
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/16/3153687

5 St Johns Road, Richmond, Richmond Upon Thames, TW9 2PE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Gray against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/0728/FUL, dated 24 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the upper and lower ground floor at the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to the upper and lower ground floor at the rear of the property at 5 St Johns Road, Richmond, Richmond Upon Thames, TW9 2PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/0728/FUL, dated 24 February 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 368 -00_001; -00/002; -00/003; 00/004; -00/005; -00/006; -00/007; -00/008; -0/009A;- 00/010; - 00/011; -00/012.
 - 3) All external joinery of the extension hereby approved shall be constructed of painted timber and shall remain that way thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The Central Richmond Conservation Area statement describes the area as being characterised by its varied townscape with high quality buildings and residential terraces. The house itself is a Building of Townscape Merit. The front of the house has a formal composition with regularly spaced, sash windows, a recessed porch and white smooth render.
 4. However, the rear of the building is simple and is faced in painted brick. It does not have original windows or doors and has little architectural interest.
-

Therefore, there would be no original features of any interest that the extension would cover. The extension would only project slightly rearwards of the existing outrigger and it would be of a small scale. It would also be a lightweight glazed structure and therefore, it would not dominate the rear of the building. Whilst I appreciate that the design would be a contrast to the existing architecture, I do not consider this in itself to be harmful. Furthermore, it would not be visible within the public arena. It is physically removed from the nearby listed St John the Divine Church and, being small, it would have no impact upon the setting of this Listed Building.

5. I conclude that the proposed extension would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such I find no conflict with the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Core Strategy (2009) Policy CP7 or its Development Management Plan (2011) Policies DM DC1, DM HD1, and DM HD3. In combination, these policies seek to ensure that development conserves and enhances the character and appearance of conservation areas and preserves Buildings of Townscape Merit. Neither would it conflict with the Supplementary Planning Document, Buildings of Townscape Merit (2015) which seeks to avoid removal of original or characteristic features and to protect the visual quality of the building.

Conditions

6. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary, in the interest of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition concerning external joinery is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the building. I have not required matching materials as the extension is to be glazed and the roof is to be metal. I have not restricted the use of the roof as it is not necessary to make the development acceptable.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions above.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR