

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 24/1554/FUL

**Address:** Avalon House72 Lower Mortlake RoadRichmond

**Proposal:** Remove the existing roof and erection of a roof extension at fourth floor and rear extensions to floors ground - four to accommodate additional commercial floorspace (Class E), provision of rear and rooftop terraced amenity spaces, alterations to the ground floor entrance, recladding and remodelling of the facade, landscaping improvements to the rear carparking area, provision of end of journey and cycle parking facilities, associated building servicing and sustainability improvements, and other associated works.

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mrs. Rachel Hunt

**Address:** 10 Cedar Terrace Richmond TW9 2JE

### Comments

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

**Comment:** [2 of 4]

Supporting notes to my objection with regards massing, height, loss of light: I understand the application will be assessed against the current version of the Richmond Local Plan. In responding I have consulted both this and the proposed plan. The following points are clear (all refs from extant plan):

LP1: Local character and design quality

4.1.6 The space between buildings should be respected and development be in harmony with surrounding buildings.

I do not believe that the proposed plans are in line with this given the considerable increase in height which is clearly not in harmony with the predominantly two storey residential properties that surround it. I do note the higher office buildings further along Lower Mortlake Road which have been referenced in the planning application but would note also that there are considerably fewer residential properties as close to those building as there are to Avalon House.

LP2: Building heights

The Council will require new buildings, including extensions and redevelopment of existing buildings, to respect and strengthen the setting of the borough's valued townscapes and landscapes, through appropriate building heights, by the following means:

1. require buildings to make a positive contribution towards the local character, townscape and skyline, generally reflecting the prevailing building heights within the vicinity; proposals that are taller than the surrounding townscape have to be of high architectural design quality and standards, deliver public realm benefits and have a wholly positive impact on the character and quality of the area;
3. respect the local context, and where possible enhance the character of an area, through appropriate: a. scale, b. height, c. mass, [...], i. wider townscape and landscape;
4. take account of climatic effects, including overshadowing [...];

I do not believe that the proposed plans are in line with this given the considerable increase in scale, height and mass and the resulting impact on the wider townscape. In addition the proposed development be closer to my property and would lead to significant overshadowing of my and neighbouring residential properties.

LP8 Amenity and Living Conditions

All development will be required to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties. The Council will:

1. ensure the design and layout of buildings enables good standards of daylight and sunlight to be achieved in new development and in existing properties affected by new development; where existing daylight and sunlight conditions are already substandard, they should be improved where possible;
3. ensure that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting, including through creating a sense of enclosure;

4. ensure there is no harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the use of buildings, gardens and other spaces due to increases in traffic, servicing, parking, noise, light, disturbance, air pollution, odours or vibration or local micro-climatic effects.

of both the indoor and the outdoor spaces. The light impact on the interior living spaces has been acknowledged in the planning application but dismissed as immaterial, I disagree with this assessment.