

Application reference: 24/2181/HOT KEW WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
29.08.2024	02.09.2024	28.10.2024	28.10.2024

Site:

14 West Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4DA

Proposal:

Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions. Rooflights to front elevation. Single storey rear extension

APPLICANT NAME

R & J Giangrande
14 West Park Road
Kew
Richmond Upon Thames
TW9 4DA

AGENT NAME

Ms Reah Booth
86-90 Paul Street
Shoreditch
London
EC2A 4NE
United Kingdom

DC Site Notice: printed on 03.09.2024 and posted on 13.09.2024 and due to expire on 04.10.2024

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

14D Urban D

Expiry Date

17.09.2024

Neighbours:

16 High Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4BH, - 03.09.2024
14 High Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4BH, - 03.09.2024
12 High Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4BH, - 03.09.2024
9 West Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4DB, - 03.09.2024
7 West Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4DB, - 03.09.2024
5 West Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4DB, - 03.09.2024
16 West Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4DA, - 03.09.2024
12 West Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4DA, - 03.09.2024

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

Development Management

Status: PCO

Application: 24/2181/HOT

Date:

Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions. Rooflights to front elevation.
Single storey rear extension

Building Control

Deposit Date: 19.04.2011 Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 11/FEN01938/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 19.04.2011 Circuit alteration or addition in a kitchen/special location

Reference: 11/ELE00632/ELECSA

Application Number	24/2181/HOT
Address	14 West Park Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4DA
Proposal	Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions. Rooflights to front elevation. Single storey rear extension
Contact Officer	Roberta Henriques
Target Determination Date	28th October 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 is a two storey semi detached dwellinghouse, located on the southern side of West Park Road within the Burlington Avenue and West Park Road Conservation Area (CA73). The site is also subject to the following planning constraints:

Item Found	More Information
Area Benefiting Flood Defence - Environment Agency.	Areas Benefiting from Defences
Area Poorly Provided With Public Open Space	Area poorly provided with Public Open Space
Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency	Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 1492
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Community Infrastructure Levy Band	Higher
Floodzone 2	Tidal Models
Floodzone 3	Tidal Models
Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency	RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 45556
SFRA Zone 3a High Probability	Flood Zone 3
Village	Kew Village
Village Character Area	The Avenues - Area 13 Kew Village Planning Guidance Page 43 CHARAREA02/13/01
Ward	Kew Ward

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises of hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions, rooflights to the front elevation and a single storey rear extension.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above. There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

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

No letters of representation were received.

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

5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

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

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D12 Fire Safety
- HC1 Heritage conservation and growth

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

Richmond Local Plan (2018)

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

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1,	Yes	No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	Yes	No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
Impact on 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 Officer Planning Report – Application 24/2181/HOT Page 3 of 10

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
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn_plan_2018_to_2033_january_2019.pdf

Supplementary Planning Documents

Conservation Areas

House Extension and External Alterations

Village Plan - Kew

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:

Burlington Avenue and West Park Road Conservation Area Statement

Burlington Avenue and West Park Road 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

i Design and impact on heritage assets

Policy Context

Policy LP1 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area. Proposals should demonstrate an understanding of the site and its context when considering the design including layout, siting and access and the compatibility of the works to the neighbouring uses.

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

The NPPF states 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The NPPF states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'.

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 Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that hip to gable extensions is not desirable and will not be encouraged. The Council will consider the following issues when determining applications for roof extensions:

- *Keep roof extensions 'in-scale' with the existing structure.*
- *Dormer windows and other roof extensions must not project above the ridgeline.*
- *Roof extensions should not dominate the original roof. Normally a significant area of the existing roof should be left beneath a new dormer and on either side of the dormer, thus setting the extension well in from either side of the roof. It may be more successful to incorporate two smaller dormers than one large dormer.*
- *Dormer windows should be smaller than that of windows of the floor below.*

Background

14 West Park Road comprises one half of a semi-detached pair of Edwardian dwellings to the southern side of this residential street. The red brick properties are two storeys in height with paired entrances beneath gabled porches. The outer bays include full height canted bay windows, surmounted by gables with mock timbering. Other detailing includes oriel windows above the porches and decorative terracotta panels.

No.14 is an unlisted building located within the Burlington Avenue and West Park Road Conservation Area (CA73). The interest of the area is described within the Conservation Area Statement and also within the Kew Village Planning Guidance SPD under Character Area 13. Whilst there is mix of detached and semi-detached properties in the area, there is broad consistency in terms of building heights, plot sizes and palette of materials.

The application site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area via its Edwardian style and broader contribution to the area's consistent architectural character.

Assessment

Proposals comprise of: "Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions, rooflights to front elevation and a single storey rear extension."

Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions

The Kew Village Planning Guidance SPD describes that hipped roofs are a dominant feature of the local area, so the existing roof of the site is in keeping with this established character. The House Extensions and External Alterations SPD states that hip to gable roof conversions are: "not desirable and will not be encouraged." The proposed alterations would remove a roof type that is characteristic of the area and introduce a form that would unbalance the symmetry with the other half of the semi-detached pair (no.16), resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the property and its positive contribution to the area. This type of roof alteration, visible from street level, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and is not supported.

The proposed rear dormer is suitably stepped down from the ridge and up from the eaves, but its width is excessive. With the hip to gable conversion omitted there is scope for a smaller rear dormer in line with the example to the neighbour at no. 16, which would preserve balance between the pair. Ideally the material should be altered from the proposed standing seam zinc to match materiality of the dormer to no.16. As submitted, however, the dormer is not supported on grounds of its scale.

It is noted that two properties in the wider vicinity benefit from similar roof extensions: which were granted under applications 13/0641/PS192 and 08/0661/PS192 at No.s 2 and 8 respectively. However, these existing extensions on the street were approved before the designation of the Burlington Avenue and West Park Road Conservation Area in 2017, so these applications were assessed against the General Permitted Development Order. Since the designation of the Conservation Area, there has been a material change in the site circumstances, meaning that the application site could no longer have a roof extension granted under the General Permitted Development Order. Therefore, the proposals need to be assessed against the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD, with which the roof extensions do not comply.

Rooflights

The rooflights do not raise any objection. They are considered to be discrete and sympathetic additions, and rooflights are a common characteristic within the locality. Therefore, the rooflights are considered to be an acceptable addition to the Conservation Area and host dwelling.

Single storey rear extension

There is no objection to the single storey rear extension. The extension would have no wider visibility from the surrounding Conservation Area. It would be subservient to the host dwelling and would be distinguishable as a later addition. The timber casement windows, timber doors and brickwork of the extension are an appropriate materials palette.

In view of the above, the proposal fails to comply with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Local Plan and policy 28 of the Publication Local Plan.

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 3m in depth for a terrace 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.

Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions

Impact on No.12 West Park Road

No.12 has a side dormer window at roof level that would face the proposed hip to gable extension. However, this window serves a staircase which, as circulation space, is not 'habitable' and as such the proposed extension would not restrict the light or outlook afforded to this neighbour. The proposed rear dormer is considered to be significantly set away from the rear habitable room windows of No.12 at roof level, so would not harm the amenity of this neighbour. The lines of sight from the rear dormer would be similar to the lines of sight from existing first floor rear fenestration. Therefore, the rear dormer is not considered to cause harmful overlooking into the neighbouring rear garden.

Impact on No.16 West Park Road

Whilst they would incorporate a significant overall combined bulk and massing, on the basis that they would be contained at roof level, and would not exceed the ridge height of the main dwelling, the proposed hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions are not considered to unduly restrict the light and outlook afforded to No.16 West Park Road. The rear facing windows associated with the dormer could enable some overlooking of the rear garden of this neighbour, but on the basis that these views would not be significantly dissimilar to the existing views afforded by first floor rear facing habitable room fenestration, significant harm is not anticipated.

Rooflights

Due to the positioning of the rooflights, they would not facilitate direct overlooking into any neighbours.

Single storey rear extension

Impact on No.12 West Park Road

At No.12, the ground floor rear facing window adjacent to the shared boundary with No.14, serves a kitchen. Since the kitchen is not 'habitable', it is not considered that the proposed extension would have a visually intrusive impact on this neighbour.

No.12's single storey rear extension where this neighbour's habitable room windows are located, has a depth of 3.5m. Therefore, the proposed extension would project approximately 1.4m beyond the rear elevation of No.12. This is considered to be a modest projection, that will not have a visually intrusive impact on this neighbour.

No.12's single storey rear extension also has a side window that would face the proposed extension. In addition, a recessed rear facing window. Floor plans for No.12 shows that these windows serve a living/kitchen/diner. These experience some light impact as existing owing to the projection in situ at No.14. These windows are secondary windows, with primary glazed doors/openings within the rear of the extension serving this room. The southerly aspect is also considered. On balance, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property in terms of loss of light.

Impact on No.16 West Park Road

This extension would have the same projection as No.16's single storey rear extension, so the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of this neighbour.

In view of the above, the scheme complies with the aims and objectives of policy LP8 of the Local Plan and policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan.

iii Flood Risk

Policy LP21 of the Local Plan states 'All developments should avoid or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.'

The application site is located within an area susceptible to groundwater flooding.

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

- Floor levels within the proposed development will be set no lower than existing levels AND, flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where appropriate.

Overall it is considered that the proposed development can be constructed and operated safely in flood risk terms, without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

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

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 it 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.

This is to notify you that had this development received planning consent it would be liable for a chargeable amount under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2012).

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.

For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the adverse impacts of allowing this planning application would significantly outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in NPPF (2021) and Development Plan, when taken as a whole.

Refuse planning permission for the following reasons

The hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions by reason of their siting, scale, bulk, and massing, would constitute poor design and a visually incongruous and dominant addition to the dwellinghouse, and create an imbalance to the appearance of No. 14 and No.16. The development is thereby contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018) in particular policies LP1, LP3, the Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) in particular policies 28 and 29 and the Supplementary Planning Documents on House Extensions and External Alterations, Conservation Areas, Kew Village Planning Guidance and Burlington Avenue & West Park Road Conservation Area Statement and the NPPF.

Recommendation:

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

I therefore recommend the following:

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

This application is CIL liable YES* NO
(*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement YES* NO
(*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online (which are not on the file) YES NO

This application has representations on file YES NO

Case Officer (Initials): ...RHE.....

Dated:03/10/2024.....

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated:

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

Head of Development Management:

Dated:

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

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

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES

CONDITIONS

INFORMATIVES

U0094768	Decision drawing nos
U0094769	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42