

Application reference: 24/0813/HOT SOUTH RICHMOND WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
28.03.2024	03.04.2024	29.05.2024	29.05.2024

Site:

15 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS,

Proposal:

Replacement of existing garage door and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation. Single story rear extension. Installation of a new rear dormer at first floor level, over existing garage.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Neil McFerran
15 Floyer Close
Richmond
Richmond Upon Thames
TW10 6HS
United Kingdom

AGENT NAME

Mr Mark Donnelly
3, Lion Yard, Tremadoc Rd,
London
SW4 7NQ
United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on and posted on and due to expire on

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRUT Transport

Expiry Date

17.04.2024

Neighbours:

149 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6HF, - 03.04.2024
11 Queens Crescent, Richmond, TW10 6HG, - 03.04.2024
24 Queens Crescent, Richmond, TW10 6HG, - 03.04.2024
28 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
16 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
13 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
12 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
11 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
10 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
9 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
7 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
6 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
5 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
4 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
3 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
2 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
1 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
8 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024
14 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS, - 03.04.2024

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

Development Management

Status: PCO

Application: 24/0813/HOT

Date:

Replacement of existing garage door and conversion of garage to habitable

accommodation. Single story rear extension. Installation of a new rear dormer at first floor level, over existing garage.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 11.04.2003

40 new build (application was amended on 27 April 2004 to reflect change from 39 new build to 40 new build)

Reference: 03/0820/AI

Application Number	24/0813/HOT
Address	15 Floyer Close, Richmond, TW10 6HS
Proposal	Replacement of existing garage door and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation. Single story rear extension. Installation of a new rear dormer at first floor level, over existing garage.
Contact Officer	Izabela Moorhouse
Target Determination Date	29/05/2024

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

The subject site comprises an end of terrace house, of a row of 3, located within the cul-de-sac of Floyer Close. The building is not identified as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) and is not designated within a conservation area.

The application site is situated within Richmond and Richmond Hill Village and is designated as:

- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Higher)
- Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency (Richmond Town Centre and Mortlake [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_004
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 100 chance
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance
- Throughflow Catchment Area (Throughflow and Groundwater Policy Zone
- Queens Road (west side) Village Character Area

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises the "Replacement of existing garage door and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation. Single story rear extension. Installation of a new rear dormer at first floor level, over existing garage."

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above, however the most relevant planning history is as follows:

02/1124 – Demolition of existing school buildings and erection of five five bedroom houses with integral double garages, two four bedroom houses with integral double garages, four three bedroom houses with parking space, four two bedroom houses – **Granted**.

It is noted that Condition T18183 of this planning permission removes all permitted development rights to the residential dwellings.

No restrictions have been placed on the private garages.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of representation were received.

Neighbour amenity considerations are assessed under Section 6 (impact on neighbour amenity) in the report below.

AMENDMENTS

The scheme was amended following officer comment. The first floor extension over the existing garage was set back in order to achieve a subservient form of development rather than the extension being read as an additional floor. Neighbours were not reconsulted as the amendment did not constitute a material change to the application.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 11. Making effective use of land
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D12 Fire Safety

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 Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
Impact on Trees, Woodland and Landscape	LP16	Yes	No
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	No
Sustainable Travel Choices	LP44	Yes	No
Parking Standards and Servicing	LP45	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf

Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version)

The Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) was published on 9 June 2023 for public consultation which ended on 24 July 2023.

The Publication Version Local Plan, together with all the representations received during the representation period, the plan and its supporting documents were submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 19 January 2024. The submission documents do not form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough, however, by publishing and submitting the Borough Local Plan for independent examination the Council has formally confirmed its intention to adopt the Publication Plan.

The Publication Version Local Plan, including its evidence base, are material considerations for decision-making. 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 Borough Local Plan to be sound and legally compliant, officers and Councillors should accord relevant policies and allocations significant weight in the determination of applications taking account of the extent to

Officer Planning Report – Application 24/0813/HOT Page 4 of 8

which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. Therefore, the weight afforded to each policy at this stage will differ depending on the level and type of representation to that policy. This is addressed in more detail in the assessment below where it is relevant to the application.

Note that it was agreed by Full Council on 27 April, when the Publication Plan was approved, that no weight will be given to Policy 4 in relation to the increased carbon offset rate, and therefore the existing rate of £95 will continue to be used; in addition, no weight will be given to Policy 39 in relation to the 20% biodiversity net gain requirement; all other aspects and requirements of these policies will apply.

Issue	Publication Plan Policy	Local	Compliance
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Trees, Woodland and Landscape	42	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No
Sustainable travel choices, Vehicular Parking, Cycle Parking, Servicing and Construction Logistics Management	47, 48	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Quality
House Extension and External Alterations
Transport
Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance

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

Other Local Strategies or Publications

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are:
Community Infrastructure Levy

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and visual amenity
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Trees
- iv Flood Risk
- v Transport
- vi Fire Safety

i Design and visual amenity

Policy LP1 states that the Council will require all development to be of a 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. Development proposals will have to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance, and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces, and the local area. Development must respect, contribute to, and enhance the local environment and character.

Conversion of garage to habitable accommodation

The proposal seeks permission for the conversion of the existing garage into a habitable space, removing the existing garage door and replacement with two windows and a door with timber finishes in order to serve the space. The conversion of garages into habitable rooms has been granted permission for nos. 22, 24, 29 and 30 in the past. Excluding no. 24, no changes were made to the external appearance of the properties.

Although the proposed alteration will be visible from the streetscape and is not similar to the surrounding houses, it would not appear unduly out of character for the area. The proposed scheme is considered acceptable in terms of design visual/amenity and is not considered to demonstrably impact the character of the cul-de-sac.

Single story rear extension

The proposal seeks permission to demolish the existing conservatory and construct a flat roof, single storey rear extension across the length of the property, including the converted garage, and to the rear of the garage owned by no. 16 which adjoins the application site. The extension would be formed in brick and roof tiles to match the existing dwelling. The roof of the extension would not exceed the eaves of the first-floor rear windows and would therefore maintain subservience to the main dwelling. In terms of depth, the proposals are approximately 0.5m greater in depth than the existing conservatory. In terms of the immediate locality, full length rear extensions are a common feature and therefore the extension would not appear unduly out of character.

A set of sliding doors, a single aluminium framed door and two large rooflights are proposed. The fenestration design is considered acceptable as it retains verticality and a satisfactory window hierarchy. The brick used reflects that of the existing dwelling and the aluminium doors demonstrate the extension is a modern counterpart to the existing dwelling. The extension would not adversely impact the character of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.

First floor rear dormer over existing garage

A rear dormer is proposed to the roof of the garage which is of modest scale. Although it is not set down from the ridge or noticeably up from the eaves, the height of the garage roof is acknowledged limiting the ability for such set ins. Matching roof tiles are proposed. The fenestration is appropriately sized and although matching windows to those existing would be preferred, it is not required. The windows are of a similar design to those on the lower floors and are sympathetically sized. The windows are considered acceptable and complimentary when viewed holistically as part of the proposed development, retaining verticality and a satisfactory window hierarchy. The depth is set back modestly from the main first floor rear elevation to ensure a sense of subservience with the dormer to read as an addition to the garage roof.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Local Plan and policy 28 of the Publication Local Plan as supported by the Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance.

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.

The site is adjoined by no. 16 to the west and the block of flats housing 1-14 to the east.

Conversion of garage to habitable accommodation

The proposed replacement windows and door are north facing onto public views, at ground floor level. The proposal would have a neutral impact on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings. The property would remain solely in residential use as a result of the proposal. An undue increase in noise or pollution would not occur as a result of the proposal.

Single story rear extension

The council SPD states that rear extensions “should project no further than 3m in the case of a terraced dwellinghouse” in order to prevent a negative impact on neighbour amenity. The proposed rear extension extends 2.5m beyond the rear elevation on the southern boundary and 3m in height, which is considered SPD compliant. It is not considered that the extension will appear visually intrusive or overbearing from neighbouring habitable room windows or rear amenity spaces. The height of these elements, their siting and relationship with neighbouring properties is such that it passes the BRE test.

First floor rear dormer over existing garage

Given distance from the common boundaries, the additional bulk and mass and fenestration at roof level is

not considered to result in unreasonable levels of enclosure and loss of light when compared to the existing. When viewed in the context of the existing side elevation facing the block of flats, the scheme would not decrease the level of outlook experienced by the residents of the ground floor flat to the extent that would warrant reason for refusal. The scheme is not considered to be visually intrusive to the extent that would be materially harmful in the context of the existing arrangement.

Given the nature and siting of the proposal away from the boundary with no. 16, the additional bulk and mass and fenestration at first floor level would result in any impact to neighbour amenity.

The changes to the fenestration to the front elevation, given siting and materiality, would not impact the surrounding residents. No harm arises to loss of privacy from rear facing fenestration given existing levels of mutual overlooking.

As such, the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of the Local Plan policies LP8 and policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan and with the requirements of the adopted Development Control for Noise Generating and Noise Sensitive Development SPD.

iii Trees

Policies LP15 and LP16 seek to protect biodiversity and health and longevity of trees, woodland and landscape in the borough. Local Plan policy LP16, subsection 5 requires;

"That trees are adequately protected throughout the course of development, in accordance with British Standard 5837 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, Recommendations (2012)."

There are no trees in the surrounding area that would be affected by the proposals. Therefore, the proposals are compliant with Local Plan policy LP16 and relevant SPDs.

iv Flood Risk

Policy LP21 states that all development should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, taking account of climate change and without flood risk elsewhere.

A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted to the Council – received 14/05/2023.

The site is located within various other flood risk constraints, as listed in the first section. The proposals include a modest increase in floorspace, and the ground floor internal finished floor levels will remain at the existing level. As such, it is not considered that any additional risk to flooding would arise, thus the proposal complies with policy LP21.

v Transport

Policy LP45 requires the provision for accommodation of vehicles in order to provide for the needs of the development whilst minimising the impact on car-based travel.

A number of properties along Floyer Close have undertaken garage conversion. The proposal would result in the loss of one on-site parking space. However, the site benefits from an off-street car parking space which complies with the London and Local Plan policy requirements and there are good transport links nearby. Therefore, no objection is raised to the proposal.

vi Fire Safety

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

A Fire Safety Strategy has been submitted to the council – received 28/03/2024.

A condition has been included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. 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.

Grant planning permission

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.

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / ~~NO~~

I therefore recommend the following:

- | | | |
|----|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | REFUSAL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | PERMISSION | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | FORWARD TO COMMITTEE | <input type="checkbox"/> |

This application is CIL liable	<input type="checkbox"/> YES*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
	(*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)	

This application requires a Legal Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> YES*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
	(*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)	

This application has representations online (which are not on the file)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------

This application has representations on file	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO
----------------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------------

Case Officer (Initials):IZM.....	Dated:21/05/2024.....
----------------------------------------	-----------------------------

I agree the recommendation:

South Area Team Manager:ND.....

Dated:21.05.2024.....