



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 24 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3167906

104 High Street, Hampton, Richmond upon Thames, TW12 2ST.

- 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 Ian Loveday against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1019/HOT, dated 15 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2017.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 104 High Street, Hampton, Richmond upon Thames, TW12 2ST in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1019/HOT, dated 15 March 2017, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 4146/1 Rev 00, 414/2-Rev A, site Location Plan dated 14/3/2016 scale 1:1250 and Block/Site location Plan dated 14/3/2016 at a scale 1:500.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the window in the southern elevation at first floor level has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the architectural integrity of the host property, the setting of 100 High Street (Grove House) listed grade II* and whether it would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 104 High Street, is a relatively recently built two-storey dwelling, semi-detached with number 106. Although designed and built at the same time, by reason of their three-dimensional form they are not a matching pair.
4. The appeal site is located in the Hampton Village Conservation Area. To the south of the site is a large, extended and remodelled, late C17 house, number 100 High Street (Grove House), listed grade II*. Due to its wide frontage, height, form and relationship to the High Street, Grove House is a significantly prominent feature. Further, as I observed, unlike the appeal property the building to the rear of the appeal site, is both prominent in the setting of Grove House and the conservation area more generally by reason of its height and roof form.
5. The appellant proposes a first floor extension built directly over an existing single storey side projection. While the existing bay window to the side would remain single storey, that facing the street would be raised to terminate with a flat roof at eaves level thus making the extension more prominent than it might otherwise be.
6. However, the pitched roof of the extension, while maintaining the eaves line of the pair of houses, would have a ridgeline significantly lower than that of the existing main roof. Further, the extension would be set well back behind the main façade of the property. Accordingly, in my judgement, what would be a well-mannered extension, when considered in the context of the semi-detached pair, would also appear as both proportionate and subordinate to the host property. Accordingly, I am not persuaded, that the house, extended as proposed, would appear either as visually intrusive or as an overbearing form of development as suggested by the Council.
7. The appeal property is set behind a high brick wall to the street and, as I saw, there are limited views of it from the High Street. In contrast, due to its height, length of its front elevation and more limited height of its boundary wall to the street, Grove House is, like the building to the rear of the appeal site, extremely prominent and striking in the street scene. Given these considerations, I do not consider that number 104, extended as proposed, would be so unduly prominent when viewed from the High Street as to cause harm to either the setting of Grove House or the character or appearance of the conservation area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed first floor addition would not cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host building, would serve to preserve the setting of Grove House, listed grade II*, as well as the character and appearance of the conservation area. The development would therefore accord with Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted April 2009) and Policies DM HD1, DM HD2 and DM DC1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Development Management Plan (Adopted November 2011) as they relate to the quality of development, the preservation of the setting of listed buildings, and the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Conditions

9. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building. To protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, I will require the proposed first floor window in the southern elevation to be non-openable and obscure glazed below a minimum height of 1.7 metres.
10. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR