

London Borough of Richmond

Planning Services

Planning Application Ref. No. 24/3187/PIP

OBJECTION

FAO Georgia Nicol

Dear Georgia

I understand you are the Case Officer for the above 'planning in principle' application. I have been instructed by my client who owns 34 Percy Road, the immediately adjacent property to the west of the application site, to object in the strongest possible terms to the above application.

As you will be aware, there have been numerous attempts by the applicant to achieve a residential property on this site which have been dismissed at appeal (LPA.Ref.Nos. 17/2111/HOT and 20/1897/HOT). Notwithstanding the dismissals, the schemes proposed then were set back from the boundary with my client's property, leaving a separation distance between the boundary and my client's property.

The proposed scheme proposed, whilst only an 'in principle' submission, provides elevations and plans that show a building abutting the boundary of the property. Apart from the Party Wall Act issues (not a planning matter), the fact that there is no set back proposed from the boundary, with the building sitting on the boundary itself, will result in severe impacts on my client's property including

- overbearing and dominant impact
- loss of daylight and sunlight and overshadowing.

It will also result in cramped appearance to the street scene within the Hampton Village Conservation Area.

For context my client's property is a commercial building includes three windows on this flank elevation serving a seating area of the showroom of the building

Overbearing.™.Dominant.Impact

The close proximity immediately abutting the boundary and the location of the windows in my client's property serving the seating area of the showroom, will result in a severe overbearing and dominant impact, with no relief along this boundary.

Policy DM DC 1 (Design Quality) states that new development should be of the highest quality design, respecting the local character and positively contribute to the surroundings, particularly in terms of relationship to the existing townscape, and refers specifically to the space between buildings and relationship to the public realm.

The proposed siting of such a building would therefore not be in compliance with this policy.

Loss.of.Daylight.and.Sunlight?and.Overshadowing.Impact

The proposed scheme will block out the majority of daylight and sunlight and result in close to 100% overshadowing of my client's property. Whilst it is a commercial building, the windows are the only windows which serve this seating area where people using the showroom would be able to sit comfortably. And removing the daylight and sunlight and causing the overshadowing to the degree it would, would be contrary to Policy DM DC 1.

Policy DM DC 5 (Neighbourliness, Sunlighting & Daylighting) states that in considering proposals for development the Council will *'generally seek to ensure that the design and layout of buildings enables sufficient sunlight and daylight to penetrate into and between buildings, and that adjoining land or properties are protected from overshadowing in accordance with established standards.'*

The proposed scheme would clearly fail on the daylight and overshadowing aspects and is therefore contrary to Policy DM DC 5.

Impact.on.the.Streetscene

It is clear from the previously dismissed appeal schemes that the Inspectors considered that the impact on the Hampton Village Conservation Area and street scene. There is little change to this proposal in many respects although the elevations submitted with the application perhaps are more in keeping. However, the inclusion of a dwelling at this location immediately abutting the boundary will result in a cramped appearance of the streetscene and would therefore be contrary to the policies DM DC 1 and DM HD 1 (Conservation Areas).

Whilst I acknowledge that this is a 'permission in principle' submission and that detailed information will need to be submitted for the 'Technical Details Consent' should the LPA deem this application acceptable, as it stands, I would request that the application be refused on the basis of the above and given the previous appeal dismissals not being adequately addressed. Even with submission of the technical details it will not alter the impacts set out above.

Accordingly, I request on behalf of my client, that this application be refused without delay.

Yours sincerely

Andy Ryley MRTPI

