The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/19/3238623
53 Park Road, Hampton Wick KT1 4AS

- 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 Conal Cunningham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
- The application Ref 19/1917/HOT, dated 19 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
- The development proposed is demolishing the existing conservatory in order to construct a single storey rear extension with raised ceiling and a lantern roof light, erection of a part 1 / part2 storey rear extension, alongside replacements of double glazed windows for all existing single glazed windows from casement to sash windows.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolishing the existing conservatory in order to construct a single storey rear extension with raised ceiling and a lantern roof light, erection of a part 1 / part2 storey rear extension, alongside replacements of double glazed windows for all existing single glazed windows from casement to sash windows and a front porch at 53 Park Road, Hampton Wick KT1 4AS in accordance with the terms of application 19/1917/HOT, dated 19 June 2019, subject to the conditions listed below.

    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: Location plan and drawing numbers 1001 to 1012 (inclusive).

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development also comprises a single storey porch to the front elevation. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I. Accordingly, this has been added to the description for clarity.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed rear extensions on the character and appearance of 53 Park Road; the Hampton Wick Conservation Area (CA); and, the setting, character and appearance of nearby listed buildings.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Park Road is a quiet street of primarily residential development close to the historic village centre of Hampton Wick. 53 Park Road is within a row of similarly small-scaled development set behind short front gardens. The buildings, generally dating from the C19, demonstrate a variety of styles but are bound by their intimate scale, common materials and close siting that result in an attractive and high-quality street scene. This aesthetic and the substantial history of the village combine to justify its location within the CA. No.53 is a painted brick two-storey cottage with extensions to the side and rear.

5. The rear of the site has skewed boundaries, the initial parts of which are defined by the rearward extension of the neighbouring buildings either side. Following the removal of the modern conservatory, the extensions would substantially nestle within the space between an existing two-storey addition to the house and the flanking dwelling at no.51.

6. Although the cumulative depth of the extensions would exceed the guidelines set out in the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD), the site circumstances would ensure that any resultant sense of enclosure or overbearing impacts on neighbours, which the guideline seeks to protect, are negligible. The general alignment with the flanking development would ensure the extensions would lie within the typical depth of development along this side of the road.

7. The increased height and width of the proposed single storey element in comparison to the existing conservatory, and the covering of the rear elevation of the existing two-storey projection, would result in some additional masking of the original elevations of the building. Further, in a similar manner to the existing conservatory and timber-clad projection, the development would contrast with the original materials and design of the dwelling.

8. In the context of the recessed location where views of it from public areas could not be obtained due to the position behind the main house and the close siting of development on this part of the road, no visual harm would arise. Moreover, the overall scale and projection would be characteristic of other rearward additions within the row. Furthermore, the proposed materials for the rear extensions would reflect the existing degree of contrast that assists in identifying later additive elements.

9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, (the Act) requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. As previously described, the extensions would not be visible from the public realm or conflict with the character of development within this part of the CA.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of no.53 or the CA and therefore the proposed development aligns with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the LP, the SPD, the Hampton Wick & Teddington Village Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (PG), the Hampton Wick Conservation Statement (CS), and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they seek to

secure high quality design and protect the heritage of the Borough including the character and appearance of conservation areas.

Listed Buildings

11. Section 66(1) of the Act requires a decision maker, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.

12. My attention is drawn to two Grade II listed buildings within the road. The closest is a terrace of 4 dwellings lying directly opposite the site. A further listed dwelling at no.40 lies about 50 metres away. As described above, the proposed rear extensions are contained behind no.53 and therefore would not directly impact the listed buildings or be visible in conjunction with their settings.

13. The parties agree that the small alterations to the front elevation would not appear out of place against the host building or within the wider locality. For these reasons, I conclude that the extensions and alterations would comply with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the LP, the SPD, PG, CS and the Framework as they seek to protect the heritage of the Borough and the setting, character and appearance of listed buildings.

Other Matters

14. Representation made to the Council by an adjacent occupier raised no objections but requested that restrictions be imposed in the event of a grant of planning permission to control noise of construction workers. Such restrictions would not meet the tests of necessity or reasonableness for planning conditions as set out in the Framework and therefore cannot be imposed in this instance.

Conditions

15. The Council have suggested several conditions which I have considered alongside the advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I find these to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case.

16. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

17. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the CA, I have added the condition in relation to the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR