



Application reference: 24/1674/HOT
 SOUTH RICHMOND WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
03.07.2024	05.07.2024	30.08.2024	30.08.2024

Site:

22 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DH,

Proposal:

Part single/part two storey rear extension, replacement rear dormer, addition of front and rear rooflights and replacement window to first floor rear.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Alistair Kirkbright
 22 Princes Road
 Richmond
 Richmond Upon Thames
 TW10 6DH

AGENT NAME

STEVE BADGER
 Pyramus, East Street
 East Street
 LEWES
 BN7 2LJ
 United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on 08.07.2024 and posted on 19.07.2024 and due to expire on 09.08.2024

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee
 14D Urban D

Expiry Date
 22.07.2024

Neighbours:

- 35 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DQ, - 08.07.2024
- 33 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DQ, - 08.07.2024
- 31 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DQ, - 08.07.2024
- 67 Kings Road, Richmond, TW10 6EG, - 08.07.2024
- 65 Kings Road, Richmond, TW10 6EG, - 08.07.2024
- 24 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DH, - 08.07.2024
- 20 Princes Road, Richmond, TW10 6DH, - 08.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: REF Application:94/0984/FUL
 Date:25/05/1994 Installation Of Ground Floor Bow Window In The Front Elevation And Erection Of Canopy Over Front Entrance Door

Development Management

Status: REF Application:20/2263/HOT
 Date:06/10/2020 Part two storey part single storey rear extension. Replacement windows, front gate and front door, paint front elevation. Replacement housing for gas meter. Installation of sun tube to rear roof slope and 2 x rooflights to front roof slope.

Development Management

Status: REF Application:23/1996/HOT

Date:12/09/2023 Remove the existing rear extension and replace it with new extension, with the addition of a first floor extension. The existing dormer to be replaced with a new one. New conservation style Velux windows added to the front roof.

Development Management

Status: PDE Application:24/1674/HOT

Date: Part single/part two storey rear extension, replacement rear dormer, addition of front and rear rooflights and replacement window to first floor rear.

Appeal

Validation Date: 16.12.2020 Part two storey part single storey rear extension. Replacement windows, front gate and front door, paint front elevation. Replacement housing for gas meter. Installation of sun tube to rear roof slope and 2 x rooflights to front roof slope.

Reference: 20/0310/AP/REF

Building Control

Deposit Date: 29.07.2009 BSIPRODUCTSERVICES: 1 windows

Reference: 09/BSI00061/BSI

Building Control

Deposit Date: 22.09.2009 Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 10/FEN01891/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 29.05.2015 Circuit alteration or addition in a special location Install one or more new circuits Install a replacement consumer unit Partial rewire Install a new circuit for ELV lighting within a dwelling

Reference: 15/NIC01442/NICEIC

Application Number	24/1674/HOT
Address	22 Princes Road Richmond TW10 6DH
Proposal	Part single/part two storey rear extension, replacement rear dormer, addition of front and rear rooflights and replacement window to first floor rear.
Contact Officer	Jeremy Maclsaac
Target Determination Date	30/08/2024

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 application site comprises a well preserved two and a half storey mid-terrace property with a largely intact original rear elevation at first floor level. It is a good example of Victorian London architecture and has been identified as a Building of Townscape Merit, along with the other dwellings in the terrace of which it forms part.

The application site is designated as:

Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Building of Townscape Merit	Site: 22 Princes Road Richmond Surrey TW10 6DH
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 /
Main Centre Buffer Zone	Richmond Town Centre Boundary Buffer Zone - A residential development or a mixed use scheme within this 400 metre buffer area identified within the Plan does not have to apply the Sequential Test (for Flood Risk) as set out in Local Plan policy LP21.
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

The proposed development comprises Part single/part two storey rear extension, replacement rear

dormer, addition of front and rear rooflights and replacement window to first floor rear.

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

23/1996/HOT – Refused Permission

Remove the existing rear extension and replace it with new extension, with the addition of a first floor extension. The existing dormer to be replaced with a new one. New conservation style Velux windows added to the front roof.

22/P0406/PREAPP - Rear ground floor extension, first floor extension Replacement rear dormer. Two conservation roof lights to front elevation.

20/2263/HOT – Refused Permission

Part two storey part single storey rear extension. Replacement windows, front gate and front door, paint front elevation. Replacement housing for gas meter. Installation of sun tube to rear roof slope and 2 x rooflights to front roof slope.

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	No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	Yes	No
Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets	LP4	Yes	No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	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	
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Designated heritage assets	29	Yes	No
Non-designated heritage assets	30	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

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

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 Richmond Conservation Area Statement
St Matthias Richmond 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 Fire Safety
- iv Biodiversity

i 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.

Policy LP3 of the Local Plan 2018 covers Designated Heritage Asset and 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.

Policy LP 4 states that development shall preserve the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets.

