



Application reference: 24/1837/HOT
MORTLAKE AND BARNES COMMON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
18.07.2024	18.07.2024	12.09.2024	12.09.2024

Site:

17 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF

Proposal:

Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension. Erection of a rear dormer and front rooflights and replacement of existing windows & doors.

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Oliver & Susana Rodwell
 17 Ripley Gardens
 Mortlake
 London
 Richmond Upon Thames
 SW14 8HF

AGENT NAME

Ms Christina Voss
 18 Crestway
 London
 SW15 5BY
 United Kingdom

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

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (South)
 LBRUT Transport

Expiry Date

02.08.2024
 02.08.2024

Neighbours:

- 20 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 19.07.2024
- 18 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 19.07.2024
- 22 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 19.07.2024
- 13 Worpel Street, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HE, - 19.07.2024
- 12 Worpel Street, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HE, - 19.07.2024
- 11 Worpel Street, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HE, - 19.07.2024
- 19 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 19.07.2024
- 15 Ripley Gardens, Mortlake, London, SW14 8HF, - 19.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: REF Application: 24/0022/HOT

Date: 19/06/2024 Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension. Erection of a rear dormer and front rooflights and replacement of existing windows & doors.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application: 24/1837/HOT

Date: Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension. Erection of a rear dormer and front rooflights and replacement of existing windows & doors.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 02.12.2008 Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 08/COR03002/CORGI

Application Number	24/1837/HOT
Address	17 Ripley Gardens Mortlake London SW14 8HF
Proposal	Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension. Erection of a rear dormer and front rooflights and replacement of existing windows & doors.
Contact Officer	Jeremy Maclsaac
Target Determination Date	12/09/2024

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 host site is a two-storey dwelling house located on the west side of Ripley Gardens.

The application site is designated as:

Archaeological Priority	Site: Richmond APA 2.3: Mortlake - Archaeological Priority Area - Tier II
Area Benefiting Flood Defence - Environment Agency.	Areas Benefiting from Defences
Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency	Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 1648
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Community Infrastructure Levy Band	Higher
Critical Drainage Area - Environment Agency	Richmond Town Centre and Mortlake [Richmond] / Ref: Group8_004 /
Floodzone 2	Tidal Models
Floodzone 3	Tidal Models
Main Centre Buffer Zone	East Sheen 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.
SFRA Zone 3a High Probability	Flood Zone 3
Take Away Management Zone	Take Away Management Zone
Village	Mortlake Village
Village Character Area	West of White Hart Lane - Character Area 2 Mortlake Village Planning Guidance Page 19 CHARAREA03/02/01
Ward	Mortlake and Barnes Common Ward

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension. Erection of a rear dormer and front rooflights and replacement of existing windows & doors.

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

24/0022/HOT – Refused Permission

Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension. Erection of a rear dormer and front rooflights and replacement of existing windows & doors.

This application was refused for the following reason:

The development, by reason of the absence of a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) has failed to demonstrate that the proposal and construction activities would not detrimentally impact on the health and longevity of nearby trees to the detriment of the visual amenity of the locality and the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal is contrary to the NPPF and the development plan, in particular, policy and LP16 of the Local Plan (2018) and policy 42 of the Publication Local Plan.

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

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

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 Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
Impact on Trees, Woodland and Landscape	LP16	Yes	No
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	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	
		Yes	No
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Trees, Woodland and Landscape	42	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Quality
House Extension and External Alterations

These policies can be found at:
https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and impact on heritage assets
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Flood Risk
- iv Trees
- v Fire Safety
- vi 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.

Rooflights and replacement windows and doors

No objections are raised to the addition of two front facing rooflights. They are marginally visible from the street scene and many properties along Ripley Gardens have front facing rooflights.

With regards to the painting of the front door and the grey painted finish to the property, no objections are raised as this is part of permitted development. Similarly, the replacement windows are of a style and appearance similar to the existing, and whilst UPVC windows are not encouraged, the applicants fallback position being permitted development rights are acknowledged and no objections are raised.

Rear Dormer

The proposals include a rear dormer roof extension which is considered substantial in form. 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 design has been amended slightly to ensure that the windows do not appear excessive and dominate the appearance dormer. Similarly, no objections are raised to the addition of a Juliette balcony railings in context with the locality and noting permitted development rights.

Single storey rear extension

With regards to the single storey rear extension, it appears to be matching the design of the no. 15. This is a flat roof rear extension. On the subject site, there will be 2 rooflights on the rear extension. The addition appears to be appropriately positioned given the level of the windows cills located on the floor above. The extension appears to be 3m deep which matches the depth at no. 15.

On the first-floor rear elevation, the first floor, single paned window will be reduced in size. No objections are raised to this portion of the proposal.

Overall the design aspects of the rear extension, dormer, rooflights and external alterations are not seen to contradict the intentions of LP1 of the Local Plan and policy 28 of the Regulation 19 Version Local Plan and are subsequently acceptable.

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.

Due to proximity, the neighbours most likely to be impacted by the proposal would be no. 15 and 19 Ripley Gardens. Both neighbouring properties benefit from single-storey rear extensions as well as rear dormers.

With regards to no. 15, the depth of the proposed extension is the same as this, 3m. These extensions have matching heights and no issues with regards to loss of light, overbearing or visual intrusion are foreseen.

With regards to no. 19, it benefits from a slightly shorter rear extension with a pitch roof. No issues are foreseen with regards to loss of light, overbearing or visual obstruction.

The proposed rear dormer would project by a modest amount. The proposal would not result in a

material loss of light or outlook when viewed from the rear garden area and habitable room windows of the neighbouring properties at 15 and 19 Amyand Park Road.

There is a natural level of overlooking in the area as the dormers occupy most of the width of the rear roof and they are set back marginally from the eaves.

The proposed development would not materially impact upon the amenities enjoyed by the inhabitants of all other neighbouring properties due to its siting, size, scale and design.

In light of the above, the proposal would safeguard neighbour living conditions in line with Local Plan Policy LP8 and policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 Version).

iii Flood Risk

LP21 stipulates requires Flood Risk Assessments to be submitted where proposals fall within Floodzone 3.

The applicant has submitted an EA Flood Risk Assessment which confirms that the floor levels within the proposed extension will be set no lower than existing, and that flood proofing measures will be incorporated where appropriate. No concerns are therefore raised in regard to flood risk.

This application complies with policy LP21 of the Local plan and policy 8 of the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 Version).

iv Trees

Policy LP16 states The Council will require the protection of existing trees and the provision of new trees, shrubs and other vegetation of landscape significance that complement existing, or create new, high quality green areas, which deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits.

LBRuT Local Plan, policy LP16, subsection 5. requires;
"That trees are adequately protected throughout the course of development, in accordance with British Standard 5837 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, Recommendations (2012).

The location of this proposal is not sited within a Conservation Area, nor are there any recorded Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) within or adjacent to the site of the proposal.

There is 1x highway Birch tree, growing in the footway outside the property that is managed and maintained by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT).

The submission of the "Arboricultural Appraisal Report (Impact Assessment & Method Statement), Ref: DEV240304-1143". A BS5837:2012 survey is included within this report. Unless otherwise specified, all tree numbers and species identification will refer to those used in the tree survey schedule in this document.

On examination, it is considered that the recommendations and working methodologies of the aforementioned Tree Report are consistent with good Arboricultural practice for construction activities around trees and are in line with the British Standard BS5837 (2012) in the execution of this proposal.

This is to ensure development protects, respects, contributes to, and enhances trees and landscapes, in accordance with LBR Local Plan (LBRLP) 5.5, Policy LP16, subsection 5 and pursuant to section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

A condition will be attached to ensure that trees are not damaged or otherwise affected by demolition, building operations, excavations and soil compaction.

Subject to conditions, the proposal may be compliant with the NPPF and, in particular, policy LP16 of the Local Plan (2018) and policy 42 of the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 Version).

v Fire Safety

London Plan policy D12 requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all planning applications.

A Fire Safety Strategy was received by Council on 18 July 2024. The applicant is advised that additions and 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.

Overall, the proposal can therefore be considered consistent with Policy D12 of the London Plan

vi 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.

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 - 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 YES NO

(which are not on the file)

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

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: