



**PLANNING REPORT**

Printed for officer by  
Jasmine Loftus on 16 August 2024

*ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE*

**Application reference: 24/1791/HOT**  
**SOUTH RICHMOND WARD**

<b>Date application received</b>	<b>Date made valid</b>	<b>Target report date</b>	<b>8 Week date</b>
15.07.2024	15.07.2024	09.09.2024	09.09.2024

**Site:**

49 Albert Road, Richmond, TW10 6DJ,

**Proposal:**

Dormer to rear roof slope. Rooflight to front roof slope. Ground floor rear/side elevation extension with a flat roof.

**APPLICANT NAME**

Alabdulkarim  
49 Albert Road  
Richmond  
Richmond Upon Thames  
TW10 6DJ

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Eugene Coleman  
26  
Gordon Avenue  
TWICKENHAM  
TW1 1NQ

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 18.07.2024 and posted on 26.07.2024 and due to expire on 16.08.2024

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

14D Urban D

**Expiry Date**

01.08.2024

**Neighbours:**

- 48 Houblon Road, Richmond, TW10 6DE, -
- 46 Houblon Road, Richmond, TW10 6DE, - 18.07.2024
- 44 Houblon Road, Richmond, TW10 6DE, - 18.07.2024
- 40 Albert Road, Richmond, TW10 6DP, - 18.07.2024
- 38 Albert Road, Richmond, TW10 6DP, - 18.07.2024
- 51 Albert Road, Richmond, TW10 6DJ, - 18.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: REF

Date: 09/09/2003

Application: 03/2236/HOT

Demolition And Rebuilding Rear Extension And Internal Alterations.

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date: 26/11/2003

Application: 03/3024/HOT

Retention Of Single Storey/two Storey Extension To Rear. (amended Description)

Development Management

Status: REF

Date:11/07/2024

Application:24/0972/HOT

Dormer to rear roof slope. Velux to front roof slope. Ground floor rear/side elevation extension with a flat roof and a bow window.

---

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application:24/1791/HOT

Dormer to rear roof slope. Rooflight to front roof slope. Ground floor rear/side elevation extension with a flat roof.

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.07.2003

Single storey rear extension.Internal structural alterations New staircase & two first floor bathrooms

---

Reference: 03/1364/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 16.04.2013

Replacement consumer unit

Reference: 13/NIC00834/NICEIC

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 02.04.2013

Installed Charnwood: C4

Reference: 13/HET01046/HETAS

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 24.09.2018

Install a gas-fired boiler

Reference: 18/FEN02929/GASAFE

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 25.07.2019

Install replacement door in a dwelling

Reference: 19/FEN01429/FENSA

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 18.07.2024

Single storey rear extension, loft conversion with rear dormer and internal structural alterations at existing two storey dwelling

Reference: 24/0868/IN

---

Enforcement

Opened Date: 22.06.2004

Enforcement Enquiry

Reference: 04/00262/EN

---

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>24/0972/HOT</b>
<b>Address</b>	49 Albert Road Richmond TW10 6DJ
<b>Proposal</b>	Dormer to rear roof slope. Rooflight to front roof slope. Ground floor rear/side elevation extension with a flat roof.
<b>Contact Officer</b>	Jasmine Loftus
<b>Target Determination Date</b>	09.09.2024

## 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 late 19th century terraced cottage within the St Matthias Conservation Area and is designated as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM). It is two storeys high, finished in painted brick under a pitched slate roof.

The front elevation features a simple arrangement of entrance door and sash window to the ground floor and single sash window to the first floor. To the rear is a two-storey outrigger and later side infill extension.

The property forms part of a long terrace on the west side of Albert Road and is typical of the late Victorian cottages of the surrounding streets. This area ("The Alberts") is characterised by the tight-knight, fine grained pattern of development with narrow streets. Similar properties surround.

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

- Building of Townscape Merit (49 Albert Road)
- Building of Townscape Merit (All Sections of Stock Brick Wall Albany Passage)
- St Matthias Richmond Conservation Area
- Critical Drainage Area
- Throughflow Catchment Area
- Main Centre Buffer Zone
- South Richmond Ward

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises the following development

### *Front elevation*

- Installation of 2no. conservation style rooflights to front roofslope.

### *Rear elevation*

- Erection of dormer extension to rear roofslope. Dormer clad in slate. Flat roof. Structure to measure approx. 1.7m (h) x 1.95 (w) x 4.2m (d). There will be 2no. white aluminium sliding sash windows to the rear face.
- Erection of replacement ground floor rear extension. Structure to have a flat roof and would measure approx. 3m (h) x 3.4 (w) x 2.6m (d). Rear-facing aluminium double doors.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above. The relevant planning history is as

follows:

24/0972/HOT	Dormer to rear roof slope. Velux to front roof slope. Ground floor rear/side elevation extension with a flat roof and a bow window.	Refused on 11/07/2024
14/2183/HOT	Demolition and rebuilding of ground floor rear extension. First floor juliet balcony on rear elevation. Rear dormer.	Granted on 16/07/2024

#### 4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

One observation received: Respondent states no objection to the proposal and notes that the development is similar to others in the area.

#### 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 Non-Designated Heritage Assets	LP4	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](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
Non-designated heritage assets	30	Yes
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes

### Supplementary Planning Documents

Buildings of Townscape Merit  
Design Quality  
House Extension and External Alterations  
Village Plan – Richmond and Richmond Hill

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning\\_policy/local\\_plan/supplementary\\_planning\\_documents\\_and\\_guidance](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:  
Article 4 Direction – St Matthias Richmond Conservation Area  
St Matthias Richmond 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
- 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 House Extensions and External Alterations SPD 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. It suggests a maximum projection of 3m from the rear wall for extensions on terraced properties.*

*With regard to windows, the SPD argues that ‘windows are important features, and an inappropriate choice can easily spoil an otherwise satisfactory design’. And adds that ‘they are normally unsatisfactory’.*

#### *Front elevation*

- **2no. conservation style rooflights:** The rooflights replace a single rooflight on the front roofslope. The conservation style rooflights would sit flush with the roof. Due to the angle of the slope, the rooflights would not be immediately visible from ground level and would have little impact on the appearance of the host dwelling.

#### *Rear elevation*

- **Dormer roof extension:** The rear dormer is modest in scale, with clearance left between the sides and lower eaves. It respects the hierarchy of the host dwelling and remains subservient. Slate cladding is appropriate. Timber windows are preferred, but the aluminium windows would be sash style and would not be visible from public view, and there would be no loss of an existing window. The character and appearance of the dwelling is preserved.
- **Ground floor extension:** The new extension replaces a small infill extension in the side return. The structure would be appropriately scaled, projecting less than 3m from the existing rear wall. More than 50% of rear garden would be retained. The anthracite-coloured aluminium doors are sited at ground floor level to the rear and are acceptable.

Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states ‘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.

Paragraph 209 of the NPPF states 'the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.

The proposed extensions at roof and ground floor level are suitably scaled. Style and materials conserve the traditional appearance of the property. As such, the proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider Conservation Area.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Local Plan and policies 28, 29 and 30 of the Publication Local Plan as supported by the St Matthias Richmond 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 and avoid overshadowing, overbearing, overlooking and visual impact that harms the reasonable enjoyment of the uses of buildings and gardens.*

*The Extensions and External Alterations SPD suggests that generally an extension of 3m in depth for a terrace property will be acceptable.*

#### *Front elevation*

- **2no. conservation style rooflights:** The rooflights front the public domain and are approx. 1.7m from floor level. There is no harm to privacy as a result.

#### *Rear elevation*

- **Dormer extension:** The rear dormer windows face predominantly towards the occupant's garden. There is adequate separation distance between properties opposite and the windows would not unreasonable compromise their privacy. Terraces are densely packed so some degree of mutual overlooking is expected, but the windows would not unduly compromise privacy.

The dormer is modestly scaled, set below the ridge and above the eaves. It is not expected to result in any overbearing, overshadowing or sense of enclosure.

- **Ground floor rear extension:** The height of 3m is acceptable for a rear extension. This height is not expected to interfere with amenity for nearby occupiers. The total depth exceeds recommendation of 3m, however it only projects 1.2m from the outrigger, so there would not be any material increase in overshadowing to adjacent properties. The depth is acceptable in this context and would not result in any unacceptable overshadowing as a result.

Additionally, both adjoining properties (nos. 47 and 51 Albert Road) have rear extensions, so there would be no harm to amenity by reason of overbearing, overshadowing or sense of enclosure.

- **Other fenestration:** Rooflight is angled directly upwards on a flat roof. There are no side windows on the extension. The front and rear fenestrations included in the proposal would not result in any unacceptable harm to privacy.

### **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 submitted a Flood Risk Assessment. The site is within flood zones 2 and 3. The erection of the rear extension would be a modest enlargement from the existing built footprint, as a side infill extension is already built. Given the scale of the works, there is unlikely to be any notable increase in flooding as a result. The development is in accordance with Policy LP21.

**Fire Safety**

*Policy D12 of the London Plan states that all development should achieve the highest standards for fire safety.*

The applicant has provided a Fire Safety Statement which satisfies the intent of policy D12.

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. 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.

**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: 16/08/2024

**I agree the recommendation:**

SG  
Senior Planner

Dated: ...19/08/2024.....

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: .....