The thrust of the above policies are carried forward to policies 28, 29 and 30 of the emerging plan.

The application site comprises a well preserved two and a half storey mid-terrace property with a largely intact original rear elevation at first floor level. It is a good example of Victorian London architecture and has been identified as a Building of Townscape Merit, along with the other dwellings in the terrace of which it forms part.

The rear gardens of the houses along the eastern side of Princes Road are short and constitute compact former workers' housing; consequently any extensions thereto need to be sensitively designed. There are examples of a number of rear extensions either side of the site, from ground level to roof height.

The Site is located within the St Matthias Conservation Area, the character and appearance of which is derived from the cohesive form of varied architectural styles across the largely residential streets.

Proposals for the site comprise: "Part single/part two storey rear extension, replacement rear dormer,

addition of front and rear rooflights and replacement window to first floor rear."

The application follows a recently refused application for similar works under 23/1996/HOT. This application was refused for the following reason:

The first floor rear extension and dormer, by reason of their scale, siting and design, would result in a visually intrusive, unsympathetic and dominant form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host Building of Townscape Merit. As such the proposal fails to comply with policies LP1 and LP4 of the Local Plan, policies 28 and 30 of the Publication Local Plan and the Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations'.



The ground floor extension would infill the existing gap to the side of the outside store. In height and depth it would broadly match that of the extension at no.24. There is no objection to the scale of this extension. The glazing is modern in design but acceptable. It is noted thi

With respect to the first floor rear extension, the proposals have been further scaled back in line with previous comments and advice. It would cover slightly more than half of the width of the existing rear elevation, contrary to guidance in the SPD, but it would maintain some appreciation of the historic rear elevation. Its depth does not extend beyond that of the neighbour at no.20 and would be in keeping. No objection to the first floor rear extension, although note that the proposed first floor plan and roof plan show some discrepancy in the width of the first floor extension, which should be checked and clarified). Proposed fenestration to the first floor extension has a traditional appearance as a timber sash, which is acceptable.

There is no objection in principle to a rear roof dormer, but the proposed dormer still does not reflect

officer advice or guidance in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD. The windows should be smaller than windows of the floor below, to maintain an appropriate hierarchy across the storeys. The dormer is not set sufficiently down from the ridge or up from the eaves, contributing to its appearance as a top heavy feature that would be out of scale and overbearing to the modest dwelling. It is still proposed to add two rooflights to the front roof slope, where pre-app comments advised one would be more acceptable. The highly sensitive nature of the site does not appear to have been sufficiently considered in the design of the proposals.

As submitted the proposals would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host Building of Townscape Merit, the terrace of Building of Townscape Merit to which it forms part and of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal fails to comply with policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Local Plan, Policies 28, 29 and 30 of the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 Version), the Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations,' as well as the Conservation Area Statement for St Matthias CA.

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.

No. 20 benefits from a single storey rear extension. it does not have any rooflights or side facing windows as it is located on the boundary with the subject site. No issues are foreseen with regards to overlooking, sense of enclosure or loss of light are foreseen with this neighbour. The proposed increase in dormer size would not result in increase the amount of mutual overlooking in the area.

No. 24 benefits from a single storey rear extension. it is comprised of three rooflights and there are no side facing windows. The rear extension is the width of the property and is along the boundary wall with the subject site. No issues are foreseen with regards to overlooking, sense of enclosure or loss of light are foreseen with this neighbour. The proposed increase in dormer size would not result in increase the amount of mutual overlooking in the area.

The site will remain in residential use and there are no issues with noise anticipated.

In view of the above, the proposal would safeguard neighbour living conditions in accordance with policy LP8 of the Local Plan and policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan Regulation 19 Version.

iii Fire Safety

Policy D12 relates to fire safety. The policy requires all development to submit a fire safety statement to demonstrate compliance with Part A of Policy D12.

A fire safety statement has been submitted which meets and aims and objectives of Policy D12. A condition will be attached requiring the development to adhere to this statement on an ongoing basis.

This does not override the need to obtain building regulations approval, with specific regard to the fire safety aspects of the building regulations regime. In view of the above, the proposal complies with policy D12 of the London Plan.

iv 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.

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.

For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the adverse impacts of allowing this planning application would significantly outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in NPPF (2021) and Development Plan, when taken as a whole.

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons

Reason for Refusal – Design

The proposed dormer, by virtue of its siting, scale, bulk and design would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host Building of Townscape Merit, the terrace of Building of Townscape Merit to which it forms part and of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal fails to comply with policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Local Plan, Policies 28, 29 and 30 of the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 Version), the Supplementary Planning Document: 'House Extensions and External Alterations,' as well as the Conservation Area Statement for St Matthias CA.

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:28.08.2024.....

I agree the recommendation:



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

Dated: ...28/08/2024.....

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: