

PLANNING REPORT

Printed for officer by
Ellie Cooke on 30 October 2024

Application reference: 24/2213/HOT
HAMPTON NORTH WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
03.09.2024	20.09.2024	15.11.2024	15.11.2024

Site:
3B Tulip Close, Hampton, TW12 3SA,
Proposal:
Loft Conversion with Front & Rear extension

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

APPLICANT NAME
Mr Clive Judkins
3 B Tulip Close
Hampton
Richmond Upon Thames
TW12 3SA

AGENT NAME
Mr Thomas French
15 Neptune Court
Vanguard Way
Cardiff
CF24 5PJ

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

Consultations:
Internal/External:
Consultee

Expiry Date

Neighbours:

28 Partridge Road,Hampton,TW12 3SB, - 23.09.2024
26 Partridge Road,Hampton,TW12 3SB, - 23.09.2024
3A Tulip Close,Hampton,TW12 3SA, - 23.09.2024
4 Orston Lodge,Old Farm Road,Hampton,TW12 3RQ, - 23.09.2024
3 Orston Lodge,Old Farm Road,Hampton,TW12 3RQ, - 23.09.2024
2 Orston Lodge,Old Farm Road,Hampton,TW12 3RQ, - 23.09.2024
Westwood Cottage,44 The Avenue,Hampton,TW12 3RG, - 23.09.2024

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

Development Management
Status: PCO Application:24/2213/HOT
Date: Loft Conversion with Front & Rear extension

Building Control
Deposit Date: 13.08.2007 Cavity wall insulation
Reference: 07/0094/CWALL

Building Control

Deposit Date: 18.04.2012 Installed a Gas Boiler

Reference: 12/FEN01076/GASAFE

Application Number	24/2213/HOT
Address	3B Tulip Close, Hampton TW12 3SA
Proposal	Loft Conversion with Front & Rear extension
Contact Officer	ECO
Target Determination Date	15.11.2024

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 single storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located within the culs-de-sac in Tulip Close. It has shared boundary with 3A Tulip Close, which is also a single-storey dwellinghouse. In front of the entrance of the subject there is a shared garage.

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

- Area Susceptible To Groundwater Flood - Environment Agency (Superficial Deposits Flooding - >= 25%)
- Article 4 Direction Basements (Article 4 Direction - Basements / Ref: ART4/BASEMENTS / Effective from: 18/04/2018)
- Community Infrastructure Levy Band (Low)
- Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency ()
- Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency ()
- Take Away Management Zone (Take Away Management Zone)
- Village (Hampton Village)
- Village Character Area (Oak Avenue Estates - Area 12 Hampton Village Planning Guidance Page 41 CHARAREA09/12/01)
- Ward (Hampton North Ward)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises of a loft conversion with a ground floor front and rear extension, incorporating 3 x front roof dormers and 1 x full length flat roof rear dormer. Two new side windows are also proposed, with one per side of the façade.

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.

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

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
-------	-------------------------------	------------

Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

- House Extension and External Alterations
- Hampton Village Plan – Character Area 12: Oak Avenue Estates

These policies can be found at:

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

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and impact on local character
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iv Fire Safety

i Design and visual impact

Policy LP 1 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 encourages the retention of the original form of the host property and any alterations should enhance the quality of the building. The original appearance should always be the reference point when considering any changes. In terms of extensions, they should not dominate the existing house and should harmonise with the original appearance.

The Councils SPD (2015) 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 proposal seeks to make several alterations and additions to the existing dwellinghouse including:

- Ground floor front extension
- Ground floor rear extension
- 3 x front pitched roof dormers
- 1 x full length rear dormer with flat roof
- 2 x new side windows (one per side façade)

The changes are discussed separately below.

Ground floor front extension

It is proposed to increase the height, width and depth of the existing entrance. Specifically, this application seeks to increase the entrance depth to 2 metres, width to 3.9 metres and height to 3 metres (ridgeline) / 2.4 metres (eaves). This is an increase of 0.74 metres (depth), 1.89 metres (width) and 0.63 metres (height). The entrance roof would change from flat to pitched.

The proposed front extension would remain central to the front façade which is considered a positive response. However, given the scale of the existing dwellinghouse, and noting the abutting dwellinghouse at 3A is of the same scale, it is considered that the proposed enlargement of the entrance would appear visually dominant to the existing dwellinghouse and the adjacent property. Further to this, front entrances of this nature are generally not sited within the immediate area. The

surrounding properties predominantly consist of angled canopies, rather than pitched roof forms.

It is noted that altering the front entrance of a house is a significant change as it is the focal point of the property. For this reason, it is pivotal that any alteration to the entrance is not overbearing and aligns with the existing character of the area. It is considered in this instance that the proposed entrance would not align with the character of the area.

Front roof pitched dormers

It is proposed to construct three front roof pitched dormers. Each dormer would be of the same size, being approximately 2 metres H x 2.1 metres W x 2.6 metres D with front facing windows.

Regarding roof extensions, the SPD for house extensions notes the following:

Avoid roof extensions in the front of a house – It is undesirable to add a roof extension (including dormers) to the front of a house, particularly when there is already a gable over a projecting bay, or when these are not a character of the street.

Review of the immediate area shows that there are minimal, if any, properties within the sites context that have front roof dormers. Furthermore, the addition of three front roof dormers would dominate the original roof, particularly owing to the subject sites small-scale nature.

For these reasons, it is considered that the proposed front roof dormers would be out of character of the area and therefore not supported by the SPD or LP1.

Rear ground floor extension

The proposed ground floor rear extension would bring the rear of the house in line with the rest of the dwellinghouse. There would be no change to the depth of the rear projection.

There is an existing conservatory which is approximately 2.98 metres wide at the rear of the property. The proposed extension would extend the width of this by approximately 2.46 metres, resulting in a rear boundary width of 5.44 metres. A setback of 0.9 metres would be retained to the southern interface at 3 Orston Lodge, Old Farm Road.

Given the ground floor extension is at the rear, no detrimental impact is anticipated on local character and therefore is supported in this regard.

Rear flat roof dormer

The proposal includes the construction of a dormer to the rear incorporating a flat roof form. The rear dormer would be set lower than the existing ridge and set in from both sides of the roof. The dormer would incorporate a Juliet balcony with three windows moderately spaced facing the rear. The proposed materials are to match existing.

The design of the rear dormer would be set lower than the existing ridge and set in by a small amount from both sides of the roof. However SPD guidance notes the following:

- 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.

While the rear dormer would not be readily visible from public views it is not considered to meet the criteria stated above. It is noted that this extension, in conjunction with the other alterations/additions proposed is considered an overdevelopment of the property and is not supported.

Side windows

It is proposed erect one window on each side façade. Both windows are proposed at the gable end and would be obscured glass. It is not clear whether the windows would be un-opening. In terms of character, there are no objections to these windows.

Summary

The proposal is considered in the context of all of the proposed additions and alterations. The cumulative impacts of these additions in combination with the sites scale and character of the existing area, is considered a significant overdevelopment of the property which would dominate the existing house and is therefore not supported.

For this reason, it is considered that the proposal is inconsistent with Policy LP1 of the Local Plan, as well as the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.

ii Impact on neighbour amenity

Policy LP8 states that development must protect the amenity and living conditions of existing, adjoining and neighbouring occupants. Design must allow for good daylight standards, avoid overlooking or noise disturbance, avoid visual intrusion, overbearing impacts or harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the uses of buildings and gardens. Harm may arise from various impacts such as noise, air pollution, odours or vibration.

The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 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.

The changes to the front elevation, including the three new pitched dormers and front extension, are unlikely to have an impact on neighbourhood amenity as they are front facing and are therefore considered acceptable.

The proposed ground floor rear extension would retain the existing rear projection as well as the setback to 3 Orston Lodge. No unacceptable impacts on neighbour amenity are anticipated in this regard.

The proposed rear dormer is not anticipated to result in unreasonable views to the neighbouring properties at No. 3A Tulip Close or 3 Orston Lodge. The proposed windows are rear facing and therefore will not directly look into neighbouring properties. It is not considered that any additional views afforded would be of significant detriment to the adjoining properties.

The proposed side windows would be obscured glass. It is not clear whether the windows would be un-opening and therefore are unable to confirm whether adequate privacy would be obtained for the neighbouring properties. Had the application otherwise have been acceptable, this would have been conditioned to ensure amenity impact on neighbouring occupiers was within acceptable limits.

iv Fire Safety

A Fire Safety Statement was submitted with the application. The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. A separate application should be made for Building Regulation requirements. Overall, taking into account the scale of the works, the scheme is consistent with Policy D12 of the London Plan.

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 scheme, by reason of its scale, bulk, massing and design, would result in an incongruent and unsympathetic development, harming the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate wider locality. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Chapter 12 of the NPPF, policy D4 of the London Plan, policy LP1 of the Local Plan, and the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations.

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 in Uniform)

☐ YES*

☒ NO

(*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring

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

☐ YES

☒ NO

This application has representations on file

☐ YES

☒ NO

Case Officer (Initials): ECO

Dated: 30/10/2024

I agree the recommendation:

Team Leader/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner - EL

Dated: 13/11/2024.....

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: