

**Application reference: 24/1649/HOT**  
**KEW WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
28.06.2024	08.07.2024	02.09.2024	02.09.2024

**Site:**

171 Sandycombe Road, Richmond, TW9 2EN,

**Proposal:**

Proposed single storey rear extension with roof window and first floor roof dormer.

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr Amandeep Mangat  
28 Sutton Road  
Heston  
TW5 0PF

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Santokh Matharu  
26 Melbury Avenue  
Southall  
UB2 4HR

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

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**  
Network Rail

**Expiry Date**  
30.07.2024

**Neighbours:**

173 Sandycombe Road, Richmond, TW9 2EN, - 09.07.2024  
169 Sandycombe Road, Richmond, TW9 2EN, - 09.07.2024

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

<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date: 25/04/2024	Application: 24/1025/PS192 Rear dormer roof extension and rooflights to the front roof slope.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: PDE Date:	Application: 24/1649/HOT Proposed single storey rear extension with roof window and first floor roof dormer.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: PCO Date:	Application: 24/2122/PS192 PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH ROOF WINDOW AND FIRST FLOOR ROOF DORMER

<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 03.06.1992 Reference: 92/0672/BN	Removal of chimney breasts, install 1 vent pipe & connect to sewer
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 21.08.2024 Reference: 24/1041/IN	Loft extension

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>24/1649/HOT</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>171 Sandycombe Road, Richmond, TW9 2EN</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Proposed single storey rear extension with roof window and first floor roof dormer.</b>
<b>Contact Officer</b>	<b>Kerry McLaughlin</b>

## 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

The proposal property is a two-storey, terrace dwelling, located on the eastern side of Sandycombe Road.

The application site is subject to the following planning constraints:

Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency	Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 1492
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater	GLA Drain London
London Underground Rail Safeguard Zone	London Underground to be consulted on any planning application within this area. Contact: Information Manager, LU Infrastructure Protection, 3rd Floor Albany House, 55 Broadway, London, SW1H 0BD Tel: 020 7918 0016 Email: locationenquiries@tube.tfl.gov.uk
Network Rail Safeguarding Zone	Network Rail asset, or within 10 metre of - Tenure: Freehold Ownership - Requirement to consult NR about sites within 10 metres of a railway line
Throughflow Catchment Area (Throughflow and Groundwater Policy Zone)	Adopted: October 2020 , Contact: Local Plan Team
Village	Kew Village
Village Character Area	East Side of Sandycombe Road - Area 7 Kew Village Planning Guidance Page 31 CHARAREA02/07/02
Ward	Kew Ward

## 3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

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

Ref	Proposal	Decision
24/2122/PS192	Proposed single storey rear extension with roof window and first floor roof dormer.	Pending Consideration
24/1025/PS192	Rear dormer roof extension and rooflights to the front roof slope.	Granted Permission

## 4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of representation have been received.

## 5. AMENDMENTS

None.

## 6. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

### NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4 - Decision-making
- 12 - Achieving well-designed places

These policies can be found at:

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65819679fc07f3000d8d4495/NPPF\\_December\\_2023.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65819679fc07f3000d8d4495/NPPF_December_2023.pdf)

### London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 - Delivering good design
- D12 - Fire Safety

These policies can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/london-plan-2021>

### 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
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](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.

Where relevant to the application under consideration, this is addressed in more detail in the assessment below.

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Local Character and Design Quality	LP28	Yes	No
Amenity and Living Conditions	LP46	Yes	No

These policies can be found at [https://www.richmond.gov.uk/draft\\_local\\_plan\\_publication\\_version](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/draft_local_plan_publication_version)

## Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations

Kew Village Plan

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)

### 7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design/Visual Amenity
- ii Neighbour Amenity
- iii Biodiversity

#### Issue i - Design/Visual Amenity

*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.*

*The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on House Extensions and External Alterations gives advice on dormers noting that they should be avoided to the front elevation and should remain in scale with the existing structure through not raising or projecting above the ridgeline. Dormers should not dominate the original roof and so significant areas should be left beneath and to either side of any proposed dormer. Windows within dormers should be smaller than those on the floor below.*

#### First Floor Dormer

The proposed rear dormer would regrettably disrupt the catslide roof at the rear of the house, which is a key feature of the architecture of the terrace row. The scale of the dormer is also out of proportion with the roof, covering the entirety of the catslide roof slope. However, the proposal is similar in scale to a number of neighbouring properties within the immediate vicinity and therefore whilst the proposal is not strictly compliant with the councils SPD (House Extensions and External Alterations), as it would dominate the roof and is not in scale with the host dwelling there are material considerations to balance against the strict application of policy guidance. The existing roof alterations in the locality has changed the character of the area to such an extent it is difficult for the application to be recommended for refusal. As such, the roof extension is considered acceptable in this instance, as it is in keeping with the changing character of the area. This also confirms that the proposal would not result in an incongruous addition to host dwelling or wider locality.

The exterior materials will be to match that of the existing dwelling, this ensures that the development is in keeping with the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

The fenestration is wholly SPD compliant being of a similar design to that of the existing fenestration and smaller than that on the floor below.

#### Rear Extension

The proposal seeks to erect a full-width, single-storey wraparound extension. The extension comprises a shallow sloped roof, with roof window. The height of the extension will be sited comfortably below the cill of the first-floor level fenestration, as required under SPD. Given the proposed dimensions in comparison to the existing built form, the rear extension will not appear overly dominant and will appear subordinate to the original building.

All new external materials will match as close as possible to existing external materials, this ensures the development will integrate satisfactorily with the original dwellinghouse. With regard to fenestration, the scheme proposes largely glazed windows and doors to the rear elevation. The proposed fenestration retains window hierarchy, as outlined in the 'House Extensions and External Alterations' SPD. The contemporary appearance assists in reducing the visual bulk and contributes to helping the extension appear an obvious addition to the main dwellinghouse. No objections are raised with regard to materials.

The amenity space in the rear garden would be reduced as a result of the proposal. However, the reduction will not be significant, when compared to the rear garden area and does not harm local character.

When viewed in the context of the neighbouring additions, it is considered that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Due to the siting, the works will not form views from the front of the dwelling/street scene, having a neutral impact on the public realm.

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable in terms of design/visual amenity. The proposal is not considered to detrimentally impact the character of the wider area or host building and therefore, is in line with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018), these policy objectives are taken forward in publication local plan policy LP28. and relevant supplementary planning documents.

### **Issue ii - 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.*

*With regard to dormer roof extensions, the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that where houses are terraced and/or have small gardens, overlooking should be minimised by restricting the side of the window and setting windows back from the eaves.*

The property would remain solely in residential use as a result of the proposal. An undue increase in noise or pollution would not occur as a result of the proposal.

#### First Floor Dormer

The proposed works align with the design of many others within the area. It is considered that a mutual level of overlooking occurs within the immediate vicinity, and the construction of the proposed dormer and associated works will not result in any unreasonable amount more. The scheme does not incorporate any new upper floor flank facing windows.

The proposed works would be located within the confines of the existing roof and given siting, the dormer will not further detrimentally impact upon any windows at No's.169 or 173 Sandycombe Road, therefore no impact is anticipated on neighbouring occupants in regard to loss of light or appearing visually overbearing.

#### Rear Extension

As this proposal is at ground level only the proposal does not raise any issues in terms of loss of privacy.

The proposal would not cause an unreasonable loss of outdoor amenity space, as required under SPD.

#### *173 Sandycombe Road*

No.173 comprises a side/rear extension abutting the shared boundary line. The proposed extension would project no more than 3m beyond the rear elevation of this extension, this is considered an acceptable projection which would satisfy the guidelines set out in the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD. It is considered that the proposed rear extension will not result in any undue overbearing, loss of light, visual intrusion or create a sense of enclosure to this property.

#### *169 Sandycombe Road*

Neighbouring amenity concerns are raised in relation to 169 Sandycombe Road. The councils 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) SPD states "Extensions that create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or appear overbearing when seen from neighbouring gardens or rooms will not be permitted." The document notes, "The effect of a single storey extension is usually acceptable if the projection is no further than 3m for a terrace property," but does go on further to state "In such instances, where the depth exceeds that outlined above (3m), the eaves height should be limited to 2.2m to mitigate the sense of enclosure." The proposed extension is ~3.5m in depth from the main rear elevation of the neighbouring property and fails to comply with guidance, which seeks a 2.2m eaves height along the boundary, proposing just ~2.8m minimum eaves height at the rearmost end. It is noted the SPD does state "the final test of acceptability will depend on the particular circumstances on the site, which may justify greater rear projection. For example, distances from the boundary and neighbouring properties; height adjacent to the boundary; use of materials and layout of neighbouring sites." The proposed extension is to abut the shared boundary line and No.169 does not comprise

any form of rear extension which could mitigate impact, as such there are no onsite circumstances that can justify a deviation from SPD in this case.

No.169 features a rear facing opening to the outrigger at ground level, which will sit adjacent to the proposed extension. The scheme is likely to impact upon neighbouring amenity, given the excessive depth and height of the extension in relation to this window. Officers have been unable to locate any historic plans via planning history or any other information to ascertain which room this window serves, however, when considering the layout of all other dwellings along the terrace row with available floor plans, it would appear that the impacted window is likely to serve a habitable room (kitchen). The onus is on the applicant to evidence that the proposal would not unduly impact neighbouring amenity and no such evidence has been provided. As such, in the absence of this, it is considered that the proposal will appear visually intrusive, overbearing, likely to cause a sense of enclosure and would result in a loss of light to an extent which would be harmful to the occupiers of No.169. Overall, owing to its siting, bulk, mass and scale, the rear extension would appear overbearing, visually intrusive, would impact on the outlook and result in an increased sense of enclosure in particular to No.169 Onslow Road.

As such, the proposal is contrary to, in particular, Policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018), these policy objectives are taken forward in publication local plan policy LP46, and the following the following Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance; House Extensions and External Alterations (2015).

### **Issue iii - Biodiversity**

Biodiversity net gain became mandatory for minor developments on applications made from 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2024. This application is exempt from mandatory biodiversity net gain on the grounds that is a householder application.

### **Other Matters**

#### **Fire Safety**

The applicant has submitted a 'Fire Safety Statement' as required under policy D12 of the London Plan (2021).

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.

#### **London Underground Rail Safeguard Zone**

Due to the close proximity of the proposed works to the London Underground Rail Safeguard Zone, London Underground requests that the applicant/developer contacts; Information Manager, LU Infrastructure Protection, 3rd Floor Albany House, 55 Broadway, London, SW1H 0BD Tel: 020 7918 0016 Email: [locationenquiries@tube.tfl.gov.uk](mailto:locationenquiries@tube.tfl.gov.uk) prior to the commencement of works.

#### **Network Rail Safeguarding Zone**

Due to the close proximity of the proposed works to Network Rail's land and the operational railway, Network Rail requests the applicant/developer contacts Network Rail's Asset Protection and Optimisation (ASPRO) team via [AssetProtectionWessex@networkrail.co.uk](mailto:AssetProtectionWessex@networkrail.co.uk). The ASPRO team will review the details of the works to ensure that they can be delivered without any risk to the railway. The applicant/developer may be required to enter into an Asset Protection Agreement to get the required resource and expertise on-board to enable approval of detailed works. More information can be obtained from the Network Rail website <https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/looking-after-the-railway/asset-protection-and-optimisation/>.

As well as contacting Network Rail's ASPRO Team, the applicant/developer must also follow the Asset Protection informatives.

## **8. 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.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

**Refuse planning permission for the following reasons**

**Reason for Refusal - Neighbour Amenity**

The proposed single storey rear extension, by reason of its combined height, depth and siting will result in an overbearing sense of enclosure and visually intrusive form of development that will adversely impact on the residential amenity of nearby occupants, in particular, No.169 Sandycombe Road. The proposed development would thereby be contrary to, in particular, policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018), the Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) in particular policies 46 and the council's 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) Supplementary Planning Document.

**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): KM

Dated: 28/08/2024

**I agree the recommendation:**



Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated: ...29/08/2024.....