

Application reference: 24/1841/HOT TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE 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:

15 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU,

Proposal:

Proposed development to refurbish and extend the ground floor into the rear garden space to create a larger kitchen dining area, to reconfigure the existing first floor within the current building envelope and add a mansard roof extension.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Ella Jarvis
15 Bell Lane
Twickenham
Richmond Upon Thames
TW1 3NU

AGENT NAME

Mr Mark Willmer
2 Manor Farm Court
Old Wolverton
MK12 5NN

DC Site Notice: printed on 23.07.2024 and posted on 02.08.2024 and due to expire on 23.08.2024

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

14D Urban D

Expiry Date

06.08.2024

Neighbours:

12 Wellesley Crescent, Twickenham, TW25RT - 23.07.2024
12 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, - 23.07.2024
Strand House, 3 The Embankment, Twickenham, TW1 3DU, - 23.07.2024
14 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, -
11 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, - 23.07.2024
Beverly Hills, 8 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, - 23.07.2024
10 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, -
19 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, -
17 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, -
13 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, - 23.07.2024
15 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU, -
6 Bell Lane, Twickenham, TW1 3NU -

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

Development Management

Status: REF

Date: 15/02/2024

Application: 23/3410/HOT

Proposed development to refurbish and extend the ground floor, to partially extend the first floor and add a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormers. Render and alterations to fenestration.

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application: 24/1841/HOT

Proposed development to refurbish and extend the ground floor into the rear

garden space to create a larger kitchen dining area, to reconfigure the existing first floor within the current building envelope and add a mansard roof extension.

Appeal

Validation Date: 01.05.2024

Proposed development to refurbish and extend the ground floor, to partially extend the first floor and add a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormers. Render and alterations to fenestration.

Reference: 24/0053/AP/REF

Building Control

Deposit Date: 03.05.2010

Circuit alteration or addition in kitchen/ special location Dwelling house
Kitchen Replacement consumer unit

Reference: 10/NIC00959/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 11.08.2011

Replacement consumer unit

Reference: 11/NIC02073/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 05.08.2018

Install a gas-fired boiler

Reference: 18/FEN03057/GASAFE

Application Number	24/1841/HOT
Address	15 Bell Lane Twickenham TW1 3NU
Proposal	Proposed development to refurbish and extend the ground floor into the rear garden space to create a larger kitchen dining area, to reconfigure the existing first floor within the current building envelope and add a mansard roof extension. Render and alterations to fenestration, and new front door.
Contact Officer	Roberta Henriques
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 end of terrace property located on the eastern side of Bell Lane. Similar dwellings adjoin the host dwelling to the north. The site is located within the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area (CA8), and is subject to the following planning constraints:

- Article 4 Direction- restricting basement development
- Main Centre Boundary- Twickenham
- Main Centre Buffer Zone- Twickenham Town Centre Boundary Buffer Zone
- Throughflow Catchment Area (Throughflow and Groundwater Policy Zone)
- Twickenham Area Action Plan
- Twickenham Village
- Twickenham Riverside Ward

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development consists of the following:

- o Demolition of chimney and construction of a mansard roof with front and rear dormers
- o Construction of single-storey rear extension
- o Removal of existing roughcast render, installation of external insulation, and addition of new render to front elevation; retention of existing cement render to side elevation and painting; new brickwork to rear elevation
- o Alteration to window openings including addition of traditional style sash windows to front and rear elevations
- o New 'vinyl clad' front entrance door

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above. The most relevant planning history relating to this site is as follows:

10/1666/HOT was withdrawn for a first floor extension to 11 Bell Lane on officer advice.

23/3410/HOT Proposed development to refurbish and extend the ground floor, to partially extend the first floor and add a mansard roof extension with front and rear dormers. Render and alterations to fenestration. Refused but Dismissed at Appeal.

Reasons for refusal:

The first floor rear extension, by reason of its siting, height, width, scale and design, would represent an excessively bulky and ungainly form of development that would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area. The development is thereby contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018) in particular policies LP1 and LP3, the Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) in particular policies 28 and 29, the Supplementary Planning Document on House Extensions and External Alterations and Conservation Areas SPG, as supported by the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area Statement and Appraisal, and the NPPF.

The front dormers and mansard roof extension, by reason of their massing and design would result in an overly dominant and unsympathetic form of the development that would harm the character and appearance of the host building, street scene and the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area. The development is thereby contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018) in particular policies LP1 and LP3, the Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) in particular policies 28 and 29, the Supplementary Planning Document on House Extensions and External Alterations and Conservation Areas SPG, as supported by the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area Statement and Appraisal, and the NPPF.

The appeal was dismissed with respect of the first floor extension only. The roof extension was found to be acceptable. This application is essentially a resubmission to gain consent for those elements which have previously been concluded to be acceptable.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of objection have been received.

10 letters of support have been received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- The current house is an eyesore.
- The extensions are acceptable to the neighbours.
- Mansard roof extension has been sensitively designed.
- This proposal has removed elements that appeal decision objected to.
- The neighbours are unanimous in supporting the application.
- The proposed development will greatly improve the neighbourhood.
- The property is an increasing health and safety risk due to lack of any maintenance to the property itself and the front and rear gardens.

Neighbour amenity considerations are assessed under Section 6 (impact on neighbour amenity) in the report below.

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 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	
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Designated heritage assets	29	Yes	No
Trees, Woodland and Landscape	42	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

Twickenham Area Action Plan (2013)

These policies can be found at:

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/11660/adopted_twickenham_area_action_plan_july_2013.pdf

Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations
Conservation Areas
Twickenham Village Planning Guidance

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

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 Trees
- iv Flood Risk
- v Fire Safety

i Design and impact on heritage assets

Policy Context

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.

Policy LP3 requires development to conserve the historic environment of the borough, and where possible make a positive contribution. Development proposals likely to adversely affect the significance of heritage assets will be assessed against the requirement to seek to avoid harm and the justification for the proposal.

The Council's 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. Regarding two storey rear extensions, the guidance states that these extensions should not be greater than half the width of the original building, to ensure the extension does not over-dominate the building's original scale and character. The same guidance is applicable to rear extensions at first floor level.

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. The NPPF states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'.

Policy HC1 of the London Plan states that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings'.

The Council's 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.

Section 8 of the Council's SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that roof extensions should be 'in-scale' with the existing house, keep existing profiles, not extend beyond the eaves or the ridge and use similar materials to the existing roof. Section 8.3 states that chimney stacks should be retained where possible and repaired in a style and material which reflect the original.

Analysis

No.13 is an end-terrace property of two storeys, rendered and missing the original features that were common between the group of three houses in the row. (Nos.11 and 13 being the other houses in the row.). The site is located within the Twickenham Riverside Conservation Area, and within the Riverside sub-area. Many of the buildings are listed and date from at least the 18th century, although burgage plots have survived since their medieval foundation. While Church Street is predominately commercial, Water and Bell Lanes are residential, lined with short terraces of workers' style cottages with shallow front gardens. There is some infill development, which has typically respected this scale and the traditional building materials.

Single storey rear extension

The single storey rear extension would have a depth of approximately 4.1m. Sufficient space would remain in the rear garden and height is comfortably below first floor level, so when considered in isolation, the single storey rear extension is considered to be a subservient addition.

The rear of the extension would feature powder coated aluminium bi-fold doors in anthracite and would be clad in brickwork to match the surrounding properties. The flank elevation of the extension would be rendered and colour matched to provide a uniform colour and texture. This materiality is considered to be acceptable.

Demolition of chimney and construction of a mansard roof with front and rear dormers

In the appeal decision for the previously refused application 23/3410/HOT the inspector commented the following: *"I find that the appeal dwelling with its flat roof currently appears incongruous within not only Bell Lane, but also from the Church Lane car park to the rear. All in all, I consider that the mansard roof extension with associated dormers, would harmonise with the local historic architecture and by themselves would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area."*

The appeal findings are afforded substantial weight, and these elements are considered to be acceptable as the inspector had no objection to them. Therefore, the proposed mansard roof extension and associated dormers are considered to be inkeeping with the Conservation Area.

Removal of existing roughcast render, installation of external insulation, and addition of new render to front elevation; retention of existing cement render to side elevation and painting; new brickwork to rear elevation

There is no in principle objection to the removal of the existing render to the front elevation and its re-provision in addition to a layer of thermal insulation. It is acknowledged that this would result in an improved visual appearance, subject to details of the thickness of the render and insulation to ensure that the dwelling remains cohesive in its appearance with that of the terrace row. This will be sought by condition.

The existing render on the side elevation is to be painted in a colour to match the existing, so there is no objection to this.

The new brickwork to the rear elevation would match the brickwork of the surrounding properties, so there is no objection to these works.

Alterations to fenestration

The proposed replacement front elevation fenestration with addition of solid brick courses would represent a notable improvement to character and design by returning a greater degree of symmetry and cohesive with the attached group of properties. Similarly, no objections are raised to the rear elevation fenestration. The upper floors in particular will be visible from the public realm from the car park but in itself, the fenestration and refacing in brick would appear as an improvement on the existing.

New 'vinyl clad' front entrance door

There is no objection to this new front entrance door that would be in the style of existing entrance doors at

neighbouring properties.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objections of policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan, policies 28 and 29 of the Publication Local Plan, and policy HC1 of the London Plan.

ii Impact on neighbour amenity

Policy LP8 requires all development to protect the amenity and living conditions for occupants of new, existing, adjoining and neighbouring properties. This includes ensuring adequate light is achieved, preserving privacy and ensuring proposals are not visually intrusive.

The Supplementary Planning Document for House Extensions and External Alterations also seeks to protect adjoining properties from visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

The host dwelling is sited in between No.s 13 and No.s 17-19 Bell Lane.

The single storey rear extension would have a depth of approximately 4.1m which exceeds the guidance in the Council's SPD which advises that single storey rear extensions at terraced properties should have a maximum projection of 3m. However, the extension would not extend more than 3m beyond the rear elevations of No.11 and No.s 17-19 Bell Close, so the extension is considered to comply with the 3m rule in the SPD.

Impact on No.13

The proposed single storey rear extension would project approximately 3m beyond the rear elevation of No.13's single storey rear extension. This projection, is considered to be modest, so it is not considered that the proposed extension would harm the outlook from No.13's ground floor rear windows, and it is not considered that the proposed extension would significantly reduce the amount of light afforded to this neighbour's ground floor rear windows.

Whilst the roof would add a significant bulk and massing, on the basis that it would be contained directly above the existing roof and would not project beyond the existing rear building line, the proposed mansard roof extension is not considered to unduly restrict the light and outlook afforded to No.13. The rear facing windows associated with the extension could enable some overlooking of the rear gardens of this neighbour, but on the basis that these views would not be significantly dissimilar to the existing views afforded by first floor rear facing habitable room fenestration, significant harm is not anticipated.

Impact on No.s 17-19

No.s 17-19 has a ground floor side window facing the application site, that serves a bathroom. This is not a habitable room and as such, the impact of the single storey rear extension on this window is considered acceptable.

Similarly, No.17-19 has a first floor side window facing the host dwelling, that serves a bathroom. This is not a habitable room and as such, the impact of the first floor rear extension on this window is considered acceptable.

The proposed single storey rear extension, would not project beyond the rear elevation of No.s 17-19. Therefore, it is not considered that the extension would harm the amenity of this neighbour.

Whilst the roof would add a significant bulk and massing, on the basis that it would be contained directly above the existing roof and would be set considerably forward from No.17-19's rear building line, the proposed mansard roof extension is not considered to unduly restrict the light and outlook afforded to No.17-19. Also, due to this, the rear facing windows associated with the extension are unlikely to result in significant overlooking of the rear garden of this neighbour.

Impact on 8 & 10 Bell Lane

Bell Lane is relatively narrow and thus the increase in height has the potential to impact on front elevation windows to the properties opposite. The relative siting of the property is such that only partially overlaps with no 8 and 10 Bell Lane. Both properties have a ground floor and first floor window within close proximity of the mansard addition. A site visit was undertaken by the Planning Officer at No.8, and it was confirmed that these windows serve habitable rooms, so it is reasonable to assume that these windows also serve habitable rooms at No.10, as this property adjoins No.8. During the site visit It was observed that the application site only partially overlaps these neighbours, and the width of the road and pavement provides a separation distance between the application site and No.s 8 and 10, resulting in the mansard roof extension only causing a small degree of obstruction to the daylight afforded to the front windows of these neighbours, but

Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1841/HOT Page 8 of 10

not significant enough to refuse the scheme on this basis. It is not considered that the front facing windows associated with the extension could enable harmful overlooking or a loss of privacy to No.s 8 and 10, as the view from these windows would not be significantly dissimilar to the existing views afforded by first floor front facing habitable room fenestration.

In light of the above, the proposals are considered to meet the aims and objectives of Policy LP 8 of the Local Plan (2018), policy 46 of the publication Local Plan and the SPD (2015) on House Extensions and External Alterations.

iii Trees

Policy LP16 of the Local Plan 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.

There are no trees designated with Tree Preservation Orders on the site and the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on trees of amenity value through either direct or indirect impacts.

iv Flood Risk .

Policy LP21 of the Local Plan states '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.

The application site is located within Throughflow Catchment Area (Throughflow and Groundwater Policy Zone).

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been provided to support this application, to comply with the requirements of LP21. The FRA confirms that:

- Mitigation measures- Floor levels within the proposed development will be set no lower than existing levels AND, flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where appropriate.
- Supporting information- Details of any flood proofing / resilience and resistance techniques, to be included in accordance with 'Improving the flood performance of new buildings' CLG (2007)

Assuming accordance with these flood risk management measures the proposed application is suitable in flood risk terms.

v Fire Safety

Policy D12 of the London Plan requires all development proposals to achieve the highest standards of fire safety.

A Fire Safety – statement of compliance has been submitted as part of the application. The report includes detail on access for fire appliances, passive and active fire safety measures, minimising fire spread and evacuation. The submission of this document therefore satisfies the requirement 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

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): ...RHE..... Dated:09/09/2024.....

I agree the recommendation:

South Area Team Manager:ND.....

Dated:10.09.2024.....