

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 21 December 2016

by Terry G Phillimore MA MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/16/3159603 (Appeal A) **The Navigator's House, River Lane, Richmond TW10 7AG**

- 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 Dr Emma Higham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/0568/HOT, dated 13 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a covered timber and steel pergola on the rear patio fixed to the rear elevation of the house; a new garden room at the back corner of the garden.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/Y/16/3155375 (Appeal B) **The Navigator's House, River Lane, Richmond TW10 7AG**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Emma Higham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 10/0569/LBC, dated 13 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2016.
 - The works proposed are a covered timber and steel pergola on the rear patio fixed to the rear elevation of the house; a new garden room at the back corner of the garden.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a covered timber and steel pergola on the rear patio fixed to the rear elevation of the house and planning permission is refused for this. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a new garden room at the back corner of the garden and planning permission is granted for this at The Navigator's House, River Lane, Richmond TW10 7AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/0568/HOT, dated 13 February 2016 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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: Dwg. Nos. 01, 02, 06Rev B.
-

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a covered timber and steel pergola on the rear patio fixed to the rear elevation of the house and listed building consent is refused for this. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a new garden room at the back corner of the garden and listed building consent is granted for this at The Navigator's House, River Lane, Richmond TW10 7AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 10/0569/LBC, dated 13 February 2016 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the works hereby granted consent and subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect the proposals would have on the character and special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Petersham Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The Navigator's House is a Grade II listed building. The list description identifies it as formerly one house with Glen Cottage, which is the adjoining property, and of 17th century origin. It adds that this was probably timber framed and a half-H in plan, with The Navigator's House the right hand wing and apparently raised in height. It is three windows wide plus 2 modern semi-circular bays and other additions to the right.
5. The addition in the form of a two-storey rear wing dates from the late twentieth century. Adjoining this wing is a single-storey conservatory. Permission was granted in 2013 for this to be converted to a more solid form of extension. The modification is shown as completed on the current plans but had not been carried out at the time of my visit.
6. The modern rear wing, and the permitted extension, are in materials and with window and door styles that are in keeping with the older building. While this has been substantially enlarged, some sense of the original building remains. Heritage significance derives from the historical development in conjunction with Glen Cottage and the continued presence of the fabric and form of this. Historic properties on River Lane as an important route between Petersham village and the River Thames are a key part of the special interest of the Conservation Area, and the above heritage features of the appeal property contribute to this.
7. The proposed pergola would have a roof structure that joins the rear elevation at above the cill height of the first floor windows. It would stretch across much of the width of both the two-storey rear addition and the single-storey infill, and project back by over 4.5m from the rear of the building into the garden. Although largely open it would have solid structural elements and glazing at roof level plus metal supports around the perimeter. As such it would be a relatively dominant structure in relation to the rear elevation. The siting, size, design and materials would be somewhat incongruous in the context of this, and the structure would further reduce the legibility of the historic building.

This would detract from heritage significance, notwithstanding the degree of concealment from the surroundings.

8. The degree of harm would be less than substantial. Government advice is that such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing optimum viable use. In this case there are no public benefits established that outweigh the harm.
9. The proposed garden building would be in one corner of the garden and well separated from the listed building. It would be a relatively small structure. No objection has been raised to it. There would be no harm to heritage significance as a result of its erection.
10. The pergola proposal fails to meet the requirements of the Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan 2011 in terms of high design quality and respect for context including heritage as set out in policies DM DC 1, DM HD 1 and DM HD 2. The garden building proposal complies with these policies.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

T G Phillimore

INSPECTOR