
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2016

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/16/3159891

4 Richmond Hill, Richmond, TW10 6QX

- 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 Edmund and Delyth Fetherston-Dilke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/0561/HOT, dated 12 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the replacement and extension of the roof and internal modifications to the second floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement and extension of the roof and internal modifications to the second floor at 4 Richmond Hill, Richmond, TW10 6QX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/0561/HOT, dated 12 February 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1026.10.01.Exg.001; 1026.10.03.Pln.025; 1026.10.03.Pln.024; 1026.10.03.Pln.061; 1026.10.03.Pln.060.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed alterations and extensions on the character and appearance of the Richmond Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No 4 is a 2/3 storey house within a terrace of houses of varied design, situated within the Richmond Hill Conservation Area (CA). It is a local Building of Townscape Merit (BTM), as is the adjacent No 6 to the south. No 2 to the north is located on a corner plot at the junction of Richmond Hill and The Vineyard, and is a Grade II Listed Building. No 4 is noticeably smaller than the houses to either side.
-

4. No 4 has a complex roof structure, certain elements of which would appear to date from different periods and to be of questionable quality in both design and construction. There is significant evidence from within the property, and from viewing the rear part of the roof itself, that the drainage channels across the roof are in a poor state of repair, resulting in internal damage to the property from ingress of water and damp. The structure of the roof would appear to make long-term repair of these channels difficult or impossible.
5. The proposed development would involve the removal of much of the roof and its replacement at the front, with a rear-facing pitch behind the front parapet, similar to the existing situation, and a single crown roof to the rear that would enable rationalisation of the drainage system at roof level.
6. There is a green space to the front of the property, across Richmond Hill, and the land slopes down to the west across this space. From any public realm perspective to the front of the appeal property there would be no significant or effective view of the altered and replaced roof within the street scene. The main issue, therefore, relates to the proposed alterations to the roof at the rear. Views of the proposed development at the rear would be restricted to a small section of The Vineyard, a narrow road running to the side of No 2 Richmond Hill. From here, the roof is seen largely in the context of the taller and bulkier Listed Building, which has a rear elevation projecting a little beyond that of the appeal property.
7. The Council contends that the proposal would remove vital authentic heritage features and impede on the integrity and relationship of the adjoining listed buildings. However, it is unclear at what time the varied roof features were incorporated into the building, and therefore what is meant in this context by the term authentic. Moreover, given the scale and position of the dominant rear elevation at No 2, the northern elements within the current complex roof structure at No 4 are barely visible from The Vineyard, whilst to retain this structure could conceivably result in significant and continual damage to the main structure of the property by way of leakage and water penetration, to the detriment of the quality of the BTM. In addition to the construction of the new roof, a chimney stack would also be removed, but this has already been reduced and capped, and is not visible as a vital component of the roofscape.
8. It would appear that an earlier rear projection at the adjacent listed building (No 2) has recently been demolished, such that the rear elevation of the main house is now in clear view from The Vineyard. The wide rear elevation has three large windows across the first floor with a mansard-style roof above, within which are three dormer windows, in line above the first-floor windows. From this perspective, the proposed roof at No 4 would appear as similar in design. Furthermore, new windows in the rear elevation of No 4, below the new roof, would match those existing and would also line up directly above those in the floor below. In this respect, the design of the new rear elevation and roof at the appeal property would be coherent within the overall appearance of the host property, and would complement that of the more prominent rear elevation at the listed No 2. It would not impede on the integrity of No 2.
9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed alterations and extension, by virtue of their limited scale, restricted visibility, and sympathetic design and materials, would not, in this case, be harmful to the character or appearance of the host

property, and may even be helpful in securing its long-term structural integrity. It would not, therefore, be harmful to the Buildings of Townscape Merit in the vicinity; it would respect and complement the character and setting of the surrounding buildings; it would have no harmful effect on the setting of the adjacent Listed Building; and it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

10. In the light of the above, the proposal would not conflict with policy CP7 of the Council's Core Strategy, or with Policies DM DC1, DM HD1, DM HD2 and DM HD3 of the Council's Development Management Plan, all of which require developments to be compatible with and respect local character, including conserving the character and appearance of conservation areas and protecting the character and setting of Buildings of Townscape Merit. Similarly, it would not conflict with more detailed guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Buildings of Townscape Merit.

Conditions

11. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR