



PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by
Jasmine Loftus on 10 July 2024

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE

Application reference: 24/1585/HOT
MORTLAKE AND BARNES COMMON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
24.06.2024	27.06.2024	22.08.2024	22.08.2024

Site:

2 Worple Street, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HE

Proposal:

Single storey rear and side infill extension. Change front door to solid panel door. Replace existing front parapet Fletton brick wall with reclaimed old brick to match existing house brick to same height.

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Robert Russell
2 Worple Street
Mortlake
LONDON
SW14 8HE
United Kingdom

AGENT NAME

DC Site Notice: printed on 29.06.2024 and posted on 05.07.2024 and due to expire on 26.07.2024

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

14D Urban D

Expiry Date

13.07.2024

Neighbours:

- The Presbytery,61 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PR, - 29.06.2024
- Church Hall (St Mary Magdalene Church),North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PR, - 29.06.2024
- 58 North Worple Way,Mortlake,London,SW14 8PS, - 29.06.2024
- 3 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 29.06.2024
- 1 Ripley Gardens,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HF, - 29.06.2024
- 3 Worple Street,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HE, - 29.06.2024
- 1 Worple Street,Mortlake,London,SW14 8HE, - 29.06.2024

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

Development Management

Status: PDE

Application:24/1585/HOT

Date: Single storey rear and side infill extension. Change front door to solid panel door. Replace existing front parapet Fletton brick wall with reclaimed old brick to match existing house brick to same height.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 26.10.2017 Install a replacement consumer unit
Reference: 17/NIC02184/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 13.10.2022 Flat
Reference: 23/NFR00021/NFRCCR

Building Control

Deposit Date: 21.06.2024 Single storey infill extension and partial or complete removal of five load bearing walls. Removal of two redundant chimney breasts .
Reference: 24/0756/IN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.10.2022 Singleply
Reference: 24/NFR00571/NFRCCR

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.10.2022 Singleply
Reference: 24/NFR00577/NFRCCR

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.10.2022 Singleply
Reference: 24/NFR00600/NFRCCR

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.10.2022 Singleply
Reference: 24/NFR00606/NFRCCR

Application Number	24/1585/HOT
Address	2 Worples Street Mortlake London SW14 8HE
Proposal	Single storey rear and side infill extension. Change front door to solid panel door. Replace existing front parapet Fletton brick wall with reclaimed old brick to match existing house brick to same height.
Contact Officer	Jasmine Loftus
Target Determination Date	22.08.2024

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 property is a two-storey end of terraced property built in the Victorian period. It is finished in stock brick with red brick lintels around fenestration and a recessed porch. To the rear is a two-storey outrigger and ground floor extension. Similar properties adjoining.

The site is opposite St Mary Magdalene's RC Church, and located within the Mortlake Conservation Area. The building is not listed or locally listed.

The application site is situated within Mortlake Village and is designated as:

- Archaeological Priority
- Area Benefiting Flood Defence
- Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flood
- Mortlake Conservation Area
- Critical Drainage Area
- Flood zone 2
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water
- Mortlake character area
- Mortlake and Barnes Common Ward

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Permission is sought for the following works:

Front elevation

- Insertion of new timber solid panel door with painted finish.
- Replacement of existing front parapet Fletton brick wall with reclaimed old brick to match existing house brick to same height.

Rear elevation

- Erection of single storey rear and side infill extension. The side infill component would have a glazed and pitched roof. The eaves lower to 2.2m to the northern side.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above. There is no recent planning history at the site.

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
- 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
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	Yes
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes

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
Local character and design quality	28	Yes
Designated heritage assets	29	Yes
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes

Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations
Village Plan - Mortlake

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:
Mortlake Conservation Area Statement

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:

- Design and impact on heritage assets
- Impact on neighbour amenity
- Biodiversity
- Flood Risk
- Fire Safety

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.

Front elevation

- **New front door:** The solid panelled door replaces the existing pseudo-period door. This presents a minor change in appearance and would be more sympathetic to the period of property.
- **Reconstruction of front wall:** The rebuilding of the front wall would use reclaimed brick and would be built to the same height as existing. There would be no material change in appearance. The character of the building would be preserved and there is no objection to this alteration.

Rear elevation

- **Rear/side infill extension:** The proposed extension replaces a smaller extension on the property. The proposed structure is appropriately scaled, with a pitched roof toward the northern boundary which reduces its visual impression. Properties on Worle Street display varying external finishes on rear extensions. There is no objection to the use of white render which would be confined to the rear and concealed from public view. Similarly, the use of modern aluminium doors and a rooflight would not affect the frontage and is not visible from any public viewpoints.

Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states that: '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.

The proposed works do not result in any harm to the subject property, street scene and preserve the character and appearance of the wider conservation area. In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan and policies 28 and 29 of the Publication Local Plan as supported by the Mortlake Conservation Area Statement.

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.

Front elevation

- **New front door:** The solid replacement front door would not result in any harm to privacy or other harm to neighbour amenity.
- **Reconstruction of front wall:** The rebuilding of the front wall would be a like-for-like replacement and would not exceed the existing height. There would be no impact through overbearing or overshadowing.

Rear elevation

- **Rear/side infill extension:**

The property benefit from an existing ground floor rear extension abutting the shared boundary with No.1, exceeding the rear elevation of No.1 by roughly 3m. The proposed extension is also to be roughly 3m in depth.

In regard to No.3, an existing ground floor infill extension abuts No.3's outrigger. The proposal extension would exceed this by roughly 3m.

As such, the proposed extension complies with the SPD 3m limit and does not result in any unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing, sense of enclosure, or loss of daylight/sunlight.

The rear-facing glazed doors face outwards and predominantly look into the occupant's own garden. The doors are sited at ground levels and would not permit any unrestricted views that pose a risk to privacy.

The rooflight above is angled upwards and does not face into any windows or gardens. There would be no direct overlooking as a result.

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 is a householder application.

Flood risk

Policy LP21 of the Local Plan states that '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'. This is supported by Policy 8 of the Draft Local Plan.

The applicant has provided a Flood Risk Assessment which sets out that the ground floor extension will not be used for sleeping accommodation and that the extension will be built to match the existing floor levels.

The new extension presents a small increase in built footprint and is not expected to increase flooding in the area. The garden depth is retained for drainage.

Therefore, the development is considered to comply with the above policies.

Fire Safety

Policy D12 of the Local Plan states that all new development must achieve the highest standards for fire safety.

The applicant has provided a Reasonable Exception Statement to comply with this requirement.

The applicant is advised that 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.

7. 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.

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.

I therefore recommend the following:

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

- This application is CIL liable YES NO
- This application requires a Legal Agreement YES NO
- This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): **JLO** Dated: 02/08/2024

I agree the recommendation:

SG
Senior Planner

Dated:16/08/2024.....

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: