

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990  
(AS AMENDED)**

**DESIGN AND ACCESS & HERITAGE STATEMENT**

Erection of ground floor rear extensions, first floor rear extension,  
reduction in height of side extension, inclusion of rear roof  
dormers and rooflights on front elevation and integral garage.  
Erection of outbuilding, associated alterations and change of use  
to a single family dwellinghouse.

**16 STRAWBERRY HILL ROAD, TWICKENHAM, TW1 4PT**



**RTPI**

mediation of space · making of place

**Members of the Royal Town Planning Institute**

Registered in England 7911049 at 32 Woodstock Grove, Shepherds Bush, London W12 8LE

# CONTENTS

---

- 1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS
- 2 PROPOSAL
- 3 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY
- 4 PLANNING POLICY
- 5 COMMENTS:
  - SCALE
  - AMOUNT
  - LAYOUT
  - LANDSCAPING
  - APPEARANCE
  - USE
  - ACCESS
  - FIRE STRATEGY
  - FLOOD RISK & SUDS
  - ENERGY
  - TREE REPORT
  - AFFORDABLE HOUSING
  - ST MARY'S UNIVERSITY LETTER
- 6 CONCLUSION

---

## **Appendix 1** – Letter from St Mary's University

## **1 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 1.1 The application relates to a large three storey detached property located on the western side of Strawberry Hill Road. The property is comprised of red brick. The dwelling is set back from the street scene.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character; the immediate street scene can mainly be characterised by large detached and semi-detached properties of various sizes and styles.
- 1.3 The application site is not identified as or within the curtilage of a listed building but is positioned within the Strawberry Hill Road Conservation Area and is a building of town townscape merit.

## **2 PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 Erection of ground floor rear extensions, first floor rear extension, reduction in height of side extension, inclusion of rear roof dormers and rooflights on front elevation and integral garage. Erection of outbuilding, associated alterations and change of use to a single family dwellinghouse.

## **3 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 No relevant Planning History

## **4 PLANNING POLICY**

- 4.1 DCLG's National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- 4.2 GLA's London Plan (2015)
- 4.3 Richmond Local Plan (2018)
- 4.4 Strawberry Hill Conservation Area – Character Appraisal & Management Plan (43)
- 4.5 Buildings of Townscape Merit

## **5 COMMENTS**

- 5.1 The proposal includes the erection of outbuilding in the rear garden.
- 5.2 The proposed outbuilding will be positioned at the rear end of the garden and will be set back from the flank and rear boundaries and comprises ancillary uses. It is proposed that the outbuilding would be constructed under permitted development criteria.
- 5.3 The existing side extension will be lowered and will include rear dormers and rooflights. As a result the side extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling and harmonise with the streetscene. Ground floor rear extensions and a first floor rear extension are proposed and would be proportionate and would not dominate the host property.
- 5.4 In addition to this the proposal seeks to use the property as a single family dwellinghouse.

### SCALE

#### ***Outbuilding***

- 5.5 The proposed outbuilding will be positioned at the rear end of the garden and will be set back from the flank and rear boundaries and will be used incidental to the proposed dwellinghouse once planning permission has been secured for a an upcoming change of use.
- 5.6 The proposed outbuilding would be wholly proportionate to the size of the plot and the host dwelling. Due to its positioning at the rear end of the generous garden plot, it will have no bearing on the scale of the main property and will remain visually separate. The footprint of the outbuilding would be appropriate for the size of the garden and would retain the majority of the existing garden space. As such, the scale of the proposal would clearly have regard to the surrounding buildings. The proposed design has been sympathetically sited so as not to appear overbearing or imposing within the surrounding environment.
- 5.7 The proposed outbuilding has been reduced significantly since the last pre-application submission and takes on board feedback issued by

officers. The existing garages are to be refurbished and it is submitted that they would not require planning permission.

- 5.8 It is submitted that the scale of the outbuilding is wholly acceptable. The proposed development would not detrimentally affect the residential amenities enjoyed by neighbouring residents. As such, the scheme would be consistent with the provisions of Policy LP8 of the Local Plan.

### ***Extensions***

- 5.9 The existing side extension will be lowered and will include rear dormers and rooflights. In addition to this it is proposed to reduce the width by approximately 300mm. As a result the side extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling and harmonise with the streetscene. Ground floor rear extensions and a first floor rear extension are proposed and would be proportionate and not dominate the host property. The proposal represents a significant reduction when compared to the pre-application scheme.
- 5.10 A proposed first floor rear extension takes on board advice given under the previous pre-app by ensuring the proposal doesn't occupy the full width of the wing and doesn't occupy 50% of the width of the property. The first floor rear extension now includes a pitched rather than a flat roof. The extensions are proportionate and do not dominate the host property.
- 5.11 The extensions respect the appearance of the host property and reflect the existing detailing on both the front rear elevations.
- 5.12 The rear ground floor extensions would contain bi-folding doors that would provide views onto the rear garden. The extensions have been reduced in depth and are staggered thereby reducing bulk and massing. The ground floor extensions respect the proportions of the building of townscape merit and would not dominate the host property. It is noteworthy that neighbouring properties have been extended to a significant degree and that the proposal would have no adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

### AMOUNT

- 5.13 The proposed scheme will include one new outbuilding and extensions to the main property.

### LAYOUT

- 5.14 Please see the accompanying drawings.

### LANDSCAPING

- 5.15 No changes are proposed

### APPEARANCE

- 5.16 Policy LP1 of the Local Plan states that the Council will require all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality and should take the opportunity to enhance the quality and character of the Borough, having specific regard to scale, height, massing, density, landscaping, proportions, form, materials and detailing. Paragraph 4.1.3 of the sub text of this policy states that the Council does not wish to encourage a particular architectural style of new development but expects schemes to be of very high quality, particularly within conservation areas. This is supported by Policy LP3 which states that all proposals in conservation areas are required to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- 5.17 The design of the extensions would be sympathetic to the traditional nature of the property. The extensions would use high quality materials.
- 5.18 The modest scale and the appropriate siting of the proposed extensions would not detrimentally affect the character of the building or townscape merit. As such, the proposal would accord with the objectives of Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan.

## USE

- 5.19 The proposal would return the property to its original single family dwellinghouse use.
- 5.20 A letter supplied by St Mary's University, the previous owners of the property, is produced in appendix 1 of this statement and confirms that the property was in a serious state of disrepair and in need of substantial refurbishment.
- 5.21 The property would need to be brought up to current standards and as accommodation is set out over 3 levels would have required adaptation for wheelchair users and installation of an elevator all at a significant and prohibitive cost to the university. The accommodation was seen by the university as being detached from the campus and not consistent with providing and developing accommodation for students on campus.
- 5.22 The costs to refurbish the building were estimated by the university to be in the region of £1m and considered to be prohibitive.
- 5.23 The property is not in a condition that meets the requirements for students in terms of amenities and comfort. The cost of refurbishing it considerably outweighs the benefits and as such refurbishment is unviable. Furthermore, the site is remote from the rest the St Marys campus and as it's not an integral part there is no need to retain it. Only the ground floor of the accommodation contained a kitchen to be shared between 18 student rooms. Meaning that students on the first and second floors would have to travel to the ground floor to use the kitchen facilities. This would be unacceptable and fail to comply with student HMO standards.
- 5.24 It is considered that the use of the property as student accommodation would represent an over intensive use of the site with comings and goings over and above what one would expect in a residential area. The prevailing character of the area is residential, comprising single family dwellinghouses. As such over-occupation of the application site would raise concerns about noise and disturbance, resulting in an impact that Local Plan policies seek to prevent. On this basis the use of the site for

student accommodation would be detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

5.25 The university has confirmed that the accommodation is no longer needed and that the university is instead focusing on providing student accommodation on campus. In light of the foregoing it is considered that the proposal complies with the provisions of Local Plan Policy LP37 which seeks to resist the loss of housing where it meets an identified community need.

5.26 Local Plan Policy LP38 states that existing housing should be retained. The redundant student accommodation would be replaced with housing in the form of a single family dwellinghouse. The property is dilapidated and in need of a £1m refurbishment, which would be beyond the reach of the university. The reality of the situation is that the accommodation was not fit for purpose and fell short of current standards. In this context the proposal complies with the provisions of Local Plan Policy LP38

#### ACCESS

5.27 The proposed development will have no impact on the existing access points of the property. The side extension will accommodate a garage and the existing rear garages are to be retained. The proposal would have no adverse impact on pedestrian or highway safety.

#### FIRE STRATEGY

5.27 London Plan Policy D12 – In the interests of fire safety and to ensure the safety of all building users, all development proposals must achieve the highest standards of fire safety. The attached planning drawings show the location for a fire appliance to park.

#### FLOOD RISK & SUDS

5.28 A flood risk and SuDS report are produced in the appendices of this statement.



### ENERGY

- 5.29 An energy report is produced in the appendices of this statement.

### TREE REPORT

- 5.30 A tree report is produced in the appendices of this statement

### AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- 5.31 An affordable housing statement is produced in the appendices of this statement

## **6 CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 The principle of the proposed development is wholly acceptable.
- 6.2 The proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area or building of townscape merit. The proposed development would result in a well-related extension integrating into the overall form and appearance a residential dwelling.
- 6.3 There would be compliance with the relevant criteria in respect of the London Plan and LB Richmond Local Plan policies. It is considered that the extensions and outbuilding are harmonious in scale and proportion. It is therefore considered that the character and appearance of the surrounding area would be fully respected and the proposal would not be harmful to the conservation area nor the building of townscape merit in accordance with local policies and relevant guidance.
- 6.4 The proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area or building of townscape merit. The proposed development would return the property back to its original single family dwelling use.

- 6.5 The proposed scheme would not adversely affect neighbours' living conditions.
  
- 6.6 The proposal would be consistent with the relevant aims and provisions of the national framework and the Council's Development Plan.