



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020

by Graham Chamberlain BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/19/3242135
159a High Street, Hampton Hill TW12 1NL

- 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 James Kelly of Wicklow Homes Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/2645/FUL, dated 27 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'second floor extension with B1 use, over an existing 2 storey B1 use. Existing pitched roof is removed and replaced with mansard roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a second-floor extension with B1 use, over an existing 2 storey B1 use, following removal of existing pitched roof and replacement with mansard roof at 159a High Street, Hampton Hill TW12 1NL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/2645/FUL, dated 27 August 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form refers to the appeal property as 'Mega House' but it is called 'Mulsanne Insurance' on the appeal form. To avoid any confusion, I have simply referred to the appeal property as 159a High Street.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are: 1) Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hampton Hill Conservation Area; and 2) The effect of the proposed development on the setting of 157 – 159 High Street (Prospect Place).

Reasons

Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hampton Hill Conservation Area (CA)

4. Hampton High Street is a vibrant and attractive historic thoroughfare described in the Conservation Area Appraisal¹ (CAA) as being enclosed by closely packed predominately two storey Victorian buildings occupying traditional long narrow

¹ High Street (Hampton Hill) Conservation Area 38

plots. It goes on to explain that the southern gateway into the CA is marked by the Pantile Bridge, but the northern gateway is less clear, being delineated by the transition to a more compact and smaller scale². This is what I observed, with the buildings to the north and west of the appeal site being arranged over three floors and those to the south generally being two storeys high, albeit with some notable exceptions.

5. The appeal building occupies a corner plot and has an historic classical style to its elevations due to the use of sash windows, a parapet, panelled doors and a string course. The balanced symmetrical elevations, particularly that to Taylor Close, are also a defining feature. That said, the stretcher course brick work and use of movement joints belies it as a modern building that was probably constructed at the same time as Garrick House opposite, which exhibits a very similar appearance, finish and material pallet. Garrick House is also within the CA and is arranged over three floors, the upper floor being a mansard roof.
6. The proposed mansard roof would have a similar appearance to the one at Garrick House. As such, it would not appear strident or out of place in the immediate context, particularly as the appeal property and Garrick House already have a group value given their similar appearance and form. This is the case even though they are in different 'blocks' either side of Taylor Close. The proposed mansard would have different proportions to the one at Garrick House, but it would still sit behind the parapet and include comparable finishing materials and a curved dormer. This would provide some visual integration, particularly in those views along the High Street where Garrick House is clearly visible in the backdrop of the appeal building.
7. The elevation of the appeal building addressing Taylor Close would retain a symmetrical appearance despite the proposed mansard roof. This is because the dormers would have a balanced layout that would align with the windows in the floors below. In this respect, the mansard would be a sensitive addition to the existing building. It would not be overly bulky either, representing a moderate increase in height and the massing would be set back from the eaves. The proposed mansard extension would be lower than Garrick House but taller than the ridge of Prospect Place. This would provide a transition between the three-storey town scape around Taylor Close into the prominently two-storey built form along the High Street to the south, as noted in the CAA.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, there would be no conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 2018 (LP) and Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which together seek to secure development that will conserve, enhance and not harm designated heritage assets such as the CA.

The effect on the setting of 157 – 159 High Street (Prospect Place)

9. Prospect Place is a modest pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings. It is finished in a slate roof atop mellow brick walls. The front elevation is visible from the High Street and it is from this direction that the building is mainly appreciated. The fenestration is not identical, but it is attractive and symmetrically placed. The sash windows, front doors and central chimney stack provide a balanced composition. The central name plate is a characterful touch.

² This description is also set out in the Hampton Hill Village Planning Guidance 2017

Accordingly, Prospect Place is a good example of modest domestic architecture from the 19th Century and this is what affords it a local significance.

10. Given the foregoing, and the guidance in the Council's Buildings of Townscape Merit Supplementary Planning Document 2015, Prospect House is a heritage asset that can justifiably be described as a Building of Townscape Merit because of its contribution to the character, appearance and history of the High Street.
11. The proposed mansard roof extension would increase the height of the appeal building and therefore Prospect House would no longer sit in a short row of two storey buildings. However, the appeal building once extended would not tower over Prospect Place and it is not uncommon to see the heights of adjoining buildings vary in the conservation area. The mansard would be set behind the existing parapet so the eaves line of the appeal building, which is already taller than Prospect House, would not be altered. In this respect the mansard would have a recessive appearance that would not obscure or unduly interfere with views of Prospect House from the High Street, from where the architectural detailing, scale and proportions of the building would still be clearly evident and capable of being appreciated and understood. As a result, the historic and architectural significance of the building would not be harmed.
12. I therefore conclude that the appeal scheme would preserve the significance, character and setting of Prospect House. Accordingly, a conflict with Policy LP4 of the LP would not occur.

Other Matters

13. I have not been directed to, or observed, any other locations in the CA where the precise circumstances at and around the appeal site are replicated, particularly the relationship of the appeal building to Garrick House. Therefore, the appeal scheme would not set a precedent. Thus, this appeal decision should not be interpreted as generally sanctioning increases in the height of buildings in the CA through the construction of mansard roofs. Technical evidence is not before me to demonstrate Taylor Close is unusually busy or unsafe and that the appeal scheme would severely impact on the road network. The appeal site already has off road parking and there is a public car park in close proximity. As such, the proposal need not increase pressure to park on street.
14. There is no evidence before me to indicate there is a need for the development but there is no onus on the appellant to demonstrate such. The area is designated as a Key Office Area so in this respect, the appeal scheme would be appropriate. Concerns have been expressed that the appeal building once extended could be converted into flats at a later date. However, there is nothing of substance before me to suggest this would be an inevitable consequence of allowing the appeal and therefore I have confined my assessment to the appeal scheme as proposed.

Conditions

15. I have considered the advice in the Planning Practice Guide and the conditions suggested by the Council and agreed by the appellant. It is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area, and the living conditions of neighbours, to ensure that the development is undertaken

in accordance with the approved drawings, that refuse is adequately stored and that details and samples of external materials are approved.

16. To protect the living conditions of neighbours it is necessary to secure details of a construction management plan. To promote sustainable transport, it is necessary to secure cycle parking commensurate to the size of the extension. Some of the details required by condition require resolution prior to commencement of development since the works they relate to are so fundamental to the development permitted that it would have been otherwise necessary to refuse the whole permission.

Conclusion

17. The appeal scheme would adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal should succeed.

Graham Chamberlain
INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than wholly in accordance with Drawing Nos: PL01, PL02, PL03, PL04, PL05, PL06, PL07, PL08 and PL09; received by the Local Planning Authority on the 27 August 2019.
3. The external surfaces of the hereby approved extension (including fenestration) shall not be constructed other than in materials details and samples of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management Statement (to include any demolition works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 1. The size, number, routing and manoeuvring tracking of construction vehicles to and from the site, and holding areas for these on/off site;
 2. Site layout plan showing manoeuvring tracks for vehicles accessing the site to allow these to turn and exit in forward gear;
 3. Details and location of parking for site operatives and visitor vehicles (including measures taken to ensure satisfactory access and movement for existing occupiers of neighbouring properties during construction);
 4. Details and location where plant and materials will be loaded and unloaded;
 5. Details and location where plant and materials used in constructing the development will be stored, and the location of skips on the highway if required;
 6. Details of any necessary suspension of pavement, road space, bus stops and/or parking bays;
 7. Details where security hoardings (including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing) will be installed, and the maintenance of such;
 8. Details of any wheel washing facilities;
 9. Details of a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works (including excavation, location and emptying of skips);
 10. Details of measures that will be applied to control the emission of noise, vibration and dust including working hours. This should follow Best Practice detailed within BS5288:2009 Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites;
 11. Details of any highway licenses and traffic orders that may be required (such as for licences for any structures / materials on the highway or pavement; or suspensions to allow the routing of construction vehicles to the site);
 12. Details of the phasing programming and timing of works;

13. Where applicable, the Construction Management Statement should be written in conjunction with the Arboricultural Method Statement, and in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - recommendations', in particular section 5.5, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and 7;
14. A construction programme including a 24-hour emergency contact number;
15. See also TfL guidance on Construction Logistics Plans. REASON: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety together with the amenity of the area.
5. No part of the development shall be occupied until commensurate cycle parking facilities have been provided in accordance with detailed drawings that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, such drawings to show the position, design, materials and finishes thereof.
6. The development hereby approved shall be occupied until arrangements for the storage and disposal of refuse/waste have been made in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning.

End of Schedule