

PLANNING STATEMENT

FOR:

**PLANNING APPLICATION FOR REVISED REAR EXTENSION,
FENESTRATION CHANGES AND INTERNAL WORKS TO THE
DWELLING FOLLOWING REFUSED APPLICATIONS (24/1063/HOT &
24/1064/LBC)**

AT:


**59 PETERSHAM ROAD
RICHMOND
TW10 6UT**

**APPLICATION SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF:
MR J EARLE**

September 2024

+44 (0) 1483 415 753 

applications@planitconsulting.co.uk 
www.planitconsulting.co.uk

3 Innovation Place, Douglas Drive 
Godalming, Surrey GU7 1JX

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement is submitted on behalf of our client, Mr J Earle in support of a revised planning application to extend the rear of the property of 59 Petersham Road and at a lower ground and garden floor level.
- 1.2 The dwelling is a Grade II listed Terraced Georgian dwellinghouse located on Petersham Road by the River Thames in Richmond. The dwelling is listed under the name “The Paragon”.
- 1.3 The proposed development would be a re-submission following on from two previous refusals for similar schemes (along with the additional two LBC refusals associated with these refusals).
- 1.4 The most recent two of these were 24/1063/HOT & 24/1064/LBC and were both submitted to the LPA on the 25th of April 2024 and validated on the 7th May 2024. The applications were both refused on the 1st of July 2024, under delegated powers.
- 1.5 The decision notice lists the reason for refusal as:
- “The proposed rear extension, by reason of its scale, siting and design, would result in an incongruous addition of excessive scale which over dominates the rear elevation and results in the loss of hierarchy between floors and fails to preserve the special interest of the listed building or the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018), in particular policy LP1, LP3, Publication Local Plan policies 28 and 29, the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations and the NPPF.”*
- 1.6 This application proposes a revised smaller scale scheme which would address the concerns raised by the officer.
- 1.7 A second slightly larger scheme will also be submitted separately from this application (along with the LBC application). The larger scheme should be reviewed and assessed entirely separately to this scheme. Both new submissions are considered to adequately address the concerns raised by the case officer.

1.8 The dwellinghouse is situated in the Richmond Conservation Area (site CA5). The dwelling is also within Flood Risk Zone 2 and within an Archaeological priority area. It is also noted there is an Article 4 on the site restricting basement developments.

1.9 It will be explained why the works proposed would comply with national and local planning policy as outlined in the London 2021 Plan, Richmond Local Plan 2018 as well as the NPPF 2023.

1.10 The proposed application will be accompanied by a Listed Building Consent application as well as a Heritage Statement due to the Building's Listing, the Listed status of both neighbouring dwellings and the siting of the building in the Conservation Area.

1.11 The remainder of this statement is set out as follows:


- 2) The Application Property and Planning History
- 3) The Application Proposal
- 4) Policy Assessment
- 5) Summary

1.12 The application is accompanied by the following documents

- Site Location Plan
- Site Plan
- Existing Plans
- Proposed Plans
- Sustainability and Climate Change Questionnaire.

2 THE APPLICATION PROPERTY

2.1 59 Petersham Road is situated in the centre of Richmond to the north west of Richmond Park on the eastern bank of the River Thames south of Richmond bridge. Below is a site location plan of the area



Screen Capture from Richmond Planning Map, the blue marker represents the site location

2.2 It should be noted that on the above plan the pink highlighted buildings are those which are listed. Many of the buildings across Petersham Road are Grade II Listed with some Grade I Listed Buildings slightly further out such as Richmond Golf Club, Richmond Palace and Richmond Bridge.

2.3 None of the buildings on Petersham Road are Grade II* or Grade I Listed. The Conservation Area Appraisal describes the area as such

“Along Petersham Road fine groups and individual houses from the 18th to 19th centuries address the Thames, affording gap views to the river from the road. There is

a general transition from more isolated buildings in the south to the more cohesive development along the road into town”

2.4 The appraisal goes on to describe the area’s Conservation significance as the following;

“Their domestic scale and elaborate decoration sit in direct contrast to the more monolithic industrial buildings further along Petersham Road. This variety in usage and design contributes to the character of the Conservation Area.”

2.5 The dwelling is a somewhat typical 18th century town house, it is also known as “The Paragon”. The sites listing is fairly brief and contains the following description;

“Two storeys, basement and attic. Three windows wide. Stuccoed, parapeted front (stucco a later addition). Roman Doric doorcase with triglyph frieze. Slated roof with 2 pedimented dormers.”

2.6 There are several planning constraints at the site, all of which are listed below.

- Archaeological Priority Area
- Flood Zone 2 and 3a
- Area Benefitting from flood defenses
- Article 4 restricting basement development
- Richmond Hill Conservation Area
- Grade II Listed as are neighbouring properties
- Main Centre Buffer Zone
- Metropolitan Open Land
- Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance: Character Area 12

2.7 59 Petersham Road also has a fairly extensive planning history which is outlined in the below table

Planning Reference	Proposal	Decision
24/1177/LBC	Demolish existing front steps to create new lightwell at Garden Level Floor including metal steps to	Refused 05/08/2024

	lower ground floor and grille. Alterations to fenestration. Glazed wall to enclose between Garden Level utility room and store.	
24/1176/HOT	Demolish existing front steps to create new lightwell at Garden Level Floor including metal steps to lower ground floor and grille. Alterations to fenestration. Glazed wall to enclose between Garden Level utility room and store.	Refused 05/08/2024
24/1064/LBC	Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with external steps. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls	Refused 01/07/2024
24/1063/HOT	Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with external steps. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls	Refused 01/07/2024
23/3127/LBC	Replace existing first floor rear windows with french doors (following the same glazing pattern and mouldings as existing). Existing juliette balcony railings to be reinstated.	Approved 29/02/2024
23/3126/HOT	Replace existing first floor rear windows with french doors (following the same glazing	Approved 29/02/2024

	pattern and mouldings as existing). Existing juliette balcony railings to be reinstated.	
23/2976/LBC	Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with balcony. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls.	Refused 29/02/2024
23/2975/HOT	Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with balcony. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls.	Refused 29/02/2024
23/0256/HOT	Proposed reconstruction of the existing roof structure dismantled during works to approved applications 22/1867/LBC and 22/1866/HOT. Addition of new hopper and downpipe to rear elevation.	Approved 20/06/2023
23/0255/HOT	Proposed reconstruction of the existing roof structure dismantled during works to approved applications 22/1867/LBC and 22/1866/HOT. Addition of new hopper and downpipe to rear elevation.	Approved 20/06/2023
22/1867/HOT	Replacement of the existing dilapidated roof coverings, repair and restoration of the	Approved 06/12/2022

	existing failed roof structure internally and construction of new roof structure and coverings externally to preserve and protect the listed fabric of the property.	
22/1866/HOT	Replacement of the existing dilapidated roof coverings, repair and restoration of the existing failed roof structure internally and construction of new roof structure and coverings externally to preserve and protect the listed fabric of the property.	Approved 06/12/2022
22/0870/LBC	Application for re rendering the front facade, repairing and reinstating a traditional ironwork balcony on rear facade, the refurbishment and partial replacement of two sash windows on the rear facade, and repainting the front door	Approved 07/06/2022
22/0830/HOT	Application for re-rendering the front facade, repairing and reinstating a traditional ironwork balcony on rear facade, the refurbishment and partial replacement of two sash windows on the rear facade, and repainting front door.	Approved 07/06/2008
05/1258/HOT	New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, enlargement of upper and lower basements under the front forecourt and related internal alterations at basement levels and alterations to forecourt boundary wall.	Approved 20/06/2005

05/1257/HOT	New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, Enlargement of upper and lower basements under the front forecourt and related internal alterations at basement, alterations to front boundary wall.	Approved 20/06/2005
04/3976/LBC	New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, enlargement of upper and lower basement under the front forecourt, related internal alterations at basement levels and alterations to forecourt boundary wall.	Refused 31/05/2005
04/3975/HOT	New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, enlargement of upper and lower basements under the front forecourt and related internal alterations at basement levels.	Refused 31/05/2005
04/0282	New Staircase And Related Alterations (at Basement Level) To The Front Area, Enlargement Of Basement Under The Front Forecourt, Related Internal Alterations To Basement Level And Alterations To Forecourt Boundary Wall.	Approved 24/03/2004
04/0283	New External Staircase And Related Alterations (at Basement Level) To The Front Area, Enlargement Of Basement Under The Front Forecourt And Related Internal Alterations At Basement Level.	Approved 24/03/2004
83/1239	Removal and replacement in part of front boundary wall. (Amended drawing received 18.4.84).	Refused 04/06/1985

83/1240	Removal and replacement in part of front boundary wall. (Amended drawing received 18.4.84).	Refused 04/06/1985
86/1412/DD01/LB	Remove external stone and concrete steps from front garden down to basement and sub-basement levels and rebuild in partly changed layout in brick with stone treads with iron balustrade, and to remove kitchen door way and replace with window to match existing adjacent, form new door way to utility room and enlarge existing window in sub-basement (in accordance with condition D of Appendix A of the consent). Condition No. D of Appendix A of notice of planning permission	Approved 10/11/1987
86/1412/LB	Remove external stone and concrete steps from front garden down to basement and sub-basement levels, and rebuild in partly changed layout in brick with stone treads with iron balustrade; and to remove kitchen doorway and replace with window to match existing adjacent; form new doorway to utility room, and enlarge existing window in sub-basement.	Approved 24/02/1987
88/0603/LB	Removal of external steps to basement level and renewal to match and complete original flight from sub-basement to ground, together with provision of iron railings to match existing and repair existing. Replacement of door to basement level with window to match adjacent. Layout of forecourt with York stone paving.	Approved 29/06/1988

67/2130	Construction of vehicular access	Refused 1602/1968
---------	----------------------------------	----------------------

- 2.8 Many of the more recent applications have mostly consisted of modest internal changes, re-rendering of parts of the property and alterations to the roof. These applications were approved.
- 2.9 As stated there have been multiple application for the rear works proposed. These are both applications 24/1063/HOT & 24/1064/LBC and 23/2975/HOT & 23/2976/LBC. Both sets of applications were for fairly similar works just of differing scales. The reason for refusal for both applications were however the same.
- 2.10 The proposed however would differ from the 2 pairs of refused applications by way of removing any lower ground floor extension, instead the proposal would remove the existing extension here and replace with an open balcony across the width of the dwelling. This balcony would have a metal balustrade. The garden floor extension will remain unchanged. This is outlined further in the below section.
- 2.11 The site was previously subdivided into two dwellings much like many of the other properties along Petersham Road however more recent planning approvals have referred to the dwelling as a singular property and as such it has been established that the dwelling is no longer subdivided.
- 2.12 It is noted that neighbouring property The Bingham Hotel 61-63 Petersham Road has had various approved changes made to the building including the provision of multiple rear extensions and alterations. Furthermore 55 Petersham has over the past 20 years had rear roof alterations as well as the addition of contemporary glass doors across it's rear elevation approved.




Elevations at 55 Petersham (11/1507/HOT)

- 2.13 Given this, the character of the dwellings when viewed from the River has already been altered to appear more contemporary.
- 2.14 The dwelling sits on a slope and as such the dwellings front door is situated on the “upper ground floor” however the rear of the property meets the garden two storeys lower from road level. The dwelling has a “lower ground floor” which presently contains the rear extension with small steps to the garden and the “garden level” level which sits level with the rear garden. These will be referred to as above. For clarity the external works proposed of this application will alter the “garden level” and “lower ground levels”.
- 2.15 For further context see below images of the refused 24/1063/HOT & 24/1064/LBC development



Rear elevation of the refused 24/1063/HOT, the blue areas represent the glass extension.



Section of refused application 24/1063/HOT

2.16 The proposed would, by way of removing the lower ground floor level enlargement entirely reduce the perceived impact of the development.

3 THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This application is for a rear extension to the property at garden level and removal of an extension at lower ground level to replace with a balcony. The extension would be a single storey highly glazed extension across the existing rear element. It should be noted the rear element to be removed is not an original feature of the dwelling and is two storeys high as extends across the garden floor and lower ground floor.
- 3.2 The existing rear element is a flat roofed rendered extension which appears out of keeping with the rest of the property and hides a portion of the original rear façade. This element will be removed and replaced with a balcony which would extend across the width of the dwelling which would make the presently hidden portion once again visible.
- 3.3 It should be noted that the demolition of this element was stated by the officer through the previous applications as being acceptable as it is was “modern and of poor-quality construction.”
- 3.4 The below photo shows the existing rear extension (to be replaced) and rear façade of the dwellinghouse.




Image of the rear of the dwelling, red circle 1 around the existing to be removed rear element


- 3.5 The garden level extension would comprise a heavily glazed extension with a depth of 4 metres and height of 2.78 metres across the width of the dwelling. The extension would be used as an entertaining room. Given the partially glazed nature of the extension the original rear windows of the garden level would still be visible as the original rear façade would remain completely unchanged. It should be noted that given the low level of the garden level only 0.6 metres would extend above the boundary wall.
- 3.6 The lower ground level above the garden level would consist of a rear patio/balcony extending over 1.9 metres of the garden level below. The below extension would have a part green roof and part glazed roof to minimize visual impact. The lower ground balcony as stated would only be over a small portion of this garden level extension. This balcony will have a metal balustrade similar in style to that of the main dwelling with a height of 1.1 metres.
- 3.7 It should be noted that the proposal also includes various internal changes. However these are of a modest scale and would not remove any original elements or harm the fabric of the dwelling in any way. On the garden level the works consist of the addition of glazed doors between the study and gym which would be converted into a family room. The new family room would also be extended to encompass the existing bathroom which would be removed.
- 3.8 The lower ground floor internal changes would include the alteration of what is presently a kitchen to a guest bedroom. A bathroom would also be added by the bedroom and a workout area would be added. A glass partition would be added to separate the workout area from the bedroom.
- 3.9 Internal changes are also proposed concerning the second floor, in which the room layout would be altered with a new en suite added through the use of additional partitions as well as a new shower room to match that of the neighbouring property.
- 3.10 Finally the front elevation will see an extremely modest change of two extended front windows which would have a width to match those above and a height to maintain the hierarchy of floors. These will be added in order to facilitate a lightwell for the garden floor changes. This would not be visible from the street level and would be done in the style of the existing front windows to minimise impact.

3.11 More details regarding the methodology of the internal works are within the heritage report however the works done would be easily reversable, modest in scale and would not impact the fabric of the heritage asset.


3.12 Below are floor plans of the existing dwelling and proposed extensions




Existing Garden Level Floor Plan



Proposed Garden Level Floor Plan




Existing Lower Ground Floor Plan



Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan



Existing Second Floor Plan



Proposed Second Floor Plan


3.13 The main differences between this scheme and the previous refused would be by way of the removal of the lower ground floor extension. This would greatly reduce any perceived bulk of the works. The newly proposed terrace/balcony would instead

appear similar in style to the rest of the building and prevent concerns regarding limited views of the rear elevation.

- 3.14 Whilst slightly glazed, the extension would be covered on the south side through an enlarged party wall which would prevent overlooking; this would match the existing wall on the north side by extending 1.8 metres from the lower ground floor. This would improve the screening to the north side as presently the rear terrace overlooks the neighbouring dwelling. As such the proposed lower ground rear terrace would have less overlooking than the existing rear windows.
- 3.15 It should be noted that the proposed changes provide no greater harm in regards to neighbouring amenity than the previous proposals, neither of which were found to cause harm to the neighbours.
- 3.16 Below are the elevations and section plans of the proposed works.



Front Elevation Existing




Front Elevation Proposed




Existing Rear Elevation



Proposed Rear Elevation



Existing Section Plan



Proposed Section Plan

- 3.17 As the plans show the majority of the works would be at a very low level with only a very small amount of work on the higher “lower ground” level.
- 3.18 As such the works would be mostly hidden from public view as neither of the neighbouring properties would be easily able to see the rear extension due to the large party walls and low level of works.
- 3.19 Whilst there is a public footway to the west of the property along the river Thames, this view is set far back from the dwelling as the rear garden is 25 metres long and is separated by the footway by a large gate and wall as well as high trees which would make any view to the rear dwelling very much obscured.
- 3.20 Below is the total floor area of each level following the proposed changes.

**SCHEME 2
AMOUNT**

EXISTING GIA	PROPOSED GIA
<i>Existing Garden Level = 56.3sqm (plus external stores)</i>	<i>Proposed Garden Level = 86sqm (including now enclosed stores) + lightwell</i>
<i>Existing Lower Ground Floor = 59.4sqm</i>	<i>Proposed Lower Ground Floor = 56.2sqm</i>
<i>Existing Upper Ground Floor = 55.8sqm</i>	<i>Proposed Upper Ground Floor = 55.8sqm</i>
<i>Existing First Floor = 55.4sqm</i>	<i>Proposed First Floor = 55.4qm</i>
<i>Existing Second Floor = 43.9sqm</i>	<i>Proposed Second Floor = 43.9sqm</i>
Total 270.8m2	Total 297.3m2

= 26.5sqm additional GIA

4 RELEVANT POLICY

4.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require all planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise

4.2 National Planning Policy Framework 2023

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) serves as the overarching planning policy document for England and is a material consideration in planning decisions

The key objective of the NPPF is to achieve sustainable development and at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The following are considered relevant.

- Chapter 2: Achieving Sustainable Development
- Chapter 4: Decision-making
- Chapter 12: Achieving well designed places
- Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

4.3 The Development Plans applicable to the area include the London Plan 2021 and the Richmond Local Plan (2018).

Planning policy context

London Plan (2021) The main policies applying to the site are:

- Policy D4 Delivering Good Design
- Policy D12 Fire Safety Policy.
- HC1 Heritage Conservation and Growth

Richmond Local Plan (2018) policies are:

- LP1 - Local Character and Design Quality
- LP3 - Impact on Designated Heritage Assets

- LP7 - Impact on Archaeology
- LP8 - Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions
- LP11 – Subterranean Developments and Basements
- LP21 Floor Risk and Sustainable Development

Supplementary planning documents:

CA5 Richmond Hill Appraisal

Listed Buildings

Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance

- 4.4 The planning officer is instructed to review the revised heritage statement submitted alongside this application prepared by Richard K Morris & Associates.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 4.5 The principal considerations are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Impact on the Listed Building
- Impact on the Conservation Area
- Impact on Character of the area
- Archaeological Impact
- Flood Risk
- Impact on neighbouring Amenity

The principle of development

- 4.6 LP 3 of the Richmond Local Plan lists a number of requirements for any works to a Listed Building. The most relevant for this application is point 4 which states any works development must;

“Require the retention and preservation of the original structure, layout, architectural features, materials as well as later features of interest within listed buildings, and resist the removal or modification of features that are both internally and externally of architectural importance or that contribute to the significance of the asset.”

- 4.7 The proposal has been specifically designed to limit the impact on the heritage asset as well as the neighbouring Listed Buildings and Conservation Area. Glazing and the contemporary design have all been utilised to reduce overall harm. This is outlined further both in the heritage statement and below.
- 4.8 Information has also been provided on the methodology of works explaining how each stage would limit harm to the fabric of the listed building.
- 4.9 Given that the dwelling is in flood risk zone 2 it is subject to policy LP 21, as such a sequential test has been conducted as well as a flood risk assessment to manage the potential flooding impact of the proposed works. Most importantly the sub terranean extensions. This is outlined further below.

Impact on Listed Building

- 4.10 As stated above LP 3 of the Richmond Local Plan lists a number of requirements for any works to a Listed Building.
- 4.11 As clearly shown the works have been designed by the architect with a mind for the preservation and retention of the heritage asset. The proposed external works include demolition of an unattractive existing rear element. This element is however non original and as such is of no heritage significance and actually blocks a fairly large amount of the original dwelling's rear elevation. As such the removal of this rear element (done with appropriate care) would result in no harm to the fabric of the heritage asset.
- 4.12 Whilst the rear extension would be replaced, this would be with a modest terrace which would not block views of the rear elevation of the Listed property. The extension on the garden floor, given its contemporary design would allow for a more clear line of distinction between the original elements and the new, as such the enlargement would improve functionality of the dwelling to future occupiers without harming or distorting the original character in any way.
- 4.13 The proposed extension would have a modest footprint in comparison to the rest of the dwelling. It should be noted that both of the neighbouring dwellings have significantly altered the rear elevation over time. As such the alteration of the rear of

the dwelling would not be out of keeping and would actually due to its glazed nature be of less impactful to the heritage asset than the neighbours approved enlargements. Below is an image highlighting the changes to the neighbouring property including roof changes and a large rear extension



View of the rear elevation of the existing dwelling highlighting the changes made on the neighbouring dwellings.

4.14 Due to this there are clear distinctions between each dwelling and as such the inclusion of more contemporary additions would not appear largely out of character and would instead continue in this pattern of allowing each dwelling more distinct from their neighbours.

4.15 The Heritage Statement provided sums up the modest nature of the proposal stating

“The use of large areas of glazing minimises the visual impact and most of the existing rear elevation will be still be visible in views from the garden. In addition, the choice of material means that the extension is completely reversible in nature..”

- 4.16 As stated the contemporary nature of the rear extension makes no attempt to appear to match the rear Georgia façade of the main dwelling. This is important as there is a preference that any external addition appear clearly separate from the Listed Building to maintain a level of distinction so that the original heritage asset is clearly identifiable.
- 4.17 Once again the heritage statement provided explains the significance of maintaining a clear separation between the dwelling and any enlargement

“The design of the extension is deliberately contemporary in character and thus distinguishes itself from the older portion of the building and has no sense of pastiche. As outlined in the advice produced in 2004 by CABE:

‘In designing for historic environments it is important is to achieve high quality design which adds to the quality of what exists, rather than getting bogged down in questions of style. Designs should be developed for present-day needs, in a holistic manner that responds to all relevant considerations and local circumstances. This does not predispose that designs have to be of any particular style, use any particular materials, or have a specific look, either copying older buildings or looking particularly modern’.

Additionally, Para.143 of English Heritage’s 2008 Conservation Principles states:

‘There are no simple rules for achieving quality of design in new work, although a clear and coherent relationship of all the parts to the whole, as well as to the setting into which the new work is introduced, is essential. This neither implies nor precludes working in traditional or new ways....’

- 4.18 As such given the modest nature of works, lack of any obvious harm and clear design effort to maintain a distinct separation between the enlargement and dwelling the proposal would be of no harm to the heritage asset. As such there’s no requirement to provide reasonable justification to offset harm as none has been identified.

Conservation Area

4.19 The site is within a Conservation Area (CA5) - Richmond Hill and as such the CA5 Richmond Hill Appraisal is an important consideration. It is noted that the appraisal does not explicitly mention 59 Petersham Road or any of the neighbouring properties however does discuss the importance of Petersham Road as a whole due to its domestic usage contrasting the more industrial usage of some of the nearby buildings.

“Their domestic scale and elaborate decoration sit in direct contrast to the more monolithic industrial buildings further along Petersham Road. This variety in usage and design contributes to the character of the Conservation Area.”

4.20 As the heritage statement outlines the modest scale and glazed nature of the proposed would, as well as having a limited impact of no harm on the listed building, also have no harm on the conservation area. Furthermore all the proposed works are to the rear of the property thus limiting any impact on view from the more public areas of the Conservation Area.

4.21 In regards to the overall principle of the change proposed the heritage statement states the following

“However, such changes would not result in and harm – substantial or less than substantial – to the listed building or to any adjacent heritage assets or the conservation area. Consequently, it is concluded that neither Sections 66 or 72 of the 1990 Planning Act nor Paragraphs 201-3 of the National Planning Policy Framework would be engaged.

As outlined in the pioneering 2008 document, Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment that: ‘Change in the historic environment is inevitable, caused by natural processes, the wear and tear of use, and people’s responses to social, economic and technological change’.”

4.22 As such no harm has been identified to the Conservation Area and once again no justification for the works are required.

Impact on Character

4.23 Policy LP 1 outlines the considerations when assessing if the design of any proposal is acceptable and states

“compatibility with local character including the relationship to existing townscape, development patterns, views, local grain and frontages as well as scale, height, massing, density, landscaping, proportions, form, materials and detailing;”

4.24 The glazed design as stated allows for the original Georgian elements to be visible, mostly minimising the impact on character. Furthermore the removal of the existing rear element and replacement with the glazed extension would actually allow for more visibility of the original rear of the building than existing. Furthermore all the major changes are at the rear of the property with the front changes being mostly on a subterranean level. As such from the street scene there is no significant impact from the development.

4.25 The proposed rear extension is of a modest scale with the majority also being fairly low level. The garden floor level is not easily visible from any viewpoint aside from the rear garden of the application dwelling. The higher up changes only consist of a small balcony which would not appear larger different from the existing rear elevation of the dwelling, a metal balustrade railed terrace which would very much be in keeping with the character of the property.

Archaeological Impact

4.26 The council are advised to consult their archaeological team, however as with the previous applications there are no archaeological concerns related to this application.

Flood Risk

4.27 As legislation has not changed from the previous application date nor has flood risk been altered, the previous flood risk assessment from applications 24/1063/HOT & 24/1064/LBC has been submitted with this application which outlines the potential risk along with mitigation methods.

Impact on Neighbour Amenity

4.28 LP8 of the Richmond Local Plan states that new develop must do the following;

“ensure the design and layout of buildings enables good standards of daylight and sunlight to be achieved in new development and in existing properties affected by new development”

&

“ensure that proposals are not visually intrusive or have an overbearing impact as a result of their height, massing or siting, including through creating a sense of enclosure”

4.29 It should be noted that amenity was not raised as a reason for refusal with the last application.

4.30 The application dwelling is a terraced townhouse and as such has two adjoining neighbouring dwellings 57 & 61 Petersham Road.

4.31 The existing screening of the boundary walls would not presently cover the potential overlooking of the proposed terrace. As such the boundary walls would be extended an additional metre to have a total depth of roughly 2 metres which would block any view from the balcony or lower ground level enlargement.

4.32 The garden level room would, given its modest height and situation within the topography of the area not be considered an overlooking concern. Furthermore due to its glazed design and modest scale there would be of no overbearing or overshadowing concern.

4.33 The lower ground extension would be removed and the proposed terrace would have no greater levels of view. Furthermore the enlarged wall would prevent any overlooking from this element.

4.34 The 2 metre boundary wall enlargements are too modest in scale to be of any impact despite sitting on the boundary line with the neighbouring dwellings.

4.35 As previously stated, the proposed scheme is smaller in scale than the previous refused scheme which was refused only on character and heritage concerns and not amenity issues. The changes proposed with this scheme would not impact amenity adversely.

5 SUMMARY

5.1 This statement has set out the details of the proposal and demonstrated that the scheme is acceptable for the following reasons:

- The proposed extension would preserve the rear façade of the heritage asset limiting any harm to the original Listed Building or Conservation Area
- The proposed is of a modest scale and hidden from the street scene thus limiting any impact on the surrounding area.
- The proposed would given it's glass design and shape as well as through the enlargement of rear partitions have no significant impact on either of the neighbouring properties
- There are no flooding concerns or archeological issues identified.

5.2 Accordingly, we trust the Council will agree with the appropriateness of the application scheme and we look forward to confirmation that the scheme will be viewed favourably by the Council.