



**Application reference: 24/1454/FUL
 SOUTH RICHMOND WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
07.06.2024	07.06.2024	02.08.2024	02.08.2024

Site:
 58 Rosemont Road, Richmond, TW10 6QL,

Proposal:
 Raise part of ridge by 1.3m. Alterations to front elevation fenestration.

APPLICANT NAME
 Mr Rory Beaton
 58 Rosemeont Road
 Richmond
 Surrey
 TW10 6QL
 UK

AGENT NAME
 Miss Caroline Speight
 20 York Avenue
 London
 SW14 7LG
 United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on 02.07.2024 and posted on 12.07.2024 and due to expire on 02.08.2024

Consultations:
Internal/External:
Consultee
14D Urban D

Expiry Date
16.07.2024

Neighbours:

- 39 Rosemont Road, Richmond, TW10 6QN, - 02.07.2024
- 41 Rosemont Road, Richmond, TW10 6QN, - 02.07.2024
- 43 Rosemont Road, Richmond, TW10 6QN, - 02.07.2024
- 45 Rosemont Road, Richmond, TW10 6QN, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 3,9 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Ground Floor Flat,9 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Garden Flat,9 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 2,9 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 1,9 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- 11 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- 15 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 7,13 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 8,13 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 5 And 6,13 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 4,13 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 3,13 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 2,13 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- Flat 1,13 Queens Road, Richmond, TW10 6JW, - 02.07.2024
- 60 Rosemont Road, Richmond, TW10 6QL, - 02.07.2024
- 56 Rosemont Road, Richmond, TW10 6QL, - 02.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:95/T1017/CA
Date:01/05/1995 Eucalyptus Tree - Reduce Size By One Third

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:97/T7929
Date:23/01/1998 Eucalyptus - Fell And Remove

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:76/0176
Date:24/09/1976 Erection of two semi-detached dwelling houses and provision of turning head.

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:11/T0082/TCA
Date:08/03/2011 T1 - Punus Pissardii - Fell

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:17/T0315/TCA
Date:20/06/2017 T1 - False Acacia - Removal of the lowest lateral limb over neighbouring property. T2 - Purple Leaf Plum - Removal of all large diameter dead wood, thin out epicormic growth and lightly reduce by 1-2m in order to re-shape the crown. T3 - Purple Leaf Plum - Removal of the dead left hand trunk, back to main union and reduce the remaining trunk by 2-3m in order to lessen branch end weight and re-balance.

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:21/T0306/TCA
Date:21/04/2021 5 DAY DANGEROUS TREE NOTICE to fell a dead silver birch in the back garden

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:23/T0330/TCA
Date:24/05/2023 T1 - Plum, Fell because tree is dangerous and dying, it has large amounts of deadwood over the neighbouring driveway.

Development Management

Status: REF Application:23/1946/HOT
Date:11/09/2023 Demolition of the existing porch and redesign, remodelling of the front elevation including Ground, First and Second floor extensions that overlap in the middle of the front and present a small wraparound roof above the front door, new windows and doors. An aluminum pergola 3m tall is also proposed at the front forming a porch area.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:24/1454/FUL
Date: Raise part of ridge by 1.3m. Alterations to front elevation fenestration.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:24/1455/FUL
Date: Single storey rear extension, external steps to garden level, install air-conditioning unit to side of property. Alterations to rear elevation fenestration. Make good existing timber cladding.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 01.08.2009 Main or Supplementary Equipotential Bonding House Dwelling
New Consumer Unit Fitted in a Existing Dwelling House Dwelling
Reference: 09/NAP00189/NAPIT

Building Control

Deposit Date: 10.07.2014 Install a gas-fired boiler
Reference: 20/FEN02833/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 07.05.2023 Install a gas fire
Reference: 23/FEN01933/GASAFE

Application Number	24/1454/FUL
Address	58 Rosemont Road Richmond TW10 6QL
Proposal	Raise part of ridge by 1.3m. Alterations to front elevation fenestration.
Contact Officer	Jeremy Maclsaac

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 has 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 is taking into account 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

58 Rosemont Road is a 1970s detached house within the St Matthias Conservation Area. It is a three-storey 'shed-style' building constructed in stock brick with timber cladding and slate roofs. The built form of no.58 is characterised by its boxy form with asymmetric mono-pitched roofs of different heights and sizes with minimal overhangs. The front elevation comprises several of these, sitting beneath a large expanse of timber cladding which forms the face of the main mono-pitched roof. This has resulted in a distinct architectural style and characteristic features.

No.58 forms a pair with no.60 and are situated at the southern end of Rosemont Road. Alongside no.45 (of similar date and construction) they form a small, distinctive group of late 20th century houses in contrast with the 19th century villas which otherwise characterise Rosemont Road.

The application site is designated as:

Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Community Infrastructure Levy Band	Higher
Conservation Area	CA30 St Matthias Richmond
Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency	Richmond Town Centre and Mortlake [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_004 /
Take Away Management Zone	Take Away Management Zone
Throughflow Catchment Area (Throughflow and Groundwater Policy Zone)	Adopted: October 2020 , Contact: Local Plan Team
Village	Richmond and Richmond Hill Village
Village Character Area	St Matthias - Area 11 & Conservation Area 30 Richmond & Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance Page 40 CHARAREA06/11/01
Ward	South Richmond Ward

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Raise part of ridge by 1.3m. Alterations to front elevation fenestration.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above however the most relevant planning

history is as follows:

23/1946/HOT – Refused Permission

Demolition of the existing porch and redesign, remodelling of the front elevation including Ground, First and Second floor extensions that overlap in the middle of the front and present a small wraparound roof above the front door, new windows and doors. An aluminum pergola 3m tall is also proposed at the front forming a porch area.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of representation were received.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 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
- 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
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	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 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 Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Designated heritage assets	29	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Quality
House Extension and External Alterations
Residential Development Standards
Village Plan – Richmond and Richmond Hill Village

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:
St Matthias Conservation Area Statement
St Matthias Conservation Area Study

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 Flood Risk
- iv Fire Safety

i Design and impact on heritage assets

Policy LP 1 of the Local Plan 2018 covers Local Character and Design Quality. This policy states the Council will require all development to be of 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.

Policy LP3 of the Local Plan 2018 covers Designated Heritage Assets. This policy states that proposals should conserve and take opportunity to make positive contribution to the historic environment such as retaining and preserving the original structure, layout, architectural features and materials or reinstatement of heritage assets. Appropriate materials and techniques should be used. There is a requirement to seek to avoid harm or justify for loss and demolition will be resisted. The significance of the asset is taken into consideration when assessing works proposed to a designated heritage asset.

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.

This application is for the upward extension of one of the elements on the front elevation, and replacement of all windows/glazed doors to the front elevation.

This application follows on from refused application 23/1946/HOT.

No objections are raised regarding the proposed works. The upward extension of the front element would be a moderate alteration which would retain its overall form. Although it would result in an increase of bulk and mass to the front, it is considered that it would remain in scale with the main building and would not dominate the front elevation. The use of matching materials would ensure that the upward extension integrated visually with the main building.

The proposed windows are acceptable. They would be in timber to match the existing and it should also be ensured that they are the same colour to preserve the appearance of no.58. The proposed alteration to the glazing of the front conservatory is acceptable and would be a modest variation. No harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a result of the proposed works.

This application is in accordance with policies LP1 and LP3. It also conforms to paragraph 205 of the NPPF (2023).

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 4m in depth for a detached 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.

56 Rosemont Road

To the west of the site, is No. 56 Rosemont which is part of a semi-detached pair. The proposal includes a second floor window facing this property. It is considered necessary to secure a condition to require this window to be obscure glazed. The eastern elevation of this neighbouring property does not contain any windows associated with habitable rooms facing the subject dwelling. Because of this, no issues are foreseen with regards to overlooking or visual intrusion with this neighbour.

Therefore, as there is no depth added to the subject and a 1.3m increase in roof height, the proposal would not be unreasonably visually intrusive or overbearing, nor would it result in an unreasonable loss of light or loss of privacy.

60 Rosemont Road

To the east of the site is No. 60 Rosemont Road, which is a detached dwelling, similar to the subject dwelling. The western elevation of this neighbouring property does not contain any windows associated with habitable rooms facing the subject dwelling with the exception of a double door set which is well setback within their neighbouring site. Given that these windows face this neighbouring dwelling, if this application was considered acceptable it would be considered necessary to secure a condition to require these windows to have obscure glazing and be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the room. This is to ensure that the windows would not be harmful to the occupiers of this neighbouring dwelling.

Therefore, as there is no depth added to the subject and a 1.3m increase in roof height, the proposal would not be unreasonably visually intrusive or overbearing, nor would it result in an unreasonable loss of light or loss of privacy.

In view of the above, the proposal meets with the aims and objectives of policies LP8 of the Local Plan 2018.

iii Flood Risk

Policy LP 21 of the Local Plan 2018 states all developments should avoid or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

The application site is located within a Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency and Throughflow Catchment Area. The proposed drawings demonstrate that the proposed floor levels will not be set lower than the existing, and as the site is within flood zone 1 no material impact on local flood conditions is anticipated.

In view of the above, the proposal will meet the aims and objectives of Policy 21 of the Local Plan 2018.

iv Fire Safety

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

A Fire Safety Statement was received by the Council. The applicant is advised that the proposal

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 proposal is considered to be compliant with London Plan policy D12.

Issue ix - Biodiversity

Biodiversity net gain became mandatory for minor developments on applications made from 2nd April 2024. This application is exempt from mandatory biodiversity net gain on the grounds that:

- The application was made before 2nd April 2024
- The development impacts habitat of an area below a 'de minimis' threshold of 25m2 or 5m of linear habitat such as hedgerows, and does not impact an onsite priority habitat
- The development is for a small scale self-build or custom house building

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/~~NO~~

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
(which are not on the file)

YES

NO

This application has representations on file

YES

NO

Case Officer (Initials):JMA.....

Dated:31.07.2024.....

I agree the recommendation:



~~Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner~~

Dated: ...31/07/2024.....

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: