



Application reference: 24/2306/HOT
KEW WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
13.09.2024	08.10.2024	03.12.2024	03.12.2024

Site:

213 Mortlake Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EW

Proposal:

Removal of existing single-storey extension, adjacent outbuildings, single storey garage and lean-to outbuilding. Construction of a single-storey rear extension, and outbuilding.

APPLICANT NAME

Mr Mark Linnard
 213 Mortlake Road
 Kew
 Richmond Upon Thames
 TW9 4EW
 United Kingdom

AGENT NAME

Mr Ewan Davies
 Suite A
 Quayside House
 Quayside
 Chatham
 ME4 4QZ
 United Kingdom

Consultations:

Consultee

LBRuT Trees Preservation Officer (South)

Expiry Date

24.10.2024

Neighbours:

- 15 Courtlands Avenue, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EP, - 10.10.2024
- 18 Courtlands Avenue, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EP, - 10.10.2024
- 17A Courtlands Avenue, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EP, - 10.10.2024
- 17 Courtlands Avenue, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EP, - 10.10.2024
- 16 Courtlands Avenue, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EP, - 10.10.2024
- 215 Mortlake Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EW, - 10.10.2024
- 211 Mortlake Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EW, - 10.10.2024

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

Development Management

Status: PCO

Date:

Application: 24/2306/HOT

Removal of existing single-storey extension, adjacent outbuildings, single storey concrete framed single garage and lean-to outbuilding to its north. Construction of a single-storey rear extension, 6.3m deep x full width of house (6.35 tapering to 5.3m); part pitched, part flat roof with parapet walls together with a brick gabled outbuilding along northeast boundary in lieu of garage.

Building Control

Deposit Date: 01.08.2009 One or more new circuits

Reference: 09/ELE00285/ELECSA

Building Control

Deposit Date: 08.04.2018 Install replacement window in a dwelling

Reference: 18/FEN00674/FENSA

Application Number	24/2306/HOT
Address	213 Mortlake Road, Kew, Richmond, TW9 4EW
Proposal	Removal of existing single-storey extension, adjacent outbuildings, single storey garage and lean-to outbuilding. Construction of a single-storey rear extension, and outbuilding.
Contact Officer	Benjamin Haworth
Target Determination Date	03/12/2024, extended to 12/12/2024

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 semi-detached dwelling house located within Kew Village.

The application site is designated as:

- 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) Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance - Environment Agency (RoFSW Extent 1 In 1000 year chance - SSA Pool ID: 45593)
- Surface Water Flooding (Area Less Susceptible to) - Environment Agency ()
- 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 (Kew Village)
- Village Character Area (West Hall Road - Area 12 Kew Village Planning Guidance Page 41 CHARAREA02/12/03)
- Ward (Kew Ward)

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises the removal of an existing single-storey extension, adjacent outbuildings, single storey concrete framed single garage, and lean-to outbuilding to its north.

To replace the removed structures, the proposal would see the construction of a single-storey rear extension that is 6.3m deep, across the full width of house tapering from 6.35m to 5.3m in height, and a brick gabled outbuilding that is part pitched part flat roof with parapet walls along the northeast boundary.

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.

Two letters of observation were provided via email.

The comments can be summarised as follows:

- Concern with the height of the roof parapets
- Construction noise, damage, and time controls
- Use of outbuilding for ancillary uses only

Neighbour amenity considerations are assessed under Section 6 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
- 14. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural 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
- SI 12 Flood risk management

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 Trees, Woodland and Landscape	LP16	Yes	No
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

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

Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version)

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

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

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

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

Issue	Publication Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Flood risk and sustainable drainage	8	Yes	No
Local character and design quality	28	Yes	No
Trees, Woodland and Landscape	42	Yes	No
Amenity and living conditions	46	Yes	No

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Quality
House Extension and External Alterations
Transport
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:
Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2021

6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Trees
- iv Flood Risk / Basement
- v Fire safety

i Design

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 Council's 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.

Rear extension

The proposal would see the removal of several minor rear extensions along the site's south-eastern boundary and the construction of a new single storey rear extension that is approximately 6.31m in depth and 6.35m in width where it joins the host dwelling, reducing down to a 5.3m width at the rear elevation wall. The height of the extension would be approximately 4.47m at the connection point to the host building, reducing to 3.38m at the rear elevation wall. The extension would contain an open plan living, dining and kitchen area with three rooflights above. Elevation walls would be London stock brick, and the roof clad with slate.

In assessing the appropriateness of the design, consideration of the surrounding residential character and scale of existing development is necessary. Several properties along Mortlake Road and the surrounding area have been altered over time with dormers and rear single storey extensions. In proximity and similarity to the subject site are the following:

- 215 Mortlake Road - a rear conservatory conversion of 6.18m in depth and the width of the dwelling house approved in 2010 (10/0465/PS192).
- 217 Mortlake Road – single storey rear extension 6m in depth, 3.74m in height and 3m in height to eaves approved in 2019 (19/1902/PDE)
- 221 Mortlake Road - a rear extension of 5.217m in depth approved in 2015 (15/1302/PDE).

It is noted 221 and 217 consents were via the prior approval route, which does not call for an amenity assessment unless an objection is raised.

The immediate adjoining property to the northwest - 211 Mortlake Road does not have a rear extension, however, as noted above, 215 and 217 Mortlake Road directly south of the property do.

While the extension appears to mirror the existing site layouts of 215 and 217 Mortlake Road, the subject proposal results in deeper development from the host building's rear elevation and that extends approximately 2m further back compared to the rear elevation point of 215 Mortlake Road.

217 Mortlake was approved as permitted development because it did not exceed the maximum permitted 6m depth and 3m height (when within 2m of a boundary). The subject application would fail both standards under permitted development activity for depth and height, and given the height appears to necessitate a reduction to the fenestration sizes, removal of the characteristic oriel window. These issues combined suggest the application represents overdevelopment of the site. The proposed development has a dominating effect on the original dwelling house and appears to deviate from the character of the neighbourhood, including surrounding extensions, owing to the combined height and depth proposed.

Outbuilding

The existing rear garage is proposed to be removed and replaced with a new outbuilding, attempting to mimic the appearance of a garage with both a flat roof and double pitched roof. The height of the flat roofed section would be approximately 2.62m and measure 2.7m in width by 3.6m in depth. The pitched-roof portion of the outbuilding would measure approximately 4.2m in width and 5.4m in depth. The height of the pitched roof eaves would be 2.9m while the highest point of the pitch would be 4.53m from existing ground level. It is noted that the proposal would see the outbuilding sunk below the existing ground level by approximately 0.6m. If the outbuilding were not sunken, the eaves would have a height of 3.5m and the roof pitch would be 5.1m in height.

Within the pitched-roof portion of the outbuilding there would be two levels containing a gym, changing and shower facilities on the ground floor, and an office room on the upper floor. A single rooflight is proposed on the flat roof while two rooflights have been proposed on the north-western roof slope. The outbuilding would be clad with a combination of London stock brick and larch, and have a slate roof.

The application compares the outbuilding to that of an approved ancillary residential accommodation building at 173 Mortlake Road (21/1608/FUL). However, a comparison between 173 Mortlake and the application cannot be made directly. Noting the obvious difference in building uses, 173 Mortlake is effectively a separate dwelling attached to 171 Mortlake Road. 173 Mortlake Road fronts the street and presents itself as a small dwelling with parking provided out the front. The subject application, on the other hand, is for a rear outbuilding that does not contain living quarters. Unlike buildings fronting a street that are for residential occupation, it is expected that rear outbuildings are not dominant, visual structures.

The outbuilding presents a relatively large form of rear garden development that is not matched by other neighbouring properties. Specifically, the height of the outbuilding pitch at 4.525m is significantly out-of-character with other outbuildings, and at a scale that would not be expected of a back garden outbuilding. Under Permitted Development standards, an outbuilding should not have more than one storey, and the height of the outbuilding should not exceed 2.5m if it is within 2m of a property boundary - the proposal would not comply with either of these requirements. Even if the property was outside the 2m boundary setback area, the outbuilding would still fail the 4m height limit.

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 3.5m in depth for a semi-detached 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.

Rear ground floor extension

The rear ground floor extension exceeds the acceptable length of rear extensions noted in the SPD of 3.5 at 6.31m. Further, the extension exceeds the recommended height of 2.2m when the depth of 2.5m is exceeded. The height of the extension pitches from approximately 4.465m at the rear of the host building down to 3.375m at the extension's would be rear elevation.

No windows are proposed on the side elevations. Windows/doors are proposed on rear wall of the extension, along with three rooflights. As such, there is not considered to be any risk of overlooking or visual intrusion from the rear extension. However, there is risk of overbearing impacts from the height of the rear extension starting at 4.465m. A submission made by the owners of the attached dwelling express their concern about the height of the extension and its potential overbearing and visual impacts, noting that the proposed height would reach their second storey/first-floor windows.

Without plans showing the neighbouring properties, an assessment against the 45-degree test set out in the SPD cannot be undertaken. Based on satellite imagery, however, there is a risk of non-compliance with rear bay windows on No. 211's rear elevation.

Outbuilding

Due to the location of windows and doors, there is not considered to be any risk of overlooking or visual intrusion from the outbuilding. However, there is risk of overbearing impacts from its height.

Like the assessment of the outbuilding's design in the above section, the proposal presents a total height that goes beyond the expected height of ancillary structures. The outbuilding is a large form of development for the site, negatively impacting on neighbouring properties visual amenity. Given the

scale and siting, if approval were recommended, a legal agreement securing ancillary use would be required.

In view of the above, the proposal fails to comply with the aims and objectives of policy LP8 of the Local Plan and policy 46 of the Publication Local Plan.

iii Trees

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

"That trees are adequately protected throughout the course of development, in accordance with British Standard 5837 - Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction, Recommendations (2012)." This includes assessment and evaluation of trees in relation to the British Standard BS5837 in the form of an AIA and AMS.

From viewing the existing and proposed site plan and undertaking a desktop inspection, there are several trees present in the front, rear and adjacent gardens that could be impacted by construction activities and or may act as a constraint upon the proposal.

While a landscape plan has been provided, it is insufficient for the purposes of assessing the impact of construction and associated activities on these existing trees and does not provide any corresponding BS5837 tree survey data that can be independently verified as part of the application process.

At this stage, the proposal in its current form has not provided suitable documentation to adequately satisfy Council's Arboriculturist that it would not be putting nearby trees at risk of damage, leading to tree loss in a conservation area, in contravention of Local Plan Policy LP16 Trees, Woodlands and Landscape.

iv Flood risk / Basement

Policy LP11 of the Local Plan states 'Proposals for subterranean and basement developments will be required to comply with the following:

1. *extend to no more than a maximum of 50% of the existing garden land or more than half of any other undeveloped garden area (this excludes the footprint of the original building);*

Complies

2. *Demonstrate the scheme safeguards the structural stability of the existing building, neighbouring buildings and other infrastructure, including related to the highway and transport; a Structural Impact Assessment will be required where a subterranean development or basement is added to, or adjacent to, a listed building.*

No information regarding structural stability has been provided.

3. *use natural ventilation and lighting where habitable accommodation is provided;*

Complies as the ground floor is only partially subterranean.

4. *include a minimum of 1 metre naturally draining permeable soil above any part of the basement beneath the garden area, together with a minimum 200mm drainage layer, and provide a satisfactory landscaping scheme;*

This requirement is not applicable, as the structure is not entirely below ground.

5. *demonstrate that the scheme will not increase or otherwise exacerbate flood risk on the site or beyond, in line with policy LP 21 Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage;*

Discussed below.

6. *demonstrate as part of a Construction Management Statement that the development will be designed and constructed so as to minimise the impact during construction and occupation stages (in line with the Local Environmental Impacts, Pollution and Land Contamination policy of this Plan);*

A draft construction management plan is expected for development of this nature also, which has not been provided.

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.

Policy LP11 of the Local Plan and policy 54 of the Publication Local Plan require schemes for subterranean development to demonstrate that the scheme will not increase or otherwise exacerbate flood risk on the site or beyond. Paras 25.57-25.58 of the Publication Local Plan explain that a screening/scoping/Basement Impact Assessment is required to demonstrate that the scheme will not increase or otherwise exacerbate flood risk on the site or beyond:

"any sub-surface, basement and cellar proposals within throughflow and groundwater policy zones and/or in an area with $\geq 25\%$ susceptibility to groundwater flooding are required to carry out a site-specific Screen Assessment, which has to be undertaken by a chartered professional, to assess the likely impacts from subterranean development. It should address: the impacts of the proposed subsurface development on the area's subterranean characteristics; land stability; and flood risk and drainage. If the Screening Assessment determines that the proposed subsurface development may have an impact on the local environment, or if it determines that further investigation work is required, then a Basement Impact Assessment is required, which has to be undertaken by a chartered professional. A Site and Assessment Verification Form has to be completed by the chartered professional who undertook the assessment and submitted as part of the application. The Council's Basement Assessment User Guide provides more information and guidance on Screening Assessments and Basement Impact Assessments."

The site is susceptible at risk of groundwater flooding. The basement user guide states the following steps explain how users can identify whether a proposed development requires the submission of a Screening Assessment during the planning process.

Determine through the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames' SFRA map if the proposed property falls within one of the two following borough designations:

- an area with $\geq 25\%$ susceptibility to groundwater flooding
- one of the four throughflow catchment areas

If the proposed development falls within one (or both) of these two designations, and contains a basement, then the applicant needs to complete a Screening Assessment. The site is noted as having a greater than 75% susceptibility of groundwater flooding.

The Screening Assessment should address the impacts of the proposed subsurface development on the area's subterranean characteristics, land stability, and flood risk and drainage. If the screening assessment determines that the proposed subsurface Strategic Flood Risk Assessment - Level 1 September 2020 London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Version 1.2 vi development may have an impact on the local environment, or if it determines that further investigation work is required, then a basement/cellar impact assessment is required. The impact assessment, undertaken by a chartered or registered Hydrogeologist, must include the following details:

- a) Detailed borehole information on or from nearby to the development site, providing results for at least two different points in time. Data recordings should take place within a 12 month period and be at least four months apart. These should identify the geological conditions on or close to the development site, the infiltration potential and the height of any groundwater.
- b) If borehole records are found to extend beneath the base of the proposed subsurface structure, basement and cellar designs should include a throughflow/groundwater drainage

system. The system needs to reduce the risk of the development flooding neighbouring properties.

- c) Details of protective measures for the proposed subsurface development against throughflow and groundwater ingress to the development.

The SFRA states the following information should be provided as part of a basement screening:

- Description of the proposed basement, cellar or surface structure development.
- Construction methods proposed.
- Characteristics of the site, including geographical information and topographical information.
- Site borehole information with water levels
- Characteristics of potential impacts
- Details of mitigation measures

The basement assessment user guide sets out the specific questions which should be answered to show that adequate consideration has been given to flood risk.

A Basement Screening Assessment which meets the requirements, carried out by a suitably qualified professional, has not been submitted by the applicant. As such, on the basis of the lack of sufficient information, Officers cannot ascertain the likely impact of the basement. The development is thereby contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018) in particular Policy LP21, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2021), Basement Assessment User Guide (2021) and the aims and objectives of the NPPF.

v Fire safety

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

A Fire Safety Statement was received with the application and satisfies the requirements of D12.

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

iv. Biodiversity Net Gain

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:

- The application was made before 2nd April 2024
- The development impacts habitat of an area below a 'de minimis' threshold of 25m² or 5m of linear habitat such as hedgerows, and does not impact an onsite priority habitat
- The development is for a small-scale self-build or custom house building

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 ground floor extension and outbuilding, by reason of their siting, scale, proportions, appearance and fenestration represent a dominant, overbearing and unsympathetic form of overdevelopment which will negatively impact on the appearance, form and proportion of the host property and harm the character and appearance of the wider area. As such the proposal would be contrary to policy LP1 of the Local Plan (2018) and the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan Publication (Regulation 19) Consultation version Local Plan (2023) policy 28. They also fail to accord with the House Extensions and External Alterations supplementary planning document.
- The proposed ground floor extension would, by reason of its combined height, depth and siting will result in an overbearing sense of enclosure and visually intrusive form of development that will adversely impact on the residential amenity of nearby occupants, in particular, No. 211 Mortlake Road. In addition, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the daylight and sunlight amenities of No. 211 Mortlake Road would not be harmed by the extension. The proposed development would thereby be contrary to, in particular, policy LP8 of the Local Plan (2018), the Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) in particular policies 46 and the council's 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) Supplementary Planning Document.
- The proposal in its current form has not provided suitable documentation to adequately satisfy Council's Arboriculturist that the proposal would not be putting nearby trees at risk of damage, leading to tree loss, in contravention of Local Plan Policy LP16 Trees, Woodlands and Landscape.

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): BHA

Dated: 06/12/2024

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

U0096292	Decision drawing numbers ~~
U0096293	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42