

Application reference: 24/1700/HOT SOUTH RICHMOND WARD

| Date application received | Date made valid | Target report date | 8 Week date |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 04.07.2024 | 04.07.2024 | 29.08.2024 | 29.08.2024 |

Site:

38 Mount Ararat Road, Richmond, TW10 6PG,

Proposal:

Erection of a rear upper ground extension to extend over part of the existing lower ground floor extension.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Patrikeeva
38 Mount Ararat Road
Richmond
Richmond Upon Thames
TW10 6PG

AGENT NAME

Mr Ed Shinton
126 - 128 New Kings Road
London
SW6 4LZ

DC Site Notice: printed on 09.07.2024 and posted on 19.07.2024 and due to expire on 09.08.2024

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

14D Urban D

Expiry Date

23.07.2024

Neighbours:

Flat 2,33 Mount Ararat Road,Richmond,TW10 6PQ, - 09.07.2024
Flat 3,33 Mount Ararat Road,Richmond,TW10 6PQ, - 09.07.2024
Basement Flat,33 Mount Ararat Road,Richmond,TW10 6PQ, - 09.07.2024
Ground Floor,33 Mount Ararat Road,Richmond,TW10 6PQ, - 09.07.2024
35 Mount Ararat Road,Richmond,TW10 6PQ, - 09.07.2024
50 The Vineyard,Richmond,TW10 6AT, - 09.07.2024
40 Mount Ararat Road,Richmond,TW10 6PG, - 09.07.2024
36 Mount Ararat Road,Richmond,TW10 6PG, - 09.07.2024

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

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date:29/09/2005

Application:05/2370/CAC

Demolition of front garden wall and row railings above.

Development Management

Status: WDN

Date:15/08/2006

Application:06/2105/HOT

Three storey side extension. Half basement rear extension forming a conservatory with bay extension over to upper ground floor.

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date:20/11/2006

Application:06/2978/HOT

Infill flank end elevation extension two and a half storey high with half basement rear extension forming a conservatory.

Development Management

Status: WNA

Date:21/08/2007

Application:06/2978/DD01

Details pursuant to condition LAO7A (tree planting) of planning permission

06/2978/HOT.

Development Management

Status: REF Application:12/0602/HOT
Date:01/05/2012 Side extension to lower ground, ground & first floor, together with a rear extension to lower ground and ground floor levels.

Development Management

Status: REF Application:12/2407/HOT
Date:18/09/2012 Side extension to lower ground, ground and first floor, together with a rear extension to lower ground and ground floor levels

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:12/3381/HOT
Date:11/12/2012 Side extension to lower ground, ground and first floor, together with a rear extension to lower ground level

Development Management

Status: GTD Application:13/1755/HOT
Date:12/07/2013 Rear extension to lower ground level including two velux roof lights

Development Management

Status: RNO Application:20/T0310/TCA
Date:08/06/2020 T1 - Orchard Apple - Fell to ground level and replant with Prunus species in similar location in rear garden.

Development Management

Status: PDE Application:24/1700/HOT
Date: Erection of a rear upper ground extension to extend over part of the existing lower ground floor extension.

Appeal

Validation Date: 28.11.2012 Side extension to lower ground, ground and first floor, together with a rear extension to lower ground and ground floor levels

Reference: 12/0224/AP/REF

Building Control

Deposit Date: 12.10.2006 3 storey rear infill extension and total refurb including structural openings at lower ground floor and new bathrooms etc

Reference: 06/2235/BN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 25.01.2007 Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 07/98157/CORGI

Building Control

Deposit Date: 06.02.2013 Single storey rear extension, underpinning and structural alterations

Reference: 13/0223/IN

Building Control

Deposit Date: 16.03.2014 Install a replacement consumer unit Rewire of all circuits

Reference: 14/NIC00476/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 16.03.2014 Install a replacement consumer unit Rewire of all circuits

Reference: 14/NIC00477/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 02.05.2014 Install a gas-fired boiler

Reference: 14/FEN01773/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 04.09.2016 Install one or more new circuits Install a replacement consumer unit

Reference: 16/NIC01893/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 07.06.2017 Circuit alteration or addition in a special location

Reference: 17/NIC01313/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 21.07.2020 Install one or more new circuits

Reference: 20/NIC01246/NICEIC

Enforcement

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Application Number | 24/1700/HOT |
| Address | 38 Mount Ararat Road Richmond TW10 6PG |
| Proposal | Erection of a rear upper ground extension to extend over part of the existing lower ground floor extension. |
| Contact Officer | Sukhdeep Jhooti |
| Target Determination Date | 29.08.2024 EOT 03.10.2024 |

1. INTRODUCTION

This application is of a nature where the Council's Constitution delegates the authority to make the decision to Officers rather than it being determined by the Planning Committee.

Before preparing this summary report the planning officer considered any relevant previous planning applications in relation to the development and considered any comments made by those interested in the application such as consultees with specialist knowledge and nearby residents.

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant Local Plan Policies, the planning officer has considered the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, any comments received in connection with the application and any other case specific considerations which are material to the decision.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The subject site comprises a four-storey building which includes lower ground floor accommodation within Richmond and Richmond Hill Village and is designated as follows:

- Archaeological Priority
- Building of Townscape Merit
- Conservation Area [CA30 St Matthias Richmond]
- Throughflow Catchment Area
- Village [Richmond and Richmond Hill Village]
- Village Character Area [St Matthias – Area 11 & Conservation Area 30 Richmond & Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance Page 40 CHARAREA06/11/01]

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises erection of a rear upper ground extension to extend over part of the existing lower ground floor extension.

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

- **13/1755/HOT.** Rear extension to lower ground level including two velux roof lights. **Granted**
- **13/P0064/PREAPP.** Replacement of existing conservatory and lower ground floor outside seating area with a revised and extended scheme. **Pre-Application Request.**
- **12/3381/HOT.** Side extension to lower ground, ground and first floor, together with a rear extension to lower ground level. **Granted**
- **12/2407/HOT.** Side extension to lower ground, ground and first floor, together with a rear extension to lower ground and ground floor levels. **Refused, Appeal allowed in part.**
- **12/0602/HOT.** Side extension to lower ground, ground & first floor, together with a rear extension to lower ground and ground floor levels. **Refused.**
- **06/2978/DD01.** Details pursuant to condition LAO7A (tree planting) of planning permission 06/2978/HOT. **Decided as no further action to be taken.**
- **06/2978/HOT.** Infill flak end elevation extension two and a half storey high with half basement rear extension forming a conservatory. **Granted**
- **06/2105/HOT.** Three storey side extension. Half basement rear extension forming a conservatory with bay extension over to upper ground floor. **Withdrawn.**
- **05/2370/CAC.** Demolition of front garden wall and row railings above. **Granted**

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

One letters of objection have been received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- Overlooking. Glass roof will give direct line of sight from both our study [first floor] and our master bedroom [second floor] into the kitchen of No. 38. The same may also be true of the proposed roof light over the dining area.
- Light pollution. We are concerned that at night [and during daytime in the winter] the proposed glazed roof and roof light will generate significant upward light pollution, visible from all of our garden-facing windows, especially our master bedroom.
- Noise Transmission. We note that the plans show the proposed use from the front reception room as a music room [adjacent to our sitting room] and also that a new toilet is to be installed on the upper ground floor [adjacent to our kitchen]. Both create a concern about noise transmission between the two houses, especially, as they abut our principal living rooms. As part of our own internal works, we did as much as was practicable to improve the sound insulation on our side of the party wall and prevent noise transmission into No. 38. We would that the plans make provision for the same actions on their side of the party wall, at least in the two directly impacted areas.

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

AMENDMENTS

Amended plans received on 1 October 2024 as requested by the case officer which show the following:

- Plans show upper ground floor extension to be built from matching materials in order to appear more subtle as requested by the Case Officer.
- Width of upper ground floor extension reduced and reduced in depth
- Upper ground floor extension windows now traditional in profile [same as existing rear ground floor] with stone coping being used over.
- Height of upper ground floor extension reduced.

As the works shown result in a reduction in built form, a neighbour consultation on these amendments has not been actioned.

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D12 Fire Safety
- HC1 Heritage conservation and growth
- SI 12 Flood Risk Management
- SI 13 Sustainable Drainage
- G6 Biodiversity and access to nature
- G7 Trees and woodlands

These policies can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan>

Richmond Local Plan (2018)

The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated Local Plan policies are:

| Issue | Local Plan Policy | Compliance | |
|---|-------------------|------------|----|
| Local Character and Design Quality | LP1, | Yes | No |
| Impact on Designated Heritage Assets | LP3 | Yes | No |
| Impact on Non-Designated Heritage Assets | LP4 | 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 |

These policies can be found at

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf

Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version)

The Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) was published on 9 June 2023 for public consultation which ended on 24 July 2023.

The Publication Version Local Plan, together with all the representations received during the representation period, the plan and its supporting documents were submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 19 January 2024. The submission documents do not form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough, however, by publishing and submitting the Borough Local Plan for independent examination the Council has formally confirmed its intention to adopt the Publication Plan.

The Publication Version Local Plan, including its evidence base, are material considerations for decision-making. The weight to be given to each of the emerging policies and allocations will depend on an assessment against the criteria set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF. As the Council considers the emerging Borough Local Plan to be sound and legally compliant, officers and Councillors should accord relevant policies and allocations significant weight in the determination of applications taking account of the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. Therefore, the weight afforded to each policy at this stage will differ depending on the level and type of representation to that policy. This is addressed in more detail in the assessment below where it is relevant to the application.

Note that it was agreed by Full Council on 27 April, when the Publication Plan was approved, that no weight will be given to Policy 4 in relation to the increased carbon offset rate, and therefore the existing rate of £95 will continue to be used; in addition, no weight will be given to Policy 39 in relation to the 20% biodiversity net gain requirement; all other aspects and requirements of these policies will apply.

| Issue | Publication Local Plan Policy | Compliance | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----|
| Flood risk and sustainable drainage | 8 | Yes | No |
| Local character and design quality | 28 | Yes | No |
| Designated heritage assets | 29 | Yes | No |
| Non-designated heritage assets | 30 | Yes | No |
| Biodiversity and Geodiversity | 39 | Yes | No |
| Trees, Woodland and Landscape | 42 | Yes | No |
| Amenity and living conditions | 46 | Yes | No |

Supplementary Planning Documents

Buildings of Townscape Merit
House Extension and External Alterations
Village Plan – Richmond and Richmond Hill Village

These policies can be found at:

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

Other Local Strategies or Publications

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are:
St Matthias Richmond Conservation Area Statement
St Matthias Richmond Conservation Area Study

Determining applications in a Conservation Area

In considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to that duty, decisions of the court have confirmed that for development proposed to be carried out in a conservation area, a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

In applications where the decision-maker is satisfied that there will be no harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area, the statutory presumption against granting planning permission described above falls away. In such cases the development should be permitted or refused in accordance with the policies of the development plan and other material considerations.

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

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

i Design and impact on heritage assets

Policy 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 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to ensure that all development preserves and where possible, enhances the character, appearance and setting of designated heritage assets

Policy LP4 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to ensure that all development preserves and where possible, enhances the character, appearance and setting of non-designated heritage assets which includes Buildings of Townscape Merit such as the application site.

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.

St Matthias conservation area lies on the plateau and northern scarp of Richmond Hill. It is situated on the north slope of Richmond Hill to the south of Sheen Road, and bounded to the east by Queen's Road. It adjoins Richmond Hill (5) to the West and Sheen Road (31) conservation areas to the North.

The Council's Conservation Area statement describes the character of the area as follows: "*There is a mix of mid and late Victorian building styles and forms, from terraced mews to large detached villas and all maintain a consistently high quality of townscape. The building styles are noticeably different ranging, for example, from the three storey grandeur of Montague Road to the interesting brick detailing and symmetry of Rosemont Road of the terrace cottages in the Alberts. The dwellings are mostly set back from the road and many have retained their front gardens and these form an important feature throughout the conservation area*".

Some of the problems and pressures as set out in the Conservation Area Statement include loss of traditional architectural features and materials due to unsympathetic alterations.

Erection of a rear upper ground extension to extend over part of the existing lower ground floor extension.

The proposed upper ground floor rear extension would be proportionate in height when viewed in relation to
Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1700/HOT Page 7 of 11

the overall height of the host dwelling and the cill height of the windows on the floor above.

The Council's SPD advises that rear extensions at an upper level should not be more than half the width of the dwellinghouse. The proposed scheme would not accord with this advice. However, the proportions would not appear incongruous when considered in the context of the group of dwellinghouses to which this forms part (no's 18-42) given presence of other upper ground extensions of various widths and designs.

The glazing deployed on the proposed extension would appear proportionate, well-positioned and complementary to the host dwellinghouse. The flat roof profile helps ensure it serves as an obvious addition to the host dwelling whilst its traditional materiality helps ensure it does not detract from the significance of the host or neighbouring BTM's.

Overall, the proposed upper ground floor rear extension would not appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling in this particular context by virtue of its size, scale and design and with regard being had to the neighbouring pattern of development.

Alterations are proposed to the existing lower ground floor rear extension in terms of fenestration and roofing material. No objections are raised given the existing extension is contemporary in nature. The predominantly glazed finish of the extension helps break up the bulk and massing along the rear elevation of the property.

Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'. In this instance, the proposal would not lead to less than substantial harm to the setting, character and appearance of the conservation area due to its overall size, scale and design.

Paragraph 209 of the NPPF states 'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'. In this instance, the proposed development would have a neutral impact upon the significance of the host and neighbouring BTM's due to its overall, size, scale and design.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of policies LP1, LP3 and LP4 of the Local Plan and policies 28, 29 and 30 of the Publication Local Plan as supported by the St Matthias Conservation Area Statement/Study.

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. Policy LP46 of the Publication Local Plan reiterates the same.

Impact on No. 40. Mount Ararat Road

This four-storey property, semi-detached property which includes a lower ground floor is situated to the south of the application site.

The scheme would comply with the 45-degree BRE test when taken from the centre of the nearest habitable room window at this property. As such, the scheme would not lead to a material loss of light when viewed from this neighbouring property.

Given its overall height, width, depth and the fact that the scheme comply with the BRE test, the proposal would not appear overbearing when viewed from the nearest rear habitable room windows and rear garden area of this adjoining property. There are no flank elevational windows proposed to the extension.

Impact on No. 36 Mount Ararat Road

The proposed extension would be approx. 2.750m in depth adjacent to this neighbouring property which is to the north. It is a three storey dwellinghouse. At ground floor the facing side elevation windows are

understood to serve non-habitable rooms. The side elevation windows to the rear extension serve a room which also benefits from rearward outlook and so will not be materially impacted. There are French doors on the main rear elevation at ground floor serving a habitable room. This room is understood to also benefit from light and outlook from the front elevation given a (closeable) opening between the two ground floor rooms in this location. The proposed extension would comply with the 45-degree elevational BRE test in relation to sunlight/daylight when taken from the centre of this nearest habitable room window of this neighbouring property. As such, it would not lead to a loss of light when viewed from this neighbouring property. Given, the overall height, width and depth of the proposed extension, it would not lead to a material loss of outlook when viewed from the garden areas and habitable room windows of this neighbouring property to justify refusal of planning permission.

Other neighbouring properties

The scheme would safeguard the living conditions of the inhabitants of all other neighbouring properties due to its siting and as due to its overall height, width depth and siting.

Privacy

The proposal also includes an extended window to the side elevation at first floor, to replace the letterbox window there presently. This will be timber framed sash to match the ground floor side window, and the applicants have confirmed it would be obscured and fixed shut below 1.7m from finished floor level within their planning statement. This could be enforced via a planning condition to restrict overlooking of neighbouring properties.

Whilst it is noted there is an increase in the overall size of the openings/glazed areas, the proposal would not result in any new onerous viewing angles above that which could already be achieved through the existing fenestration. Thus, the proposal would not result in an increase in overlooking or raise issues with regards to privacy on any neighbouring properties. The rooflight alterations could occur under permitted development as a fall-back position. The rooflights would not lead to any onerous viewing angles in terms of linear or lateral views above that which could already be achieved through the existing fenestration. Thus, the proposal would not result in an increase in overlooking or raise any issues with regard to privacy on any neighbouring properties.

Light Pollution

It is noted a public objection has been received raising concerns regarding possible light pollution as a result of the rooflights. The proposed rooflights would not result in a materially harmful degree of light pollution noting that which is already caused by the existing fenestration on the proposal property and surrounding properties.

Concerns over light pollution, in planning and amenity terms, are usually in regard to light spillage or a materially harmful level of glare, for example the impact of sports court floodlighting spilling over neighbouring boundaries or being of an unusually high intensity that could be considered visually intrusive. Domestic lighting from a residential window would not be considered harmful in light 'spill' terms. Neither is it of an intensity that could generally be considered incongruous and thus visually intrusive. This is not a location which is characterised by an inherent level of darkness after hours given it is characterised by generous sized dwellings with large window openings as well as being within a suburban environment where many of the properties benefit from extensions which have rooflights/roof lanterns.

Noise Transmission

The existing use of the property would remain residential [C3]. As such, the scheme would not lead to material increases in the levels of noise, disturbance or activity to warrant refusal of planning permission. Sound insulations are internal works and are not something the Local Planning Authority can insist upon. The applicant may wish to take implement sound insulation but that is a matter for them and not the Local Planning Authority.

In view of the above, the proposal would safeguard neighbour living conditions in line with Policy LP8 of the Local Plan and Policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan.

iii Trees

Policies LP15 and LP16 seek to protect biodiversity and health and longevity of trees, woodland and landscape in the borough. Local Plan policy LP16, subsection 5 requires;

"That trees are adequately protected throughout the course of development, in accordance with British Officer Planning Report – Application 24/1700/HOT Page 9 of 11

Standard 5837 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, Recommendations (2012).”

The site is within a Conservation Area where trees are protected by default. Given the siting of the proposed extension, it would not adversely impact upon the health and longevity of any nearby trees. The proposal is compliant with the aforementioned policies.

iv Flood Risk

Policies LP21 of the Local Plan and 8 of the Publication Local Plan require all development to reduce flood risk from all sources. The site is within flood zone 1 and is within a throughflow catchment area. The proposed built form would be above the existing lower ground floor extension. As such, the proposal would not materially increase the levels of flood risk compared with the existing situation. There would be no further excavation at lower ground floor with regards to throughflow flooding. Therefore, the proposal is compliant with the aforementioned policies.

v Fire Safety

Policy D12 of the London Plan relates to fire safety. A fire safety statement has been submitted which meets the aims and objectives of policy D12. A condition would be imposed to ensure the scheme adheres to the submitted fire safety statement on an ongoing basis. This does not override the need for the scheme to comply with the building regulations.

vi Biodiversity

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

7. LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker. The Mayor of London's CIL and Richmond CIL are therefore material considerations.

On initial assessment this development is not considered liable for the Mayoral or Richmond CIL however this is subject to confirmation by the CIL Administration Team

8. RECOMMENDATION

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process. In making this recommendation consideration has been had to the statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the requirements set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Grant planning permission

Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains how the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. For the reasons set out above, this application falls to be determined in accordance with the test under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the proposal is in general conformity with the Development Plan overall and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify refusal.

Recommendation:

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

I therefore recommend the following:

1. REFUSAL
2. PERMISSION
3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

This application is CIL liable

YES* NO
(*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement

YES* NO
(*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online
(which are not on the file)

YES NO

This application has representations on file

YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): ...SJH

Dated: ...02.10.2024

I agree the recommendation:

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Head of Development Management / South Area Team Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

South Area Team Manager:ND.....

Dated:03.10.2024.....