



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2021

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor

**Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 10 August 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/21/3268158**

**51 and 51A Oldfield Road, Hampton TW12 2AJ**

- 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 Andrew Morris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
  - The application Ref 20/1897/HOT, dated 9 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2020.
  - The development proposed is the Demolition of Workshop and Construction of Two Storey Side Extension
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Preliminary Matter

3. While the address is listed inconsistently across various documents, it has been clarified by the appellant that the address listed on the application form, 51 and 51A Oldfield Road, is accurate.
4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that neither the appellant nor the Council have made any further submissions regarding the revised Framework. However, in light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that any references made to the revised Framework within this decision would not be unreasonable to the parties.

### Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hampton Village Conservation Area.

## Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The site comprises a two storey dwelling of traditional style and simple shape with single storey workshop within the Hampton Village Conservation Area (CA). The surrounding area is primarily residential, and Oldfield Road is noted as contributing late 19th century houses to the CA. The workshop element marks the transition into a small commercial hub, which falls outside the CA.
7. The proposal involves replacing the workshop with a contemporary two storey side extension. Although notably different in design to the host dwelling, the overall design approach, including choice of materials, is acceptable in this context given the transitional location of the site. Another Inspector, in considering a proposal at the site, found similarly in this regard, stating that a contemporary side extension with metal cladding and flat roof was not in principle unacceptable due to the proximity of the commercial hub.
8. However, the proposed extension would sit forward of the front elevation of the dwelling. It would read as a dominant addition which would not respect the layout of the host dwelling, visually competing with it and undermining its appearance, which would be harmful to its character and appearance.
9. Moreover, the extension would be a prominent feature in the streetscene. While the mix of materials would add interest to the western elevation, the scale and projection from this direction would result in an imposing feature, which would obscure views of the host dwelling at the entrance to the CA. Even considering the varied building lines and forms of dwellings on the street, it would result in a property of a scale that appears out of place.
10. Although the current workshop is of limited architectural merit, its scale and design ensure that it integrates in the streetscene. The proposal, while of the same footprint and incorporating design elements to complement industrial units and mark the end of the CA, would be a much more dominant addition. In this sense the visual disruption to both the host dwelling and the CA would be more pronounced.
11. Accordingly, the contribution that the host dwelling makes to the character and appearance of the CA would be diminished as a result of the proposed extension. Visual harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the CA and its significance as a designated heritage asset would be reduced. This harm would be localised and would equate to 'less than substantial' harm in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nonetheless the Framework makes it clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
12. Paragraph 202 of the Framework specifies that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against public benefits of the proposal. The appellant has highlighted that the proposal would provide improved living accommodation but this represents a personal benefit. It is further stated that the off road parking would ease pressure on the street and provide access to the property for loading and unloading. However, this benefit is limited by the single dwelling nature of the proposal and as such does not outweigh the great weight that I give to the harm identified above.

13. For all of these reasons I find that the proposal would have a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan July 2018, the Hampton Village Planning Guidance (June 2017) and the SPD, which together seek to promote good design and preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal would also conflict with the statutory test relating to conservation areas.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

14. Having had regard to all matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*C Rafferty*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

*RC Kirby*

INSPECTOR