



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2023

by P J Staddon BSc, Dip, MBA (Distinction), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/22/3303999

175 Hampton Road, TWICKENHAM, TW2 5NG

- 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 Origen against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1187/FUL, dated 8 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the 'construction of replacement single storey rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a replacement single storey rear extension at 175 Hampton Road, Twickenham TW2 5NG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/1187/FUL, dated 8 April 2022, 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: 1973-(01)000 P2; 1973-(01)001 P3; 1973-(01)001 P4; 1973-(02)001 P2; 1973-(02)002 P2; 1973-(02)003 P2; 1973-(02)101 P3; 1973-(02)102 P2; 1973-(02)103 P2; 1973-(04)001 P2; 1973-(04)101 P3; 1973-(SK)101 P2.
 - 3) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Strategy prepared by Campbell and Co Architects dated 10 January 2022 unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.
 - 4) No new external finishes, including fenestration and works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the finishes of the existing building.
 - 5) No development above ground level shall take place until detailed drawings to a scale of not less than 1:20 of the new window and door hereby permitted on the main building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details as may be approved shall be implemented and retained as such thereafter.

- 6) The flat roof of the extension shall not be used for any purpose other than as a means of escape in emergency or for maintenance of the building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the host non-designated heritage asset and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 175 Hampton Road is a former public house dating from the mid C19th, which sits on a corner plot at the junction with Stanley Road, albeit that the junction is no longer open to vehicular traffic. The main building is of brick construction, now painted, with slate covered pitched and hipped roofs. It is sited in the northern part of the plot, such that its front and north side walls abut the back of the footways on Hampton Road and Stanley Road respectively. The building is currently vacant and in a state of disrepair.
4. To the rear of this building there are 2 single storey additions, comprising an older flat roofed brick-built extension, with 2 sliding sash windows facing Stanley Road and, linked to this addition, a relatively recent open sided timber framed structure with rollable clear plastic inserts providing some protection from the elements. This structure, approved by Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council (the Council) in 2014¹, appears to have been used as a covered dining area. These rear additions are most visible when viewed from Stanley Road.
5. To the south of the main building, there is a former coach house which appears to have been used for office purposes, but was vacant when I visited. Between the 2 buildings there is a vehicular access from Hampton Road, leading to a car park of about a dozen spaces in the eastern part of the site.
6. The appeal proposal seeks to replace the timber framed rear addition with a flat roofed extension of a similar size connected to the existing building by a glazed link. The extension would be constructed in brickwork, painted to match the existing building. It would include extensive glazing on its 3 sides, such that it would appear as a contemporary addition to the rear of this traditionally styled property. The drawings indicate soft landscaping in the form of a boundary hedge alongside Stanley Road. The appeal proposal also includes some minor works and alterations to the main building and the former coach house.
7. The building is not located within a designated Conservation Area and it is not Listed, nor is there any suggestion by the Council that it should be Listed. However, the property is identified as a 'building of townscape merit' (BTM) through the Council's 'local list'. It is therefore a building of local heritage interest and a non-designated heritage asset for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
8. The appellant has submitted a Heritage Statement which provides a useful assessment of the appeal site's history and the heritage significance of its buildings. It assesses that the significance of the appeal premises is largely

¹ Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council planning application reference 14/3051/FUL

derived from it having been developed as a mid C19th inn, during a period of rapid urban expansion, with its aesthetic and architectural value principally derived from its street facing elevations.

9. Paragraph 203 of the Framework states that the effect of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application and that, in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
10. Similarly, policy LP4 of the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (LP) (adopted July 2018) says that the Council will seek to preserve and, where possible, enhance the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets, including BTM, and makes plain that there will be a presumption against the demolition of BTM. LP policy LP1 requires all proposals to respect local character and achieve design quality. The Council has also published 2 Supplementary Planning Documents, titled the 'Buildings of Townscape Merit' (BTMSPD) (adopted May 2015) and the 'Twickenham Village Planning Guidance' (TVDG) (adopted January 2018), which are material considerations.
11. The appeal proposal would be a relatively modest sized addition, and similar in footprint to the addition it would replace. It would be distinctly subservient to the main building and marginally lower than the existing rear addition to which it would connect. Being located at the back of the building, it would not challenge or erode the significance, character and setting of the building. Indeed, I noted that the TVDG includes a photograph² of the former public house, taken in 1972, which captures the main view, which would not be affected by the appeal proposal extension. I therefore find no conflict with policy LP4 or with the guidance contained within the BTMSPD and TVDG.
12. Whilst the design incorporates more glazing and a somewhat more contemporary feel, its modest scale, limited height and the use of a glazed link, all help to create a neat, appropriate and successful addition that, in my assessment, achieves the design quality required by policy LP1 and by the Framework, notably paragraph 130.
13. Overall, I assess that the appeal proposal would not be harmful to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore accord with LP policies LP1 and LP4, the TVPG, the BTMSPD and with paragraphs 203 and 130 of the Framework.

Planning conditions

14. The Council has suggested a list of planning conditions in the event that this appeal was to be allowed. I have incorporated most of its suggestions, with some adjustments and editing for clarity.
15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition listing the approved plans is required to provide certainty. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted Fire Safety Strategy is necessary to ensure public safety. Conditions requiring the use of matching external materials and windows, and the submission of more detailed drawings

² Twickenham Village Planning Guidance (TVPG) Supplementary Planning Document in January 2018 – Page 26

of windows and doors, are necessary to ensure a high standard of design. A further condition restricting the use of the proposed flat roof of the extension is necessary to protect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

16. I have considered the Council's suggestion that a condition should be imposed requiring a noise assessment. However, given the longstanding use of the premises, the nature and small scale of the extension, and the fact that it will replace an open sided structure with no noise control measures, I do not consider that imposing such a condition would be necessary or reasonable.

Other matters

17. I have noted a representation from an interested party which states that they believe the appellant wishes to convert the property to a nursery. However, I must determine this appeal on the planning merits of the proposal as submitted, which makes no reference to such a use.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons stated above, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions listed in paragraph 1 of this decision.

P. Staddon

INSPECTOR