

Application reference: 24/1427/FUL
HAMPTON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
04.06.2024	02.07.2024	27.08.2024	27.08.2024

Site:

2 Palace Gate, Hampton Court Road, Hampton, East Molesey

Proposal:

Change of use from single family dwellinghouse to mixed use of short-term rental accommodation for up to 330 days each year and a single family dwellinghouse

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

APPLICANT NAME

Alexander Fox
2 Palace Gate
Hampton Court Road
Hampton
East Molesey
KT8 9BN

AGENT NAME

DC Site Notice: printed on 03.07.2024 and posted on 12.07.2024 and due to expire on 02.08.2024

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

14D Urban D
LBRUT Transport
14D POL

Expiry Date

17.07.2024
17.07.2024
17.07.2024

Neighbours:

1 Palace Gate, Hampton Court Road, Hampton, East Molesey, KT8 9BN, - 03.07.2024
3 Palace Gate, Hampton Court Road, Hampton, East Molesey, KT8 9BN, - 03.07.2024
The Green, Hampton Court Road, Hampton, East Molesey, KT8 9BW, - 03.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:02/1442
Date:10/07/2002 Change Of Use To Single Dwelling House Including Loss Of Offices At Ground Floor

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:04/1025
Date:13/01/2005 Internal Alterations

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:90/0252/FUL
Date:28/03/1990 No2 Change Of Use Of Ground Floor To Office Use &2 Storey Rear Y Rear Extension. No 3 -change Of Use Of Part First Floor To Office Use.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application:90/0313/CAC
Date:06/04/1990 Demolition Of Two Storey Lean-to Building At Rear.

<u>Development Management</u> Status: WDN Date:30/05/1991	Application:91/0625/CAC Demolition Of Free Standing Wall And Derelict Outbuilding To Rear.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:16/01/1992	Application:91/1810/FUL Change Of Use From Residential Maisonette To B1 Offices On 1st & 2nd Floors Of 2 Palace Gate With Provision Of 2 Car Parking Spaces To Rear Of No 1 Palace Gate.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:16/01/1992	Application:91/1812/CAC Demolition Of Free Standing Wall And Derelict Out Buildings To Rear Of No 2 Palace Gate.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:04/12/1998	Application:98/2359 Use Of First And Second Floors As Offices Associated With Existing Use At First Floor Of 1 Palace Gate And Ground Floor Of 2 Palace Gate.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:31/10/1983	Application:83/0574/ADV For Advertisements.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:31/10/1983	Application:83/0699 Erection of canopies.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:31/10/1983	Application:83/1021 Erection of canopies.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:24/01/1986	Application:85/1074 Demolition of Tudor style ground and first floor extension.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:24/01/1986	Application:85/0956 Demolition of rear additions and erection of ground, first and second floor extensions and change of use to hotel. (Plan Nos.254/10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 received 24.7.85).
<u>Development Management</u> Status: PCO Date:	Application:24/1427/FUL Change of use from single dwellinghouse to mixed use of short-term rental accommodation for up to 330 days each year or single dwellinghouse.
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 01.10.1992 Reference: 92/1045/FP	Refurbishment of ground floor & external redecorations
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 02.04.2004 Reference: 04/0680/BN	Convert into four bedroom dwelling.
<u>Building Control</u> Deposit Date: 12.06.2022 Reference: 22/FEN02055/GASAFE	Install a gas-fired boiler

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 visited the application site if required to assess the application, 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, observations during any site visit, 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 property is three-storeys and forms part of a terrace on the west side of the Hampton Court Bridge, opposite the main gates to Hampton Court Palace.

The application site is situated in Hampton and has the following designations:

- Archaeological Priority (Site: Richmond APA 2.22: Bushy Park - Archaeological Priority Area - Tier II)
- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 50%)
- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Low)
- Conservation Area (CA11 Hampton Court Green)
- Floodzone 2 (Fluvial Models)
- Listed Building (Grade: II Site: 2 Palace Gate Hampton Court Road East Molesey Middlesex KT8 9BN)
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 2812)
- Take Away Management Zone (Take Away Management Zone)
- Thames Policy Area (Thames Policy Area)
- Village (Hampton Village)
- Village Character Area (Hampton Court Green - Area 5 & Conservation Area 11 Hampton Village Planning Guidance Page 27 CHARAREA09/05/01)
- Ward (Hampton Ward)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposal is for a change of use from a single family dwellinghouse with permanent residents to use as either a single family dwellinghouse with permanent residents or short-term rental accommodation for up to 330 days/nights a year.

The property is currently being used as a short-term accommodation for at least part of the year. It is understood that the accommodation is not rented out for more than 90 nights a year as short-term accommodation.

The most relevant planning history is as follows:

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date:24/01/1986

Application:85/0956

Demolition of rear additions and erection of ground, first and second floor extensions and change of use to hotel. (Plan Nos.254/10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 received 24.7.85).

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date:28/03/1990

Application:90/0252/FUL

No2 Change Of Use Of Ground Floor To Office Use &2 Storey Rear Y Rear Extension. No 3 -change Of Use Of Part First Floor To Office Use.

Development Management

Status: REF

Date:16/01/1992

Application:91/1810/FUL

Change Of Use From Residential Maisonette To B1 Offices On 1st & 2nd Floors Of 2 Palace Gate With Provision Of 2 Car Parking Spaces To Rear Of No 1 Palace Gate.

The reason for refusal was as follows:

The proposal would result in the introduction of new office development and in the loss of residential accommodation which could still be used with or without adaptation for residential purposes of some kind and as such is contrary to paragraph 3.37 of the Great London Development Plan, policy HSG 3 and EMP 3 of the Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan and policies HSG 3, 14 and EMP 2 of the draft Unitary Development Plan.

Development Management

Status: REF

Date:04/12/1998

Application:98/2359

Use Of First And Second Floors As Offices Associated With Existing Use At First Floor Of 1 Palace Gate And Ground Floor Of 2 Palace Gate.

The reason for refusal was as follows:

The proposed use would result in the loss of floorspace previously used for residential accommodation which could be refurbished to maintain that use. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy HSG 3 of the Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan.

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date:10/07/2002

Application:02/1442

Change Of Use To Single Dwelling House Including Loss Of Offices At Ground Floor

It should also be noted that, at neighbouring No.1 Palace Gate, an application for change of use from C3 residential to C1 hotel use was refused by the Council (ref. 23/1619/FUL) as it was not considered that the loss of housing and lack of accessibility in the new hotel rooms had been fully justified. However, the decision was overturned by the Planning Inspectorate. The Inspector reasoned that the site, being close to tourist attractions was a suitable location for hotel accommodation, saying:

The appeal scheme would result in the loss of existing housing and thus conflict with Policy H8 of the London Plan. However, the harm resulting from the loss of housing would be outweighed by the economic benefits associated with the proposal, which would support the sustainable growth of the visitor economy. This conclusion is based upon the particular circumstances of the proposal, including the location and listed building status of the appeal premises. I have also had regard to the fact that the Council is presently able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Overall, I therefore find no conflict with LP Policies LP38 and LP43, and Policy E10 of the London Plan, as well as the aims of Section 11 of the Framework, which seeks to ensure that planning decisions make effective use of land.

4. AMENDMENTS

No amendments were received.

5. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

The neighbours notified of this application are listed above.

No letters of representation were received.

6. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION**NPPF (2021)**

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- 11. Making effective use of land
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- E10 Visitor Infrastructure
- D12 Fire Safety
- H8 Loss of existing housing and estate redevelopment
- H9 Ensuring the best use of stock

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
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8
Loss of Housing	LP38
Visitor Economy	LP43
Sustainable Travel Choices	LP44
Parking Standards and Servicing	LP45

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 examination in public has now concluded and the Planning Inspectorate's report is expected. 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 will be addressed in more detail in the assessment below if/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. The examination in public of the Publication Version Local Plan has now concluded and the report of the Planning Inspectorate is being awaited.

Issue	Draft Local Plan Policy
Local character and design quality/ Design process	Policy 28/ Policy 42
Designated Heritage Assets	Policy 29
Archaeology	Policy 33
Amenity and Living Conditions	Policy 46
Loss of Housing	Policy 14
Visitor Economy	Policy 26
Sustainable travel choices	Policy 47
Vehicular Parking Standards, Cycle Parking, Servicing and Construction Logistics Management	Policy 48

Supplementary Planning Documents

Transport

These documents 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:

Hampton Court Green Conservation Area Statement
Hampton Court Green Conservation Area Appraisal (draft)

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.

Determining applications affecting a Listed Building

Sections 16(1) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that, when considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, or whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to this duty decisions of the court have confirmed that a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. However, this does not mean that the weight that the decision-maker must give to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting is uniform. It will depend on, among other things, the extent of the assessed harm and the heritage value of the asset in question. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to a listed building or its setting is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

7. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

i. Principle of development

Paragraph 119 of Chapter 11 of the NPPF states that 'Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.'

Policy E10 of the London Plan calls for London's visitor economy to be strengthened by enhancing and extending its attractions, inclusive access, legibility, visitor experience and management and supporting infrastructure, particularly to parts of outer London well-connected by public transport, taking into account the needs of business as well as leisure visitors. The London Plan has identified a target for additional hotel bedrooms, with evidence identifying room requirements for the borough. The policy seeks to create an Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1427/FUL Page 6 Of 12

additional 58,000 bedrooms of serviced accommodation by 2041 across London, with the evidence base behind it down to borough level and boroughs in outer London expected to plan proactively for new accommodation (https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/visitor_accommodation_-_working_paper_88.pdf). Table 20 shows 157 new hotel rooms anticipated in the borough to 2041, based on shares of the London supply projection.

Part G of the Policy states that 'In outer London and those parts of inner London outside the CAZ, serviced accommodation should be promoted in town centres and within Opportunity Areas (in accordance with the sequential test as set out in Policy SD7 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents) where they are well-connected by public transport, particularly to central London.'

Part H states that 'To ensure sufficient choice for people who require an accessible bedroom, development proposals for serviced accommodation should provide either: 1) 10 per cent of new bedrooms to be wheelchair-accessible in accordance with Figure 52121 incorporating either Figure 30 or 33 of British Standard BS8300-2:2018 Design of an accessible and inclusive built environment. Buildings. Code of practice; or 2) 15 per cent of new bedrooms to be accessible rooms in accordance with the requirements of 19.2.1.2 of British Standard BS8300-2:2018.'

Policy H9 of the London Plan states that 'Boroughs should take account of the impact on housing stock and local housing need when considering applications for a change of use from housing to short stay holiday rental accommodation to be used for more than 90 days a year.'

Policy LP 43 of the Local Plan states the Council will support the sustainable growth of the visitor economy for the benefit of the local area by: 1. supporting proposals which promote and enhance the borough's existing tourist attractions, including the unique, historic and cultural assets that are connected via the River Thames, such as The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Ham House and Hampton Court Palace; 2. proposals that lead to increased visitors and tourists need to be of an appropriate scale for the size of the centre and will be assessed against the transport policies of this Plan; 3. requiring accommodation and facilities to be accessible to all; at least 10% of hotel bedrooms should be wheelchair accessible; 4. enhancing the environment in areas leading to, within and around visitor destinations where appropriate. It also states in relation to visitor accommodation that: 1. proposals which result in the loss of bedspaces will be resisted; 2. proposals which increase the number of bedspaces will be supported subject to other Local Plan policies; 3. proposals will be supported which contribute towards providing a range of visitor accommodation, including small independent hotels and bed and breakfast accommodation, subject to other Local Plan policies.

The change from a single dwellinghouse to a mixed use of short-term rental accommodation or dwellinghouse would be a material change in the use of the site and require planning permission.

The recent appeal decision from the Planning Inspectorate in relation to No.1 Palace Gate is pertinent when considering this case. At No.1, the change of use to hotel rooms for short term accommodation was thought to be acceptable by the Inspector due to the location of the site and the benefit to the visitor economy. The Inspector also reasoned that, as the building was listed, the requirement to provide wheelchair accessible rooms was impractical, although submission of an accessibility statement was conditioned.

No.2 Palace Gate is immediately next door to No.1 and also faces directly towards Hampton Court Palace. While No.2 would be let out as short-term accommodation as a single unit and No.1 would provide hotel rooms, they would both be providing short term accommodation and contribute to the visitor economy. As the house is listed it is also thought that requiring some of the rooms to be wheelchair accessible may harm it as a heritage asset. This is discussed below.

As such, the application is materially very similar to the application at No.1 Palace Gate granted permission by the Inspector. Therefore, it is thought that the same reasoning of the Inspector should apply to No.2. Therefore, in this particular case, the change of use would be acceptable. It is noted that such a change of use may not be acceptable in other locations, even in close proximity to the application site, due to the loss of housing.

ii. Design and impact on heritage assets

Policy Context

Chapter 12 of the NPPF advises that poorly designed developments should be refused, especially where designs do not reflect local design policies, guidance and supplementary planning documents. It also says that significant weight should be given to designs which reflect local character, or to ones which are innovative designs in achieving high levels of sustainability, or which help improve the general standard of design in an area and fit in with the 'overall form and layout of their surroundings'.

In Chapter 16 of the NPPF, it states that '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. It goes on to say in Paragraph 202 that, '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 D4 of the London Plan states that the ' design of development proposals should be thoroughly scrutinised' and that 'design quality development should be retained through to completion'.

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'

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 states that development should conserve and, where possible, take opportunities to make a positive contribution to, the historic environment of the borough, particularly in relation to designated heritage assets.

Analysis

The applicant has stated that the rental income from letting out the property on a short-term basis is used towards the upkeep of the property and its fabric which would benefit the heritage asset.

The applicant has confirmed that no physical changes to the property are proposed. As discussed below, it is thought that some changes may be required in order to make the property more accessible to visitors. It is thought that an informative should be added to any permission to remind the applicant that any changes to the property, internal or external, would require listed building consent.

It is not thought that the change of use would fundamentally alter the character of the Conservation Area which already has hotels and guest accommodation in it, and which form part of its character.

No objection has been received from the Conservation Officer consulted on the application.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objections of Chapter 12 and Chapter 16 of the NPPF, policy D4 and policy HC1 of the London Plan and policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan.

iii. 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.

It is thought that use as visitor accommodation would result in greater number of people entering and exiting the site compared to a residential property. This has the potential to disturb neighbours. It is noted that there are no residential neighbours immediately next to the site, being in between a public house and a café with hotel accommodation above.

The movements of people to and from No.2 would be confined to the street frontage. It is not thought that visitors using the entrance would create additional noise or disturbance for neighbours compared to other pedestrians on the pavement or customers sitting outside the local public house or road traffic.

On balance, therefore, the proposal would not detract from the amenity and living conditions of neighbours and would comply with policy LP8 of the Local Plan and the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.

iv. Fire Safety

Policy D12 Fire Safety of the London Plan Part A requires all development to demonstrate the highest levels of fire safety. All non-major applications require the submission of a Fire Safety Strategy, unless reasonable exemption has been demonstrated.

As no physical changes are proposed, it is not thought that submission of a Fire Safety Strategy is required in this instance and that the application is a reasonable exception.

The property will need to fully comply with Building Regulations and any other relevant legislation. A planning permission, if granted, is *not* a consent under the Building Regulations.

v. Transport, Access, Parking and Servicing

Policy LP24 of the Local Plan states that: 'All developments, including conversions and changes of use are required to provide adequate refuse and recycling storage space and facilities, which allows for ease of collection and which residents and occupiers can easily access, in line with the guidance and advice set out in the Council's SPD on Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements'.

Policy LP44 of the Local Plan states that the Council will work in partnership to promote safe, sustainable and accessible transport solutions, which minimise the impacts of development including in relation to congestion, air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions, and maximise opportunities including for health benefits and providing access to services, facilities and employment. Policy LP45 of the Local Plan outlines that development must demonstrate an appropriate level of off-street parking to avoid an unacceptable impact on on-street parking conditions and local traffic conditions. It is further stated that in areas with a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating (1-4), it is particularly important that parking standards are met. Appendix 3 'Parking Standards' of the Local Plan. The Council's Transport SPD is also relevant.

The application has been reviewed by the Transport Officer who notes that vehicle parking outside the property is already restricted. As such, visitors to the site would not be able to park outside the property. Therefore, it is not thought that the change of use would materially impact parking for neighbouring properties. In the Planning Statement submitted with the application, it states that there is space for 5 bicycles to be parked on the property which is thought to be a positive. No objection has been raised from the Transport Department regarding the proposals.

It also notes that the ground floor of the property can be accessed by wheelchair users and that there is space at the front of the property for loading and unloading passengers into or from a vehicle. As the property would not be in hotel use, it is not thought that the accessibility requirements of the London Plan in relation to new hotel rooms would be applicable here. Therefore, it is thought that the details on access are sufficient. Due to the listed status of the house, it is thought that major interventions into the fabric of the house, for example, to create a lift, may not be acceptable or proportionate.

The Planning Statement notes that the property is serviced by local businesses in connection to the short term lets. Naturally, the increase in visitor numbers and times, would increase the servicing requirement. Therefore, it is thought reasonable that the applicant should submit a detailed servicing plan, including details on food deliveries, cleaning services, waste disposal and parking arrangements for service vehicles.

Consequently, the proposals are considered to comply with policies LP24, LP44 and LP45 of the Local Plan as well as the SPDs on Transport and on Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements subject to further information being provided.

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

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.

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.

Grant planning permission subject to condition

Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES

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): JPH

Dated: 16/09/2024

I agree the recommendation: CTA

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:16/09/2024.....

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:

REASONS:
CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:
UDP POLICIES:
OTHER POLICIES:

The following table will populate as a quick check by running the template once items have been entered into Uniform

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

CONDITIONS

INFORMATIVES
