

## Application reference: 24/2405/HOT HAM, PETERSHAM, RICHMOND RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
24.09.2024	24.09.2024	19.11.2024	19.11.2024

**Site:**

59 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UT,

**Proposal:**

Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Demolition of existing front steps that lead from driveway to garden level. Proposed single storey rear extension with terrace over. Proposed front lightwell (where the existing steps from driveway to garden level are located) with windows at garden level, new helical steps from the driveway and associated alterations.

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

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr & Ms Earle and O'Donnell  
59 Petersham Road  
Richmond  
Richmond Upon Thames  
TW10 6UT

**AGENT NAME**

Ms Sinead Hagerty  
The Laurels  
81 Fairhaven Road  
Redhill  
RH1 2LB

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 07.10.2024 and posted on 18.10.2024 and due to expire on 08.11.2024

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

21D Urban D  
English Heritage 1st Consultation  
GLAAS 1st Consultation  
Environment Agency

**Expiry Date**

28.10.2024  
28.10.2024  
28.10.2024  
28.10.2024

**Neighbours:**

36 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UW, - 07.10.2024  
30 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UW, - 07.10.2024  
34 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UW, - 07.10.2024  
32 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UW, - 07.10.2024  
61 - 63 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UT, - 07.10.2024  
57 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UT, - 07.10.2024

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

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date: 24/03/2004

Application: 04/0282

New Staircase And Related Alterations (at Basement Level) To The Front Area, Enlargement Of Basement Under The Front Forecourt, Related Internal Alterations To Basement Level And Alterations To Forecourt Boundary Wall.

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date: 24/03/2004

Application: 04/0283

New External Staircase And Related Alterations (at Basement Level) To The

Front Area, Enlargement Of Basement Under The Front Forecourt And Related Internal Alterations At Basement Level.

<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:04/06/1985	Application:83/1239 Removal and replacement in part of front boundary wall. (Amended drawing received 18.4.84).
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:04/06/1985	Application:83/1240 Retention and improvement of vehicle hardstanding and access involving demolition of front boundary wall. (Amended drawing received 18.4.84).
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:10/11/1987	Application:86/1412/DD01/LB Remove external stone and concrete steps from front garden down to basement and sub-basement levels and rebuild in partly changed layout in brick with stone treads with iron balustrade, and to remove kitchen door way and replace with window to match existing adjacent, form new door way to utility room and enlarge existing window in sub-basement (in accordance with condition D of Appendix A of the consent). Condition No. D of Appendix A of notice of planning permission 86/1412 dated 24.2.87.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:24/02/1987	Application:86/1412/LB Remove external stone and concrete steps from front garden down to basement and sub-basement levels, and rebuild in partly changed layout in brick with stone treads with iron balustrade; and to remove kitchen doorway and replace with window to match existing adjacent; form new doorway to utility room, and enlarge existing window in sub-basement.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:29/06/1988	Application:88/0603/LB Removal of external steps to basement level and renewal to match and complete original flight from sub-basement to ground, together with provision of iron railings to match existing and repair existing. Replacement of door to basement level with window to match adjacent. Layout of forecourt with York stone paving. (Letter dated 24th May 1988 from Architect. Received on 24th May 1988).
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:16/02/1968	Application:67/2130 Construction of vehicular access.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:31/01/2005	Application:04/3975/HOT New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, enlargement of upper and lower basements under the front forecourt and related internal alterations at basement levels.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:31/01/2005	Application:04/3976/LBC New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, enlargement of upper and lower basement under the front forecourt, related internal alterations at basement levels and alterations to forecourt boundary wall.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:20/06/2005	Application:05/1257/HOT New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, Enlargement of upper and lower basements under the front forecourt and related internal alterations at basement, alterations to front boundary wall.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:20/06/2005	Application:05/1258/LBC New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, enlargement of upper and lower basements under the front forecourt and related internal alterations at basement levels and alterations to forecourt boundary wall.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:07/06/2022	Application:22/0830/HOT Application for re-rendering the front facade, repairing and reinstating a traditional ironwork balcony on rear facade, the refurbishment and partial replacement of two sash windows on the rear facade, and repainting the

front door.

<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:07/06/2022	Application:22/0870/LBC Application for re-rendering the front facade, repairing and reinstating a traditional ironwork balcony on rear facade, the refurbishment and partial replacement of two sash windows on the rear facade, and repainting the front door
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:06/12/2022	Application:22/1866/HOT Replacement of the existing dilapidated roof coverings, repair and restoration of the existing failed roof structure internally and construction of new roof structure and coverings externally to preserve and protect the listed fabric of the property.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:06/12/2022	Application:22/1867/LBC Replacement of the existing dilapidated roof coverings, repair and restoration of the existing failed roof structure internally and construction of new roof structure and coverings externally to preserve and protect the listed fabric of the property.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:20/06/2023	Application:23/0255/HOT Proposed reconstruction of the existing roof structure dismantled during works to approved applications 22/1867/LBC and 22/1866/HOT. Addition of new hopper and downpipe to rear elevation.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:20/06/2023	Application:23/0256/LBC Proposed reconstruction of the existing roof structure dismantled during works to approved applications 22/1867/LBC and 22/1866/HOT. Addition of new hopper and downpipe to rear elevation.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:29/02/2024	Application:23/2975/HOT Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with balcony. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:29/02/2024	Application:23/2976/LBC Demolition of dilapidated modern two storey flat roof rear extension with balcony platform and steps at rear of property. Proposed part single and part double storey glazed rear extension with balcony. Proposed access to extension internally utilising existing openings. Proposed internal alterations.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:29/02/2024	Application:23/3126/HOT Replace existing first floor rear windows with french doors with juliette balcony.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: GTD Date:29/02/2024	Application:23/3127/LBC Replace existing first floor rear windows with french doors (following the same glazing pattern and mouldings as existing). Existing juliette balcony railings to be reinstated.
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:01/07/2024	Application:24/1063/HOT Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with external steps. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF Date:01/07/2024	Application:24/1064/LBC Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with external steps. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls
<u>Development Management</u> Status: REF	Application:24/1176/HOT

Date:05/08/2024 Demolish existing front steps to create new lightwell at Garden Level Floor including metal steps to lower ground floor and grille. Alterations to fenestration. Glazed wall to enclose between Garden Level utility room and store.

---

Development Management  
Status: REF Application:24/1177/LBC  
Date:05/08/2024 Demolish existing front steps to create new lightwell at Garden Level Floor including metal steps to lower ground floor and grille. Alterations to fenestration. Glazed wall to enclose between Garden Level utility room and store.

---

Development Management  
Status: PDE Application:24/2403/HOT  
Date: Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Demolition of existing front steps that lead from driveway to garden level. Proposed part single and part two storey rear extension. Proposed front lightwell (where the existing steps from driveway to garden level are located) with windows at garden level, new helical steps from the driveway and associated alterations. Internal reconfiguration/additions.

---

Development Management  
Status: PDE Application:24/2404/LBC  
Date: Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Demolition of existing front steps that lead from driveway to garden level. Proposed part single and part two storey rear extension. Proposed front lightwell (where the existing steps from driveway to garden level are located) with windows at garden level, new helical steps from the driveway and associated alterations. Internal reconfiguration/additions.

---

Development Management  
Status: PDE Application:24/2405/HOT  
Date: Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Demolition of existing front steps that lead from driveway to garden level. Proposed single storey rear extension with terrace over. Proposed front lightwell (where the existing steps from driveway to garden level are located) with windows at garden level, new helical steps from the driveway and associated alterations. Internal reconfiguration/additions.

---

Development Management  
Status: PDE Application:24/2406/LBC  
Date: Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Demolition of existing front steps that lead from driveway to garden level. Proposed single storey rear extension with terrace over. Proposed front lightwell (where the existing steps from driveway to garden level are located) with windows at garden level, new helical steps from the driveway and associated alterations. Internal reconfiguration/additions.

---

Appeal  
Validation Date: 23.10.2024 Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with external steps. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls

Reference: 24/0124/AP/REF **Appeal In Progress**

---

Appeal  
Validation Date: 23.10.2024 Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with external steps. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls

Reference: 24/0125/AP/REF **Appeal In Progress**

---

Building Control  
Deposit Date: 15.05.2006 Installed a Gas Boiler  
Reference: 07/94256/CORGI

---

Building Control  
Deposit Date: 05.06.2018 Install a gas-fired boiler  
Reference: 18/FEN03653/GASAFE

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 14.11.2022

Re-roofing works to property

Reference: 22/1951/IN

---

Enforcement

Opened Date: 19.10.2021

Enforcement Enquiry

Reference: 21/0468/EN/LBUW

---

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>24/2405/HOT and 24/2406/LBC</b>
<b>Address</b>	<b>59 Petersham Road, Richmond, TW10 6UT</b>
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Demolition of existing front steps that lead from driveway to garden level. Proposed single storey rear extension with terrace over. Proposed front lightwell (where the existing steps from driveway to garden level are located) with windows at garden level, new helical steps from the driveway and associated alterations. Internal reconfiguration/additions.</b>
<b>Legal Agreement</b>	<b>NO</b>

### 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 has 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 is taking into account 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 application site is a Grade II Listed property located to the western side of Petersham Road and forms a central part of a terrace row of other Grade II Listed Buildings. The application site and the terrace row form part of the wider Richmond Hill Conservation Area. The property appears two storeys from the rendered front elevation with habitable roof accommodation evidenced via two small pitched roof dormers. From the rear elevation, the property appears taller as the land slopes down towards the rear garden and so the two basement storeys are exposed. The rear elevation is formed of brown brick with red brick detailing.

The application site is subject to the following constraints:

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

Historic England describes the Grade II Listing as:

*Circa 1720. Two storeys, basement and attic. Three windows wide. Stuccoed, parapeted front (stucco a later addition). Roman Doric doorcase with triglyph frieze. Slated roof with 2 pedimented dormers.*

### 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Demolition of existing front steps that lead from driveway to garden level. Proposed single storey rear extension with terrace over. Proposed front

lightwell (where the existing steps from driveway to garden level are located) with windows at garden level, new helical steps from the driveway and associated alterations.

Internal reconfiguration/additions.

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

22/1867/LBC and 22/1866/HOT - Replacement of the existing dilapidated roof coverings, repair and restoration of the existing failed roof structure internally and construction of new roof structure and coverings externally to preserve and protect the listed fabric of the property. Granted: 06.12.2022

22/0830/HOT and 22/0870/LBC - Application for re-rendering the front facade, repairing and reinstating a traditional ironwork balcony on rear facade, the refurbishment and partial replacement of two sash windows on the rear facade, and repainting the front door. Granted: 06.06.2022

23/2975/HOT and 23/2976/LBC – demolition of 2 storey rear extension with balcony platform and steps. Proposed part single and part 2 storey glazed rear extension with balcony. Proposed internal alterations including to facilitate access to extension. Alterations to rear boundary walls. Refused for the following reason:

*The proposed works, by reason of the proposed rear extension, the proposed garden level shower under the stairs and removal of wall between the hall and 'media room', and the introduction of second floor bathrooms would result in an incongruous addition of excessive scale which overdominates the rear elevation, results in the loss of hierarchy between floors, results in harm to historic fabric via removal and continued exposure to moisture and erodes the historic plan form. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the special interest or the listed building, nor the character or appearance of the conservation area. These works would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets, with no public benefits to outweigh this. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018), in particular policy LP1, LP3, Publication Local Plan policies 28 and 29, the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations and the NPPF.*

05/1257/HOT and 05/1258/LBC - New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, enlargement of upper and lower basements under the front forecourt and related internal alterations at basement levels and alterations to forecourt boundary wall. Granted 20/06/2005. This was a resubmission of the scheme below which included additional details of construction and a method of intent statement for working procedures.

04/3975/HOT and 04/3976/LBC - New staircase and related alterations (at basement level) to the front area, enlargement of upper and lower basements under the front forecourt and related internal alterations at basement levels. Refused for the following reason:

*The proposal, by reason of the lowering of the existing lower ground and basement floors to accommodate the extra level, would put the structural stability of this grade 2 listed building and neighbouring listed properties at risk, to the detriment of the architectural and historic integrity of this and neighbouring grade 2 listed buildings, and the character and appearance of the Richmond Hill Conservation Area. It would therefore be contrary to policies ENV10 and ENV11 of the Adopted Richmond upon Thames Unitary Development Plan and BLT2 and BLT3 of the emerging Unitary Development Plan: First Review.*

#### **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
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

Officer Planning Report – Application 24/2405/HOT Page 6 Of 14

**London Plan (2021)**

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D10 Basement Development
- 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		No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3		No
Impact on Archaeology	LP7	Yes	
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	
Basement and Subterranean Works	LP11	Yes	
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	

These policies can be found at [https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted\\_local\\_plan\\_interim.pdf](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.

Where relevant to the application under consideration, this is addressed in more detail in the assessment below.

Issue	Publication Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	
Local character and design quality	28		No

Designated heritage assets	29		No
Archaeology	33	Yes	
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	
Basements and subterranean developments	54	Yes	

### Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extensions and External Alterations  
Listed Buildings  
Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning\\_policy/local\\_plan/supplementary\\_planning\\_documents\\_and\\_guidance](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:  
Richmond Hill Conservation Area Statement

### 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.

### Determining applications affecting a Listed Building

Sections 16(1) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that, when considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, or whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to this duty decisions of the court have confirmed that a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. However, this does not mean that the weight that the decision-maker must give to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting is uniform. It will depend on, among other things, the extent of the assessed harm and the heritage value of the asset in question. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to a listed building or its setting is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

## 6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- I. Design and impact on heritage assets
- II. Impact on neighbour amenity



- III. Flood Risk
- IV. Archaeology
- V. Fire Safety
- VI. Biodiversity Net Gain

## **Issue i - Design and impact on heritage assets**

### *Background*

No. 59 Petersham Road is a grade II listed terraced town house which formed an important element of the early development of Richmond. It was constructed as part of a small terrace named The Paragon, in 1720 and is shown on the 1746 Rocque Map. The building is situated within the Richmond Hill Conservation Area (5) and makes an important contribution to its character, appearance and historic development.

Due to its early construction date, the building is of considerable architectural interest, forming a high-quality example of an early Georgian town house which appears to retain most if not all of its original character externally, both to the front and rear elevations. Any original surviving fabric internally and externally will be of high significance due to the particular early age of this building and its potential to yield further information regarding the construction methods of this period, prior to the standardisation of building construction later in the century. The survival of fabric can also provide insight into the domestic aspirations of the occupiers of this period and how they lived. As such, the building is also of considerable historic interest.

No. 59 is particular importance due to the high survival of original fabric, when comparing to its listed neighbours. In addition to its surviving roof form which was subject to a number of applications in the last 18 months, the rear elevation of the building which overlooks the Thames Bank also appears to have experienced little alteration. A metal and timber canopied balcony at first floor level, although not likely an original feature of this elevation, holds some significance illustrating later adaptations to the building, allowing a small outside space to appreciate views of the river. Review of old photographs show that a further balcony feature on the neighbouring property at no. 61 however this has since been removed. The lack of alteration to the rear has allowed the historic hierarchy of the floors to be clearly discernible in the window arrangement with smaller, more modest windows to the lower status floors and large windows, to the higher status floors, notably the lower ground and ground floor. The balcony was likely inserted to appreciate views towards the Thames and to heighten the social importance of this floor.

Internally, there has been some changes however there is a high survival of original or historic features including fireplaces (as well as corner fireplaces which are common of early Georgian properties), timber panelling and original windows. The original layout and plan form also appears to be legible across all floors with only a few later partitions including that to the front room of the garden level.

### *Proposal*

The proposal seeks to demolish the existing rear extension and add a single storey rear extension. It is proposed to demolish and rebuild the front lightwell. The proposed internal alterations including the insertion of bathrooms at lower ground floor and second floor level.

### *Rear Extension*

This proposal follows on from the previously refused applications set out in the planning history section above.

There are no objections to the removal of the existing rear extensions to the listed building as these are poor quality and modern in appearance and form. Any replacement extensions should be of a high-quality design and ensure the original rear elevation is fully readable, particularly the garden elevation due to the significance placed on this largely unaltered elevation and its contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

In regard to the proposed size, it is noted that the extension is now single storey which is much improved on the previous application in terms of mass and bulk. However, the extension will still be significant in terms of size, covering the whole of the garden level elevation and therefore in order to ensure it is acceptable, it needs to be of the highest quality in terms of materiality and form.

In regard to design, this is now taking a slightly different approach compared to previous applications as the proposed extension will now be partially solid with ceilings for lighting and green roof elements rather than the previously proposed glass box. The most concerning element is the proposed use of mirrored vertical cladding to part of the single storey extension which may appear highly incongruous and assertive. There is a lack of supporting information to demonstrate the final appearance of the building which means it is not possible to fully ascertain the acceptability of the design. As such, the application fails to demonstrate the extension will form a complimentary and high-quality addition that will not harm the special architectural interest of the listed building or the character and appearance of the conservation area

In regard to structural aspects, the extension should sit independently of the listed building. There is some information in the structural report to state that this will be independent, but it is still not clear how it will physically connect to the listed rear wall. A detail showing the connection between the rear wall and the new extension should be provided. Had the application been considered in acceptable in all other regards, it would have been necessary to get the applicants agreement to fund a structural review to ensure the proposal does not harm the host listed building.

In regard to the proposed balustrade, the conservation officer has recommended its omission to avoid such a structural visually competing with the balcony above. In its current form, this will cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the building, adding visual clutter to the largely unaltered rear elevation.

#### *Internal Alterations*

There is no section looking through the extension towards the original rear wall to show either that this will be retained or clarify the changes proposed which creates ambiguity, preventing the level of harm, or not, from being fully understood. For example, there appears to be window seats proposed in front of the original windows, and while the floor plans and section BB state/show 'window openings retained' it does not clarify whether window frames will be retained or removed. The potential removal of the sash windows is of concern as the windows are likely some of the earliest in the building if not original and so their removal would result in harm to the listed building.

Also at garden level, it is proposed to remove the front partition to the ensuite and change this to a family room. This will form a modest enhancement to this level. Glazed sliding doors are proposed between the two rooms but there are no room elevations to show how this will appear.

At garden floor level, plumbing routes have been provided but the same concern remains regarding the lack of supporting information such as a method statement. The proposals for a limecrete floor are supported but more detail is needed regarding how the floor is to be removed and replaced.

At lower ground floor level, additional works have been proposed compared with previous applications.

These include the insertion of a glazed screen and ensuite bathroom which will be partially glazed, part solid. A partition will be formed between the two rooms where it is currently open. It is likely that there was a partition between the two rooms, but the partition proposed is not in the historic location but instead and a bar inserted in the location. It is not clear how this will impact on the important corner fireplace in this location as no room elevations are provided but the insertion of the partition between the two rooms can not be considered a benefit as it will not reinstate the historic plan form. The insertion of the bathroom and partition will also appear incongruous and in fact reduce the legibility of the historic plan form with the ensuite cutting in the front room. It is likely that this room was not subdivided. The use of the glazed screen could be a suitable approach subject to the impact on planform being resolved. At present, the proposals at this level will cause a level of less than substantial harm to the special interest of the listed building by reducing the legibility of its historic plan form and potential to impact on the original corner fireplace.

At second floor level, previous concerns were raised regarding the introduction of new bathrooms at this level, particularly the one in the front room as this will impact on the appreciation of the original plan form of this level. These have been modified and the plans state a glazed ensuite which is now full height. There is some detail in the section B-B but it would be preferred if a room elevation be provided to really show how this addition will sit in the room and how the changes will reduce the visual impact on the room layout. This is important given the previous concerns raised to ensure the changes sufficiently address the identified harm to the plan form of this level.

#### *Front Lightwell*

The works to the front lightwell follow on from the previously refused applications set out in the planning history section above. The key concern with the previous application was the lack of details of how the works will be undertaken to remove the staircase to the light well.

The proposals for the front lightwell have been altered from the previous application. The proposed changes to the garden elevation windows are noted and are now considered acceptable. However, the proposals are conflicting as the information on the drawings states the retaining wall will be re-constructed and reinforced but this is not reflected in the demolition drawings. In this application, the lightwell will be made bigger but there is little information on the proposed removal, rebuilding and extension works to the lightwell. The current staircase was inspected on site and looked original and so the works will cause a degree of harm to the significance of the listed building. Improving drainage etc to the lightwell will be a benefit but there is insufficient information to demonstrate how the works will be undertaken and the listed building protected.

While works to the same area were consented in 2004, these permissions have now lapsed, and policy Officer Planning Report – Application 24/2405/HOT Page 10 of 14

updates have occurred. As such, this is not sufficient justification to permit approval now, despite the concerns raised above.

### *Basement and Subterranean Works*

Policy LP11 sets out criteria for basement and subterranean development works.

The proposal would comply in that it would not introduce any additional below ground levels, would not exceed more than 50% of the garden space, the proposed doors would provide natural light and ventilation.

The application complies with Part B.2 in that a structural impact assessment has been submitted due to the property and its neighbours being listed buildings. The report concludes the works can be carried out without affecting the existing structure, as such there are no structural alterations or additions necessary and so the structural integrity of the building remains.

Flood risk is assessed further in the relevant section below.

There is no requirement for the proposal to include 1m naturally draining soil due to the lightwell.

While no construction management statement has been submitted, it is noted that this could have been conditioned with the applicants agreement, had all other matters been considered acceptable.

### *Conclusions*

The proposed extension has been reduced in size and height but there are concerns regarding the design and proposed materiality of the extension. There is a significant lack of supporting information to demonstrate the appearance and design of the extension and how it will impact on the historic appearance of the listed building. Little detail on method of attachment to the rear wall. Lack of sections through the extension to the rear wall to show the retention of the rear windows or clarify loss of historic fabric. The drawings suggest that these will be removed which will cause harm as these are original windows that make a significant contribution to the special interest of the building. Railings above the extension should be removed as it visually competes with the upper balcony as per previous comments.

Internally, there is some potential enhancement to the garden room layout but there is harm to the lower ground floor layout with the insertion of an ensuite, reducing the legibility of the plan form at this level plus a new partition not in an historic position between the front and rear rooms. The harm caused by the lower ground floor works are not outweighed by the garden level layout changes especially as there is an obvious way of introducing an ensuite with minimal impact on the listed building as suggested above.

Lack of supporting information relating the front lightwell works and the demolition plans are incorrect as they do not reflect the demolition and partial replacement of the front retaining wall. No details of how the stairs will be removed and the wall reinforced.

Overall, there remains a number of concerns regarding the proposals despite reduction in size of the rear extension. There is a lack of supporting information that means it is not clear of the full extent of the harm that is proposed. From the information provided, the works will cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building. Harm to the conservation area is at the lower end of the scale as the second floor to the extension has been removed but the terrace will be visible and part of the rear extension. The harm to the listed building could be avoided with revisions and additional supporting information. As such, in its present form, the proposals would fail to accord with the statutory duties of the 1990 Act, paras 205, 206 and 208 of the NPPF as any modest heritage benefits that would derive from the proposals would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore, it would fail to accord with local plan policies LP1 and LP3.

### **Issue ii - Impact on Neighbour Amenity**

Policy LP8 sets out that all development will be required to protect amenity and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to light provision, overlooking, noise or disturbance, sense of enclosure, visual intrusion and overbearing impacts.

As the proposal does not result in a change of use, the proposal is not considered to result in harmful noise or disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.

### *Rear Extension*

In regard to light, the garden level extension will not result in loss of light to neighbouring properties given it will be screened from these by the existing boundary wall.

Also for these reasons, the extension is not considered to result in harmful sense of enclosure, visual intrusion or overbearing impacts to neighbouring occupiers.

Lines of sight will be blocked by the boundary treatments and so will not result in harmful overlooking or loss of privacy.

#### *Front Lightwell*

The proposal will not result in harmful overlooking given the proposed windows are sited below ground and so do not afford lines of sight beyond the lightwell.

The proposal will not result in loss of light, sense of enclosure, visual intrusion or overbearing impacts given the works are limited to below ground level at the front of the house.

Therefore, no objection is raised in this regard as the proposal is considered to preserve the reasonable enjoyment and function of neighbouring buildings and external space.

#### **Issue iii – Flood Risk**

Policy LP11 at part B.5 sets out that it should be demonstrated the scheme will not increase or otherwise exacerbate flood risk on the site or beyond in line with Policy LP21.

Policy LP 21 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 Flood Zones 2, 3 and SFRA Zone 3a, in an area susceptible to groundwater flood and is within an area buffered by flood defences.

#### *Works to Front Lightwell*

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment notes that while the entire site is within flood zones 2 and 3, this is due to the land sloping downwards from front to the rear garden. The area where works are proposed is confirmed to be within flood zone 1, will be no lower than the existing floor levels and will remain dry within predicted flood levels.

The latest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (Sept 2020) defines area at risk of groundwater flooding in the borough where it will need to be demonstrated that basements can be safely developed without increasing throughflow and groundwater related flood risk. This application site is located within one of the areas at risk of ground water flooding.

In areas identified as at risk of ground water flooding or in throughflow catchment areas on Richmond SFRA maps, a screening assessment will be required to demonstrate that subterranean development can be safely developed without increasing ground water related flood risk.

Such a screening assessment has been submitted. The information within cumulatively with the information within the flood risk assessment and structural impact assessment provides the answers to the relevant questions on subterranean characteristics, land stability, flood risk and drainage. Some queries which are not answered within the screening assessment are subsequently answered in the flood risk assessment and structural impact assessment. Some of the questions are answered yes such as the site being underlain by an aquifer, the most shallow strata being London Clay, and the proposed works resulting in a change in impermeable area cover. However, the report concludes that a Basement Impact Assessment is not required, as the current hydrogeology is unaffected by the proposal. This is evidenced via the slope of the site and trial pits which did not find groundwater.

#### *Rear Extension*

It is not considered that a Basement Screening Assessment is required for this portion of the proposed works. This is because of the cumulative impact of the limited lowering of floor levels from 380mm from the main house to the proposed extension, the steep slope of the site from front to rear boundary and the existing paving in the same location as the proposed extension and the structural statement noting trial pits did not encounter groundwater meaning the proposal is unlikely to impact groundwater flows.

Therefore, no objection is raised to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk.

#### **Issue iv – Archaeology**

Policy L7 sets out that the Council will seek to protect, enhance and promote its archaeological heritage.

The application site is located within an area of archaeological interest.

The works are located within or in close proximity to the existing built footprint. As such, the affected ground has already been disturbed and so it is unlikely that there are any archaeological remains to be impacted.

Therefore, no objection is raised to the application in this regard.

#### **Issue v – Fire Safety**

Policy D12 of the London Plan requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all applications to demonstrate that fire safety has been considered at an early stage. Where the applicant considers parts of or the whole policy do not apply, this should be justified in a Reasonable Exception Statement (RES).

The application includes a Fire Safety Statement. This information is considered to satisfy the intent of Policy D12 and so no objection is raised to the proposal in this regard.

The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. This permission is NOT a consent under the Building Regulations for which a separate application should be made.

#### **Issue VI - Biodiversity Net Gain**

Biodiversity net gain became mandatory for minor developments on applications made from 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

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 rear extension and balcony railings by reason of its siting, design and lack of information on materiality fails to demonstrate the proposal would not result in an incongruous addition. The proposed lightwell by reason of the lack of and conflicting information fails to demonstrate how the listed building will be protected during and after the works are complete and so fails to demonstrate that the integrity and significance of the listed building will be preserved.

Cumulatively, the application fails to demonstrate the proposal would not result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building, nor preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, with no public benefits to outweigh this. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018), in particular policy LP1, LP3, Publication Local Plan policies 28 and 29, the SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations and the NPPF.

#### **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): .....SG..... Dated: .....26/11/2024.....

**I agree the recommendation:**

South Area Team Manager: .....ND.....

Dated: .....26.11.2024.....