD Application:94/T3876/CA

Date:17/01/1995 Fell Sycamore

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:94/T3692/CA

Date:06/01/1995 Fell Sycamore

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:23/0957/HOT

Date: loft conversion with side rear dormers and 2no roof lights to front roof slope. rear extension with flat roof and rooflights

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Number**  | 23/0957/HOT |
| **Address**  | 89 Clarence Road Teddington TW11 0BN |
| **Proposal**  | Loft conversion with side rear dormers and 2no roof lights to front roof slope. rear extension with flat roof and rooflights |
| **Contact Officer**  | JMO |
| **Target Determination Date**  | 07/06/2023 |

**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**

89 Park Road is a 1920s end terrace house within the Park Road Teddington Conservation Area. It is two storeys, fronted in red brick (ground floor) and pebbledash (first floor) with stock brick sides and rear under a hipped tiled roof. To the front is a two-storey bay window surmounted by a gable, and square, glazed porch. To the rear is a single-storey outrigger.

No.89 forms part of short terrace of three which in turn forms part of a small late 1920s development at the south-eastern end of Clarence Road (nos.73 - 89). Clarence Road has a varied character, with the southern section consisting of semi-detached Victorian and Edwardian pairs to the north, in a highly cohesive streetscape, transitioning to a more varied streetscape on the eastern side with the 1920s (and later) buildings.

The special interest of no.89 is derived from its architectural style and surviving original features, visual relationship and group value with neighbouring properties, and contribution to the streetscape and character of Clarence Road.

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

* Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 179)
* Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
* Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Low)
* Conservation Area (CA22 Park Road Teddington)
* Land Use Past Industrial (gravel pit, large pit beside railway tracks Start: 1870 End: 1894)
* 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.)
* Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency ()
* Take Away Management Zone (Take Away Management Zone)

**3.** **DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

The proposal seeks to erect a single storey rear extension and carry out a loft conversion. To facilitate the loft conversion, two dormers are proposed to the side and rear roof slope respectively along with rooflights to the front.

There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

**4.** **CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT**

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

One letter of support was received which generally outlined that there was no objection to the proposal. It did raise concern with the boundary line between the host dwelling and n.91, however, this is not considered a material planning matter.

As the property is within a conservation area, the Councils Conservation officer was consulted. Their comments have been outlined below:

* REAR EXTENSION

No objections are raised regarding the rear extension. It would be subservient to the main building and would be similar to other existing rear extensions within the terrace and the wider group. It would not be visible from public vantage points within the Conservation Area and therefore would have no impact on the character or appearance of the Park Road Teddington Conservation Area.

* DORMERS

Usually, large dormers are not supported as they dominate the roof slope and obscure the majority of the original roof. However, it is acknowledged that within the group no.89 forms a part of, all but one other property (no.75) have a large side dormer. Therefore, it is noted that this has become an established feature of this group. Due to this, in this case, no objections are raised regarding the proposed side dormer as it would be similar to the many other examples within the group. The dormer would therefore not appear incongruous and would fit in with now-established character of the group. It would have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the Park Road Teddington Conservation Area.

The rear dormer would not be visible from public vantage points within the Conservation Area and therefore would have no impact on the character or 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 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>

**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 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 rear extension and make alterations to the roofline. For clarity, each aspect will be assessed separately.

Single storey rear extension

This aspect would be L shaped with the deeper side built closer to the common boundary with n.91 and the shallower along the common boundary with n.87.

The total max depth and width of the extension is approximately 6m and 6.3m respectively with the depth reducing to approx. 4m for a width of 2m along the common boundary with n.87. The extension would be covered by a flat roof, large roof-lights with an overall height of 3.4m. The extension would be finished with three rooflights and set of bi-folding doors.

It is considered that the extension, while generous in height, would be subservient in relation to the host dwelling given it would remain well below the cill line of the first floor windows and would align with the neighbours extension. Furthermore, no objection is raised with regard to its overall scale or massing when compared to the local context given single storey rear extensions are very common alterations to neighbouring dwellings.

It is considered that the use of materials to match ensures that the extension would adequately integrate to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Roof Alterations

This aspect of the scheme involves the addition of two pitched dormer extensions being installed to the existing side and rear roof elevations.

 

The council’s SPD offers the following advice regarding roof alterations:

* Dormer windows and other roof extensions must not project above the ridgeline.
* Roof extensions should not dominate the original roof. Normally a significant area of the existing roof should be left beneath a new dormer and on either side of the dormer, thus setting the extension well in from either side of the roof. It may be more successful to incorporate two smaller dormers than one large dormer.
* Dormer windows should be smaller than that of windows of the floor below.
* Ensure sensitivity to the existing character – A dormer window with a flat roof may be out of character with the original building. Hipped or gabled dormers are often preferable, or alternatively consider using roof lights.
* Match/or use complementary materials – The sides of dormer windows should be covered in materials that match or complement the main roof.
* Excessive use of roof lights and an excessive number of roof lights can appear visually disruptive. It is preferable that roof lights are flush with the existing roof (conservation type) and that they are carefully placed to line up with the windows on the floor below.

It is considered that the proposal would adequately meet the above guidance in so much that the additions would not exceed the ridgeline, be set in from the sides and eaves of each roofline, ensuring that the additions are subservient additions. Furthermore, the use of materials to match is considered to ensure that any addition integrates to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Large dormers are ordinarily discouraged as they dominate and obscure the majority of the original roofline. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that within the group that no.89 forms a part of, all but one other property (no.75) feature very similar pitched roofed side and rear dormer extensions. As such, no objection is raised in this regard as it is not considered that the proposal would erode the existing character of the streetscape.

It is noted that the extension would fail to meet guidance given the proposed windows would exceed the width of those below, while so, no objection is raised given this would be a modest departure from guidance and the proposed windows would not erode the visual hierarchy of the property’s rear elevation.

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’. For the reasons set out above, the proposal is considered to have a neutral impact upon the conservation area.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with the aims and objections of policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan and are not considered to unduly impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

**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 3m in depth for a terrace 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.*

Immediately adjoining the host dwelling numbers 87 and 91 Clarence Road to the North and South respectively. Given their proximity to the host dwelling, it is considered that any alteration to this property would likely have the greatest impact upon the amenity of these neighbours. However, where appropriate the amenity of the wider neighbouring area will also be considered.

Roof extensions

With regard to the proposed rear roof slope dormer, it is considered that the set in from the properties eaves adequately meets SPD guidance which was adopted to restrict lines of sight from dormer windows. Turning to the proposed side dormer, given this window is side facing and will be fitted to the second floor of the property there is an increased risk that the proposal would introduce a new form of overlooking to the private cemetery spaces of n.91 Clarence Rd. Ordinarily a condition may be added to the decision stating that any side facing window set above the first floor would be obscure glazed and non-opening below a height of 1.7 metres. After careful assessment however, it is the officer’s view that such a condition would not be expedient given the window would overlook the northern roof slope of n.91 which doesn’t have a dormer, thus not eroding the amenity of this neighbour.

Finally, given the proposed roof lights would face the streetscape of Clarence Road, it is also not anticipated that they would introduce an unacceptable degree of overlooking into neighbouring properties.

As such the officer raises no objection to the scheme in regard to overlooking or neighbouring privacy.

As both the proposed dormers and the proposed roof lights would be sited within the existing massing of the property's original roofline it is not considered that any new sense of overbearing or enclosure would incur as a result of the proposed development.

Rear Extension

With regard to overlooking, no objection is raised in this regard given all proposed windows and doors would be set behind the property's existing boundary treatment and the proposed rooflights would be set well above head height.

It is noted that the depth of the proposed extension would exceed the upper depth limit as outlined in the SPD for a terraced property. While so, no objection is raised with regard to overbearing given the extension would align with no.87’s extension and the deeper part of the extension with no.91 which itself is a detached property which extends further rearward than the application property and is well separated from the host house. As such, the proposal is considered to meet the aims and objectives of SPG.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objections of policies LP8 of the Local Plan.

**iii** **Fire Risk**

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

A Fire Safety Strategy and plan were provided with the application. A condition will be included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. The applicant is advised materials and arrangement would need to be Building Regulations compliant, and all 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

**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: 06/06/2023

**I agree the recommendation: A Vedi**

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated: 07/06/2023………………………………..

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: …………………………

|  |
| --- |
| **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**

U0079232 Composite Informative

U0079233 NPPF APPROVAL - Para. 38-42