



## **Planning Committee 6th December 2023**

### **Addendum**

The Addendum details amendments made to the agenda reports since their publication. It may include corrections to the report, additional information (such as extra informatives and conditions) and late correspondence received in relation to the agenda items.

#### **22/1029/FUL - Kingston Bridge House, Church Grove, Hampton Wick, Kingston Upon Thames KT1 4AG - Pages 13 - 158**

##### **Additional Condition**

##### **Heating and Cooling**

The development hereby approved shall at all times be constructed and operated so as to accord with the recommendations in the Building Regulations Part O Overheating Risk, Thermal Model CIBSE TM59:2017 Report Ref QD2069 -01 prepared by Queensberry Design Ltd Engineering, Sustainability & Architectural Consultants dated March 2023.

REASON: To ensure that the development does not overheat and achieves adequate ventilation in line with Building Regulations (2010) Part O of Schedule 1 (as amended).

##### **Window obscure glazed - No openable**

The proposed first, second and third floor window(s) in the north-west elevation(s) of the 4-storey building(s) hereby approved shall at no time be openable or glazed, otherwise than in obscured glass, below a minimum height of 1.7 metres (5'7") above the relevant floor level.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

##### **Parking/Loading/Turning**

No building/dwelling/part of the development shall be occupied until the 21 parking bays indicated on Drawing No. FLU.1191.3.10 Rev S has been constructed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and shall at no time be used other than by occupiers/callers to the premises and for no other purpose.

REASON: To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the free flow of traffic, the conditions of general safety along the neighbouring highway or the amenities of the area.

**Amended Condition**

**Parking for People with Disabilities**

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved details shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that demonstrate that the 7 M4(3) accessible car parking bays have been provided as shown on the approved drawings and that these bays shall be managed such that they are solely available to the occupants of the 7 wheelchair accessible residential units M4(3).

REASON: To ensure the provision of a satisfactory and convenient form of development for people with disabilities

**Late Correspondence**

An objection was submitted to Councillor Jonathan Cardy following the completion of the Committee Report on 04 Dec 2023 on this proposal. This is summarised below.

Objection	Officer Comment
<p>Car parking: We all know that there is severe pressure on parking in Hampton Wick. The matter discussed at length at the August Planning Committee meeting regarding The Firs in Hampton Wick. On that occasion, the Planning Committee, along with the sadly departed Cllr Elengorn were unanimously sympathetic to the concerns of existing Hampton Wick residents (thank you for that).</p> <p>The impact of the KBH development on parking in Hampton Wick will obviously dwarf that of The Firs. There never was enough parking provision (32 spaces for 74 dwellings) but the developer is planning on REDUCING the amount of parking to 21. This is highly objectionable. Even if the developer can't provide sufficient parking for all the flats, please at least don't actually reduce the number of spaces to compound this situation.</p> <p>I hear someone saying that the residents of KBH won't be allowed to buy CPZ permits. That's all very well but there will still inevitably be increased pressure on Hampton Wick parking as many if not all of the new KBH residents will of course have cars and will take up</p>	<p>Car parking is in line with the London Plan (2021) Policy T6 and Table 10.3 (which is an upward target). The proposal does not contribute towards car parking stress in the locality as all occupants of the 70 units will be restricted from obtaining car parking permits. This will be secured by a legal agreement.</p>

<p>CPZ spaces, even if only outside the hours of operation e.g. after 6.30pm.</p> <p>However, if the developer and the planning officials really do think that refusing parking permits will deter new residents from having cars, then why stop at reducing onsite parking from 32 to 21 spaces? Why not get rid of even more onsite parking and use the extra area for some much-needed affordable housing instead of the paltry four units in this application? It feels very much as though this developer wants to have its cake and eat it too.</p> <p>Let's not undo all that good work achieved on the parking issue by the Planning Committee (including Cllr Elengorn) at the September meeting.</p>	
--	--

One objection was also received by the Hampton Wick Association on 16 Nov 2023. This is summarised below:

<p>Hampton Wick Association</p> <p>Winter gardens: The latest revision to the elevations of Kingston Bridge House, in a 1970's revival style with period embellishments, are seriously flawed to the extent as to be misleading. We therefore object to these proposals. The CGIs, submitted 12 Sept 23, show 'winter gardens' as recessed balconies (i.e., a protected semi-outdoor amenity space) with single full height and width glazing closing them off facing the Hampton Court Road. This elevation faces south-west, and such internal spaces would be rendered uninhabitable because of the very substantial heat gain this results in, even if air-conditioning was used. The applicants M&amp;E Engineer will confirm this. In practice winter gardens in such locations typically incorporate some form of opening such as oversized louvre glazing. Architects such as Ian Simpson have worked on such details for many years (architect of One</p>	<p>The balconies were removed from the units along Hampton Court Road as existing levels of NO<sub>2</sub> (nitrogen dioxide) along this elevation are above Defra guidelines of 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (micrograms per cubic meter of air). The removal of the balconies was a measure advised by the Council's Air Quality Officer. Glazed frontages are not uncommon in buildings. It is not acceptable to knowingly subject future occupants to NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations of 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> or above.</p> <p>The applicant provided an Overheating Risk. Thermal; Model CIBSE TM59:2017 Report. This report also covers ventilation. The report was accompanied by the Zehnder AID100 fan specification.</p> <p>Additionally, Appendix 8 of the Sustainability &amp; Energy Statement by Blue Sky Limited contains the Good</p>
--	---

<p>Blackfriars and the Beetham Tower Manchester, for example, all with winter gardens). The point is that the designers will need to radically change the appearance of this elevation from that currently shown to make the scheme work. It cannot be built as shown. To leave the images as they would be misleading to the extent they are not appropriate for an application. They should be amended, following advice from their engineers, to show something that can be built.</p>	<p>Homes Alliance (GHA) Early Stage Overheating Risk Tool assessment.</p> <p>The above documents were independently reviewed by Climate Integrated Solutions, the Council's sustainability advisors on this application. They supported the applicant's strategy and have advised us that it meets the Cooling Hierarchy/Overheating Criteria.</p>
---	--

An additional two objections were received online on the 04 Dec 2023. These are summarised below:

Objections	
<p>Car parking: Parking in Hampton Wick is an issue of great concern to residents. Parking surveys carried out recently show that there is already almost 100% take-up of parking spaces at most times of the day and night. With 70 flats in this design, there is simply insufficient space on the borough's roads to provide more residents' spaces. With new developments being built, it is clear that there has to be a stop to all new parking permits.</p>	<p>Car parking is in line with the London Plan (2021) Policy T6 and Table 10.3 (which is an upward target). The proposal does not contribute towards car parking stress in the locality as all occupants of the 70 units will be restricted from obtaining car parking permits. This will be secured by a legal agreement.</p>
<p>Car parking: We all know that there is severe pressure on parking in Hampton Wick. The matter discussed at length at the September Planning Committee meeting regarding The Firs in Hampton Wick. On that occasion, the Planning Committee, along with the sadly departed Cllr Elengorn were unanimously sympathetic to the concerns of existing Hampton Wick residents (thank you for that). The impact of the KBH development on parking in Hampton Wick will obviously dwarf that of The Firs. There never was enough parking provision (32 spaces for 74 dwellings) but the developer is planning on REDUCING the amount of parking to 21. This is highly objectionable. Even if the developer</p>	<p>As above.</p>

<p>can't provide sufficient parking for all the flats, please at least don't actually reduce the number of spaces to compound this situation. I hear someone saying that the residents of KBH won't be allowed to buy CPZ permits. That's all very well but there will still inevitably be increased pressure on Hampton Wick parking as many if not all of the new KKBH residents will of course have cars and will take up CPZ spaces, even if only outside the hours of operation e.g. after 6.30pm. However, if the developer and the planning officials really do think that refusing parking permits will deter new residents from having cars, then why stop at reducing onsite parking from 32 to 21 spaces? Why not get rid of even more onsite parking and use the extra area for some much-needed affordable housing instead of the paltry four units in this application? It feels very much as though this developer wants to have its cake and eat it too. Let's not undo all that good work achieved on this issue by the Planning Committee (including Cllr Elengorn) at the September meeting.</p>	
<p>Balconies: The balconies alone are designed to occupy very prominent positions despite being no more useful than for storing bikes, toys and wet washing.</p>	<p>London Plan (2021), the Council's current Local Plan (2018) and Emerging Local Plan (2023) do not contain design policies restricting balconies. The clear glazed balconies are acceptable against the Council's Local Plan (2018) Policy LP1 and Emerging Local Plan Policy 28.</p>
<p>Design: The design of this proposed development does not seem to be visually appropriate for this imposing position facing parks and the bridge. It does not seem possible that the developer was unable to produce a more suitable design, with architectural merit, than this poor mismatch of styles.</p>	<p>London Plan (2021), the Council's current Local Plan (2018) and Emerging Local Plan (2023) are not prescriptive on any architectural style. The proposal would retain its existing silhouette and the quality of materials and external finishes would be improved. It is considered that the development would comply with the London Plan Policies, in particular D3 and D11 and Local Plan design Policies LP1, LP2, LP39 and Emerging Local Plan Policy 28.</p>

<p>Affordable housing: I am objecting to the desire of the developer to avoid providing affordable units - with such an appalling shortage of rental properties in the borough, every effort should be made to make developers meet the provision for this type of housing.</p>	<p>The Council is advised by our external viability assessors that the application would provide the maximum viable amount of affordable homes (4 x social rent units). This will be subject to an early and late-stage review within the legal agreement to accompany this application. On the basis of the above, the application adequately complies with Local Plan (2018) Policy LP36 and Emerging Local Plan (2023) Policy 11.</p>
---	--

### Briefing Note by Westcombe Developments

A briefing note was prepared by Westcombe Developments dated 06.12.2023. This was circulated to Councillors by the planning agents. A summary of its contents is set out below:

- On Wednesday 6 December members of the planning committee will discuss our proposals for Kingston Bridge House in Hampton Wick. We propose to refurbish and redesign the derelict and dilapidated student accommodation building into 70 new homes. The application is recommended for approval.
- Crucially, our proposed development does not alter the height and massing of the existing structure. The proposal has seen a significant level of support from the local community.
- In addition to providing new social rent affordable housing - with early and late-stage reviews to ensure the maximum possible quantum of affordable - there will be significant improvements to biodiversity, landscaping and access.
- Images showing the current building and CGIs of after the development have been provided.
- Derelict, hazardous, and unneeded student accommodation revitalised into much-needed family flats of various sizes.
- Low carbon heating through the use of Air Source Heat Pumps.
- 181% Biodiversity net gain due to the inclusion of a green biodiversity roof.
- High quality refurbishment and transformation of the existing structure using materials complementary to the surrounding conservation area and heritage assets.
- Significant improvements to the biodiversity and landscaping of the site and surrounding area, including the planting of 16 new trees.

The agent's briefing note sets out that there were 53 letters of support and only 12 objections received. The Council would make a correction/clarification on this point. A total of 15 objectives have been received (including those late objections summarised above). Of these 10 were received from third parties (incorporating multiple responses from the same address). Additionally, 2 objections were received from the Hampton Wick Neighbour Association and one objection was received from the Kingston Town Neighbourhood Conservation Advisory Committee.

The individual comments which were stated to be extracts from the letters of support in the agent's briefing statement are not accepted. These are set out in the table below.

More homes are needed.
I feel that it is incredibly important that it is revitalised into something useful, such as housing rather than unneeded commercial.
The houses are much needed amenity for the local area with the shortage of suitable living accommodation in the area.
Creating more new homes will help the local businesses, and most of them are family businesses.
We need homes! This development would improve the appearance of this very shabby corner.
We believe that the residential block will help increase our customers and revenue.
Would like to support because more customers for local traders.
Considering the block won't be increased in size and parking permits won't be issued, I have no problem with the development.

The letters of support actually received, do cover the themes of welcoming new homes, improvements to an unattractive empty building. They also refer to the fact that future residents will not be able to apply for CPZ parking permits. However, Council Officers have not been able to identify any letters of support referring to the economic benefits of the proposal upon local traders and businesses. Additionally, the letters of support do not appear to reflect the wording in the table above.

## **TPO T1187: 14 Avenue Gardens, Teddington**

### **Late Correspondence**

A comment supporting the TPO was submitted to the council following the completion of the Committee Report on 04 Dec 2023 on this proposal, summarised below:

Comment	Officer Comment
The owner has now erected two buildings in his back garden, overcoming the owner's objection regarding loss of space.	The objection could apply broadly to site where development is proposed; intended development is not a suitable reason not to serve a TPO.
"This tree is one of only three left from the grounds of Bushy Park Lodge that used to own all the ground between Park Road and Avenue Gardens. The rear entrance to this old property is now the access lane to the garages for the	The comments support that the tree provides amenity.

<p>houses on Park Road, and there was once a line of trees of which this is one. All three of these trees are visible from my property. It also supports squirrels and birds.”</p>	
<p>The council have said that this is "a mature specimen with good form and character" therefore the objection that the tree presents a risk is invalid.</p>	<p>No evidence of defective condition has been provided to the council. Offers by the council of a site meeting to discuss the owner's objection were not taken up.</p>
<p>Trees enhance rather than reduce property value.</p>	<p>There is some research to support this view.</p>
<p><i>The tree causes loss of light.</i> It is at the bottom of the garden.</p>	<p>The relationship between the tree and the property is considered reasonable.</p>
<p><i>The tree drops needles.</i> It's a tree. They all drop leaves and needles.</p>	<p>Season nuisance is not considered sufficient to justify revoking the TPO. These issues can be addressed through normal maintenance of the property</p>
<p><i>The tree presents a subsidence risk.</i> It is far enough away from adjoining properties to present no risk.</p>	<p>Research found the maximum distance from pine trees for recorded subsidence damage was 9 meters. Subsidence requires the presence of shrinkable clay soil; the site is on superficial deposits of non-shrinkable Kempton Park Gravel Member</p>