

PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by Georgia Nicol on 11 September 2024

AGENT NAME

Hampton

TW12 3AZ

United Kingdom

Expiry Date

02.08.2024 02.08.2024

Ms Grainne O Keeffe

Atrium 36 Broad Lane

Application reference: 24/1694/HOT

HAMPTON NORTH WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
04.07.2024	16.07.2024	10.09.2024	10.09.2024 EOT 16.09.24

Site:

2 Broadmead Close, Hampton, TW12 3RT

Proposal:

Ground floor rear and side extension. First floor side and rear extension. Modifications to front elevation incl. new porch and bay window. Garage conversion

APPLICANT NAME

Mrs Sabin Haq 2 Broadmead Close Hampton Richmond Upon Thames

TW12 3RT

Consultations: Internal/External:

> Consultee LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (North) LBRUT Transport

Neighbours:

5 Broadmead Close, Hampton, TW12 3RT, - 19.07.2024

Flat 11, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 10, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 9, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 8, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 7, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 6, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 5, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024 Flat 4, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 3, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 2, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

Flat 1, Broadmead, 48 Broad Lane, Hampton, TW12 3BL, - 19.07.2024

6 Broadmead Close, Hampton, TW12 3RT, - 19.07.2024

Caradean, Marlborough Road, Hampton, TW12 3RX, - 19.07.2024

3 Broadmead Close, Hampton, TW12 3RT, - 19.07.2024

1 Broadmead Close, Hampton, TW12 3RT, -

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:99/T1066 Date:07/10/1999 Cypress - Remove

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:09/T0043/TPO

Date:24/03/2009 T6 - Triple Stem Ash - Fell T9 - 15 - Silver Birch - Reduce laterally towards

'Marlings' in North Westerly direction by 2 - 3 m to mitigate direct

Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1694/HOT Page 1 of 10

encroachn	nent to the prop	perties in B	roadmead	Close.

	encroachment to the properties in Broadmead Close.		
Development Management			
Status: GTD	Application:22/T0931/TPO		
Date:21/12/2022	T1 Silver Birch (Betula pendula) TPO tree no. may be different to the tree number we have given this tree - dead tree - Fell to ground level and remove all arisings. T2 Lawson Cypress (Chamaecyparis lawsoniana) TPO tree no. may be different to the tree number we have given this tree - raise crown to give 6 foot clearance. T3 Cherry Laurel (Prunus laurocerasus) Fell to ground level, remove all arisings and grub/grind out stump.		
Development Management			
Status: PCO	Application:24/1694/HOT		
Date:	Ground floor rear and side extension. First floor side and rear extension.		
	Modifications to front elevation incl. new porch and bay window. Garage		
	conversion		
Development Management			
Status: GTD	Application:24/1695/HOT		
Date:28/08/2024	Garden room to rear garden		
Building Control			
Deposit Date: 04.10.2005	Conversion of rear half of garage to utility room		
Reference: 05/2048/BN			
Building Control			
Deposit Date: 03.11.2009	7 Windows 3 Doors		
Reference: 09/FEN02301/FENSA			
Building Control			
Deposit Date: 29.09.2020	Install a gas-fired boiler		
Reference: 23/FEN01197/GASAFE			

Application Number	24/1694/HOT
Address	2 Broadmead Close Hampton TW12 3RT
Proposal	Ground floor rear and side extension. First floor side and rear extension. Modifications to front elevation incl. new porch and bay window. Garage conversion
Contact Officer	GNI
Target Determination Date	10.09.24
	EOT 16.09.24

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 subject site contains of a two-storey detached dwellinghouse on the northern side of Broadmead Close. There dwelling forms part of a row of four detached dwellings of a similar design.

The application site is situated within Hampton Village and is designated as:

Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 25% <50% - SSA Pool ID: 396)

Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)

Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Low)

Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 13751)

Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 42684)

Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 42723)

Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 47989)

Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency ()

Take Away Management Zone (Take Away Management Zone)

TPO (REF: T0163 - T11 Cypress Tree - Cupressus sp)

TPO (REF: T0163 - T12 Cypress Tree - Cupressus sp)

TPO (REF: T0163 - T13 Cypress Tree - Cupressus sp)

TPO Wood Group Area (REF: T0163 - G2 Cypress Tree - Cupressus sp)

Village (Hampton Village)

Village Character Area (Priory Road East and Surroundings - Area 11 Hampton Village Planning Guidance Page 39 CHARAREA09/11/01)

Ward (Hampton North Ward)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises a ground floor rear and side extension, first floor side and rear extension, modifications to front elevation including a new porch and bay window, and the conversion of the garage to habitable space.

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

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:24/1695/HOT Date:28/08/2024 Garden room to rear garden

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

The neighbours notified of this application are listed above.

One letter of objection has been received from no. 1 Broadmead Close and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light/overshadowing
 - conservatory, patio, kitchen, downstairs closet and ensuite bathroom impacted
 - the proposed double storey shadows 2/3 conservatory and is continued in the 2.8m single storey
- Houses have enjoyed spacing of 3.5m at first floor level to separate the detached houses and allow light into neighbouring properties at first floor level and privacy for each house through design and layout
- Overbearing
 - o proximity and height
 - o double storey wall adjacent to conservatory
 - o double storey elevation further by 2m beyond the line of my rear elevation
 - o single storey rear extension projects 4m with height of 2.8m is unacceptable
- Visual Amenity
- Loss of Privacy
 - my window will overlook kitchen rooflights and would have a similar line of sight to my bedroom
 - proposed window of bedroom 2 at first floor on the boundary line will increase the opportunity of overlooking into my conservatory and garden
- Streetscape Impacts
- Design understanding that properties need to be separated by at lease 1m on either side of the boundary fence at first floor level which would be more acceptable
- Access access to the rear of my property will be blocked during the proposed work and my patio paving would need to be lifted to facilitate the building of the proposed foundations

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

Amended plans were submitted by the applicant on 05.09.24 following discussions with Planning Officers. The scheme was amended to reduce the size of the two-storey extension, by setting it back significantly at the front and incorporating two windows to improve streetscape presentation.

The proposed plans were not required to be renotified as the proposed amendments result in a reduction of mass and consequent impacts. The proposed new windows in the front elevation will not result in any adverse privacy impacts warranting reconsultation.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 11. Making effective use of land
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural 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

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	Comp	liance
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1,	Yes	No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
Impact on Biodiversity	LP15	Yes	No
Impact on Trees, Woodland and Landscape	LP16	Yes	No
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	No
Parking Standards and Servicing	LP45	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	Comp	liance
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Biodiversity and Geodiversity	39	Yes	No
Trees, Woodland and Landscape	42	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No
Sustainable travel choices, Vehicular Parking, Cycle Parking, Servicing and Construction Logistics Management	47, 48	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Quality
House Extension and External Alterations
Transport
Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements
Residential Development Standards

Officer Planning Report - Application 24/1694/HOT Page 5 of 10

Village Plan – Hampton

These documents can be found at:

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_docume nts_and_quidance

Other Local Strategies or Publications

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are: Community Infrastructure Levy Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2021

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Trees
- iv Biodiversity
- v Flood Risk
- vi Fire Safety
- vii Loss of Parking/Transport

i Design

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 extension is integrated with the house which can work well with detached houses and sometimes on the end of uniform terraces. Alternatively, the extension is made to appear as an obvious addition which is subordinate to the main structure, so that the original form can still be appreciated. In such circumstances, the ridge of the extension should be set lower to that on the main house. Where the extension is to be subordinate to the existing house it is usually desirable to set back the extension by at least 1 metre behind the front elevation and 1m from the side boundary.

The Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations further states that two storey side and rear 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 proposed development as amended comprises a ground floor rear and side extension, first floor side and rear extension, modifications to front elevation including a new porch and bay window, and the conversion of the garage to habitable space.

The proposed first floor side/rear extension is set above the existing garage with a two-storey component at the rear and as amended will be setback 2.66m from the front elevation with a width of 2.6m and a total depth of 7.6m. The proposed first floor side/rear extension is set down from the roof ridge of the existing dwelling and with the increased setback is considered appropriately subordinate to the existing dwelling and therefore consistent with the aims of SPD guidelines. Whilst the first-floor side/rear extension has not been setback from the western side boundary, the revised design is less than half the width of the existing dwelling, does not dominate the host dwelling or its neighbours and due to the siting of the row, avoids any adverse terracing effect within the street. The first-floor side extension in its streetscape presentation is of a similar design, massing and scale to the existing first floor side extension at no.1 Broad Lane. The incorporation of two windows in the first-floor extension assists in mitigating the solidity of the proposed development as well as integrating it within the design of the existing dwelling and streetscape. A variation of the 1m side setback is considered acceptable in this instance and the proposed first floor/rear extension is an appropriately designed addition for the host dwelling and wider streetscape context.

A small rear first floor extension is also proposed with a depth of 1m, width of 3.7m with a pitched roof form. Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1694/HOT Page 6 of 10

The proposed depth is minor and the pitched roof form is appropriately set down from the existing ridge and designed to mirror the design of the existing roof. The design draws on the similar first floor rear extension at no.1 and is considered acceptable in this instance.

The proposed single storey rear extension will extend the full width of the dwelling and existing garage and will have varying depths, projecting 3m from the primary rear wall of the dwelling and inclusive of the two storey rear extension will project 5.9m from the wall of the exiting garage. The proposed rear extension will have a height of 2.75m at the sides, with a total height of 3.75m to the top of the pitched roof component. The proposed design of the rear extension is considered to be acceptable and compatible with the existing dwelling. While the rear extension exceeds the guidance for single storey rear extensions for detached dwellings in part, the particular circumstances of the site are considered to justify a greater rear projection as discussed in the amenity section below.

Modifications to the front elevation including removal of the bay window with minor infills, new porch and removal of the garage door/replacement with new windows are appropriate changes to the dwelling and considered to have a neutral impact on the streetscape.

It is noted that a small garden room has been recently approved. This garden room replaced the general footprint of an existing shed. Whilst not yet constructed, it is considered if both schemes are constructed sufficient rear amenity space will be retained.

The proposed materials for the development will generally match the existing dwelling and are considered acceptable.

The proposed development is appropriately designed, compatible with the host dwelling and surrounding streetscape and is in keeping with the general character of other extensions within the group of dwellings on Broad Lane. In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Richmond Local Plan (2018), LP28 of the Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) and the SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations.

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 4m in depth for a detached 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.

Numbers 1 and 3 Broad Lane adjoin the host dwelling to the south-west and north-east respectively. Given their proximity to the host dwelling, it is considered that any alteration here would likely have the greatest potential impact upon their amenity. Caradean Marlborough Road adjoins the site to the rear, due to the location of the proposed works, the distance to this property from the subject site and the siting of this dwelling, no adverse impacts are anticipated to this dwelling.

1 Broad Lane

The dwelling within this site has a large rear conservatory which provides habitable space to this dwelling and by design contains a large amount of glazing.

The proposed first floor side extension/rear two storey extension is appropriately designed to mitigate impacts to this adjacent dwelling and will extend approximately 2m beyond the first-floor rear elevation at no.1. Due to this minimal projection and the location of the existing built form within the site at no. 1, no adverse overbearing or visual amenity impacts are considered to result from this element of the proposal. It has been demonstrated that adequate sunlight and daylight access will remain to windows at both first floor and ground level and the roof of the conservatory. It is noted the first floor as amended will allow for light to access the first-floor side western elevation window at this dwelling. The proposed windows on the rear of the side extension are oriented within their own site and are not considered to result in adverse visual privacy impacts to no 1. No side windows are proposed.

The proposed single storey rear extension will be built along the south-western site boundary, with a height of 2.75m and will have a projection of approximately 2m beyond the rear conservatory at no. 1. The Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1694/HOT Page 7 of 10

proposed rear extension whilst taller than the existing fence, is not an abnormal height for a rear extension and is not considered to result in unreasonable or harmful overbearing impacts to no. 1. The depth of the proposed rear extension, inclusive of the two-storey component along this boundary is acceptable given the existing building form and location of the rear conservatory at no. 1 and will not result in a sense of enclosure or unacceptable visual impacts. It has been demonstrated that the proposed development will meet the relevant BRE tests and will maintain adequate sunlight and daylight access to the rear conservatory at no. 1 which benefits from large amounts of glazing along its rear elevation.

The proposed rooflights in the roof of the ground floor extension are considered to result in limited visual privacy impacts due to their location only allowing for oblique overlooking from no. 1 with views largely obstructed by the proposed building form.

The central first-floor extension will not generate any adverse amenity impacts to no. 1 nor will the proposed changes to the front elevation.

Given the above, the proposed development is not considered to generate adverse amenity impacts to no.1 which would warrant refusal of the application.

3 Broad Lane

The proposed rear single storey extension represents a small projection and will be appropriately located away from the shared eastern boundary with this dwelling. The other proposed works, including the other rear/side extensions and the changes to the front of the property are located an appropriate distance away from this dwelling. As a result, no adverse amenity impacts will result to this property.

Given the above, the application is considered consistent with the aims and objectives of policy LP8 Richmond Local Plan (2018), LP46 and of the Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) and the SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations

iii Trees

Policies LP15 and LP16 seek to protect biodiversity and health and longevity of trees, woodland and landscape in the borough.

LP16, requires 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. 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)."

There are several tree protection orders within the site and surrounds. The application, inclusive of the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment was reviewed by Council's Tree Officer who advised the proposed development is acceptable subject to the inclusion of an Arboricultural Method Statement which incorporates appropriate tree protection measures. The applicants have agreed to the inclusion of this precommencement condition.

iv Biodiversity

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

v Flood Risk

Policy LP 21 'Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage' states that 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.

Appropriate documentation has been submitted which identify that the proposed finished floor levels will not be set lower than the existing. The proposal is considered acceptable with regard to LP21 of the adopted Local Plan and LP8 of the Publication Local Plan.

vi Fire Safety Strategy

A Fire Safety Statement and Fire Safety Diagram was submitted with the application. A condition is included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. The materials proposed will need to be Building Regulations Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1694/HOT Page 8 of 10

compliant. The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. A separate application should be made for Building Regulation requirements. Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with this Policy D12 of the London Plan.

vii Loss of Parking/Transport

Policy LP45 states that the Council will require new development to make provision for the accommodation of vehicles in order to provide for the needs of the development while minimising the impact of car-based travel including on the operation of the road network and local environment and ensuring making the best use of land.

The proposed works include the conversion of the existing garage to habitable space. The application was reviewed by Council's Transport Officer and advised as acceptable. Sufficient onsite parking will remain within the site and the existing garage does not meet modern standards/SPD requirements.

The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with LP45 of the Richmond Local Plan (2018), LP48 and of the Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) and the Transport SPD.

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:

I therefore recommend the following:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / NO

1. 2. 3.	REFUSAL PERMISSION FORWARD TO COMMITTEE		
This applic	ation is CIL liable	YES* (*If yes, complete 0	NO CIL tab in Uniform)
This application requires a Legal Agreement		YES* (*If yes, complete [NO Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)
This application has representations online (which are not on the file)		YES	■ NO
This applic	ation has representations on file	YES	NO
Case Offic	er (Initials):GNI	Dated:12.	09.24
I agree the	e recommendation: CTA		
Team Lead	der/Head of Development Manageme	nt/Principal Plan	nner
Dated:	.13/09/2024		