

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 23/3232/FUL

**Address:** 84 Lower Mortlake Road Richmond TW9 2HS

**Proposal:** Change of use of building from Class E 'Commercial, Business and Service' to Class C3 'Residential' together with rooftop alterations and extensions to provide 21 no. residential properties. Refurbishment of facade, to include the installation of balconies together with associated amenities, parking and landscaping.

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mr. Brett Ray

**Address:** 20 Sheendale Road Richmond TW9 2JJ

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Object to the proposal

**Comment:** We object to the proposal on several fronts.

The proposal balconies and rear facing windows will negatively affect the privacy and gardens of Sheendale Road.

Furthermore, Sheendale Road and Crofton terrace are within a conservation area, which you (local authority) have demonstrated in recent decisions you wish to preserve the features of.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCA), in respect of development affecting CAs, states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and/or appearance of the area. These plans contravene this.

The current office is sited to the end of eighteenth and early nineteenth century villas that front Sheendale Road to which Crofton terrace is part of and are also considered to be Buildings of Townscape Merit, or non-designated heritage assets in line with Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

In undertaking development, the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy LP1 lists a number of design principles in order to ensure development respects, contributes to and enhances the local environment and character, such as consideration around compatibility with existing character; development patterns, views, local grain, scale; height, layout, siting, heritage assets and natural features, amongst others. LP Policy LP3 is related to heritage assets and seeks to conserve and enhance heritage assets, with development within CAs required to preserve and where possible

enhance the character or appearance of the CA. LP Policy LP4 applies specifically to non-designated heritage assets and seeks to preserve and where possible enhance their significance and character. Again this fails to deliver.

Most importantly, we have been provided written evidence that planning and the local authority do not support working from home in the Sheendale Road area, this is evidence by rejection to amendments to our garage facing Crofton terrace, one of the reasons being that other resolutions can be sought by office space.

While we oppose turning the offices into residential, we support the office owners in providing a we work space which would be very popular in the area considering the new development of several hundred flats to be granted on the Homebase site in the near future.

Taking the above into account, the proposed scheme would be contrary to LP Policies LP1, LP3 and LP4. Consequently,

and although

serious, the proposed scheme would cause 'substantial harm' to the significance of the CA within the meaning of the term in paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Paragraph 200 of the Framework states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 202 of the Framework requires that, where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

The public benefit here would be to encourage the office owners to provide office space for today's uses.