



PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by

Application reference: 24/2268/HOT
MORTLAKE AND BARNES COMMON WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
10.09.2024	10.09.2024	05.11.2024	05.11.2024

Site:

66 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SR

Proposal:

The proposed works relate to alterations to the rear glazing and glass roof of the existing ground floor side infill extension and the erection of a rear dormer extension at loft level above the two-storey rear outrigger to a terraced house.

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

APPLICANT NAME

Sorcha & Kevin Gray
 66 First Avenue
 Mortlake
 London
 Richmond Upon Thames
 SW14 8SR

AGENT NAME

Nisha Attra
 342 Clapham Road
 London
 SW9 9AJ

DC Site Notice: printed on and posted on and due to expire on

Consultations:

Internal/External:

Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

- 68 First Avenue, London, SW14 8SR -
- 87 Second Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QF, - 12.09.2024
- 89 Second Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QF, - 12.09.2024
- 85 Second Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QF, -
- 83 Second Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8QF, - 12.09.2024
- 67 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SP, - 12.09.2024
- 65 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SP, - 12.09.2024
- 68 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SR, - 12.09.2024
- 64 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SR, -

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

Development Management

Status: PDE

Date:

Application: 24/2268/HOT

The proposed works relate to alterations to the rear glazing and glass roof of the existing ground floor side infill extension and the erection of a rear dormer extension at loft level above the two-storey rear

outrigger to a terraced house.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 13.02.1998 Loft conversion

Reference: 98/0233/RR

Building Control

Deposit Date: 21.03.2007 2 Windows 1 Door

Reference: 07/08035/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 20.07.2011 1 Window

Reference: 11/FEN02387/FENSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 28.10.2009 Installed a Gas Cooker

Reference: 14/FEN02026/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 05.12.2014 Install a gas-fired boiler

Reference: 15/FEN00032/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 13.03.2016 Rewire of all circuits

Reference: 16/NIC00514/NICEIC

Building Control

Deposit Date: 02.10.2024 Erection of a rear dormer extension at loft level above two storey rear outrigger to terraced house, internal alterations including reconfiguration on ground, first and second floor, internal structural alterations, enlargement of ground floor window at rear and enlarging structural opening for bi-fold doors

Reference: 24/1276/IN

Application Number	24/2268/HOT
Address	66 First Avenue, Mortlake, London, SW14 8SR
Proposal	The proposed works relate to alterations to the rear glazing and glass roof of the existing ground floor side infill extension and the erection of a rear dormer extension at loft level above the two-storey rear outrigger to a terraced house.
Contact Officer	Roberta Henriques
Target Determination Date	5 th November 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 terraced dwellinghouse, located on the western side of First Avenue. The site is subject to the following planning constraints:

Item Found	More Information
Archaeological Priority	Site: Richmond APA 2.3: Mortlake - Archaeological Priority Area - Tier II
Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency	Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 75% - SSA Pool ID: 1383
Article 4 Direction Basements	Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018
Community Infrastructure Levy Band	Higher
Increased Potential Elevated Groundwater	GLA Drain London
Main Centre Buffer Zone	East Sheen Town Centre Boundary Buffer Zone - A residential development or a mixed use scheme within this 400 metre buffer area identified within the Plan does not have to apply the Sequential Test (for Flood Risk) as set out in Local Plan policy LP21.
Protected View (Indicative Zone)	View 7 RICHMOND PARK TOWARDS ST PAULS CATHEDRAL
Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency	
Take Away Management Zone	Take Away Management Zone
Village	Mortlake Village
Village Character Area	West of White Hart Lane - Character Area 2 Mortlake Village Planning Guidance Page 19 CHARAREA03/02/01
Ward	Mortlake and Barnes Common Ward

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises of alterations to the rear glazing and glass roof of the existing ground floor side infill extension and the erection of a rear dormer extension above the two storey outrigger.

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.

2 letters of general observation have been received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- Negative impact on privacy from proposed juliette balcony
- Other rear dormers have sash window

1 letter of objection has been received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- No.68 First Avenue concerned that the dormer will block their light from the rear window on the top floor.

It is noted that one representation made comments about Party Wall Matters. As party wall is a separate matter to planning, this is not a material consideration which can be given weight in assessing the planning application.

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

These policies can be found at:

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

London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D12 Fire Safety

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

Richmond Local Plan (2018)

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

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1,	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 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
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Quality

House Extension and External Alterations

Village Plan - Mortlake

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:

Community Infrastructure Levy

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2021

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Flood Risk
- iv Fire Safety
- v Biodiversity

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.

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 proposed works relate to alterations to the rear glazing and glass roof of the existing ground floor side infill extension and the erection of a rear dormer extension at loft level above the two-storey rear outrigger to a terraced house.

Works to single storey side infill extension

It is proposed to alter the rear glazing and glass roof of the existing single storey side infill extension. The replacement bi-fold door would be crittall style to match the sash style windows in the existing property. The replacement window would match the detailing of the bi fold door. The replacement roof would be similar in appearance to the existing roof. Therefore, these alterations are considered to be architecturally in keeping changes, that would be cohesive with the appearance of the existing house.

Rear dormer extension above two storey outrigger

The Councils SPD for House Extensions and External Alterations states roof extensions should be kept in scale with the existing structure and raising the ridge of the building is normally unacceptable. It states that 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.

The application site benefits from an existing rear dormer over the main roof, but there is no planning history for these works. The current application seeks to extend over part of the existing two storey outrigger.

The outrigger dormer increases the massing at roof level. It is not significantly set down from the main ridge and is only set in from the side to a minor extent. While a portion of the rear outrigger roof is left uncovered, this is not a significant area when considering the cumulative impact with the existing dormer which erodes the entire main rear roofscape. As such, the dormer fails to comply with SPD Guidance in that the roof extension is not in scale and dominates the original roof.

The proposed dormer would be constructed in materials to match the existing to which there is no objection.

The application refers to similar examples of outrigger dormers in the area. It is noted that only 4 of the 23 properties within the same terrace row benefit from dormers over the outrigger. As such, outrigger dormers do not form part of the prevailing character of the area and so this does not justify approval despite conflict with the SPD.

Further to this, it is noted that some outrigger dormers were granted under Lawful Development Certificate. Insufficient detail such as in regard to the volume of the dormer is submitted within this application to clarify whether or not the proposal would fall under permitted development. As such, this is not a valid fallback position.

Therefore, the proposed outrigger dormer by reason of its siting over the outrigger, design in regard to height and width and overall scale and bulk would form an incongruous addition which dominates the roof of the host dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the site itself and the wider terraced row. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 of the Local Plan and policy 28 of the Publication Local Plan, and the Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (2015).

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.

Works to single storey side infill extension

The lines of sight from the new window and door of the single storey rear extension would be the same as the lines of sight from the existing window, door and garden space. As such, no additional overlooking will occur as a result of these works.

The footprint and height remain the same and so the proposal will not result in a harmful sense of enclosure, visual intrusion, harm to light provision, nor will it appear overbearing.

Rear dormer extension above two storey outrigger

Impact on No.64

At first floor level and at roof level, the window at No.64 First Avenue nearest to the proposed extension is understood to serve a WC. This room is not 'habitable' and so the proposed extension

would not harmfully restrict the light or the outlook afforded to this neighbour.

At roof level, the nearest habitable room window at No.64 is set in from the proposed roof extension by approximately 3.9m, and the roof extension would not intercept a 45 degree angle taken from the centre of this window. Therefore, it is not considered that the extension would harm the neighbour amenity afforded to No.64.

The dormer would feature a Juliet balcony. The Juliet balcony would not project significantly beyond the rear elevation, so no increased overlooking beyond the current levels of overlooking from first floor rear fenestration, is considered to arise as a result of the balcony.

Impact on No.68

No.68 First Avenue benefits from a rear dormer extension. It is understood from planning history that the window of the dormer serves a study. The roof extension proposed at the application site would intercept a 45 degree angle on floor plan. However, the 45 degree BRE test on elevation would pass. As such, it is not considered that the proposed extension would harmfully restrict the light or outlook afforded to this neighbour.

The dormer would feature a Juliet balcony. The Juliet balcony would not project significantly beyond the rear elevation, so no increased overlooking beyond the current levels of overlooking from first floor rear fenestration, is considered to arise as a result of the balcony.

As such, having regard to its siting, design, scale and materiality, it is not considered that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties and the proposals are considered to comply 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 that 'all developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere'. This is supported by Policy 8 of the Draft Local Plan.

The application site is located within an area at risk of ground water flooding.

The development would be at roof level and would involve replacing the glazing and roof of the single storey rear extension; so no additional built footprint is to be created.

Therefore, the proposed works will not increase groundwater flood risk in the area and is in compliance with the above policies.

iv Fire Safety

London Plan policy D12 requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all planning applications.

A Fire Safety Strategy has been received on 10th September 2024.

Had the application been considered acceptable in all other regards, a condition would have been included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with this Policy D12 of the London Plan.

v 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.

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 proposed outrigger dormer by reason of its design, siting, scale and overall bulk, would appear incongruous and over dominant, representing an unsympathetic and visually obtrusive form of development, detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and terrace of which it forms part. The proposal is contrary to, in particular, Policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018), policy 28 of the Publication Local Plan, and the Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and External Alterations (2015).

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 YES NO

Case Officer (Initials):RH..... Dated:30/10/2024.....

I agree the recommendation:

SG
 Senior Planner

Dated:31/10/2024.....

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

Head of Development Management:

Dated: