



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/22/3307867

59 High Street, Teddington, Richmond Upon Thames TW11 8HA

- 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 Salim Rajabali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/1845/FUL, dated 6 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear extension at 59 High Street, Teddington, Richmond Upon Thames TW11 8HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/1845/FUL, dated 6 June 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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: AA80137-L01 Location Plan; AA80137-P04 Ground Floor & Roof Plan as Proposed; AA80137-P04 Section AA, BB & Front Elevation as Proposed.
 - 3) The materials used in the external surfaces, including fenestration, of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appeal site is part of a small parade of traditional shop units on Teddington High Street, with flats above. Numbers 59 and 57 in the parade have together been identified by the Council as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM). BTMs are defined as non-designated heritage assets in Policy LP4 of the London Borough of Richmond Local Plan (RLP).
3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the significance and character of 59 and 57 High Street, Teddington.

Reasons

4. The significance of 59 and 57 High Street as a non-designated heritage asset is derived from its 19th Century style frontage, as noted in the Council's list of BTMs. This frontage also contributes positively to the character of the premises. The rear of nos. 59 and 57 can be viewed from a municipal car park

situated behind the parade. This view is somewhat limited by a boundary wall, a tree and existing single-storey extensions. The traditional roofs of the buildings are nevertheless visible, along with the first-floor windows. Overall, the contribution of this rear view to the significance and character of nos. 59 and 57 is modest.

5. The yard at the rear of no. 59 is accessed from the back of the rear shop unit. It is a small space, surrounded by walls, with a doorway that opens onto the municipal car park. There is little evidence the yard has recently been used as a garden or private outdoor space. At the time of my visit, there was no visible planting or seating. However, it could potentially be used for this purpose in the future. Views of the rear of nos. 59 and 57 from the yard are restricted by the small size of the space and the existing, large rear extension at no. 57. Overall, I consider the contribution of the yard to the significance and character of nos. 59 and 57 is modest.
6. The proposed single-storey rear extension would involve complete in-fill of the yard at no. 59 to create further space for the rear shop unit. The extension would have a flat roof with nearly flush horizontal rooflights. A doorway would remain in the rear wall, with a new window next to it.
7. The extension would not be visible from the High Street, so there would be no impact on the historic frontage of nos. 59 and 57. There would therefore be no harm to the feature than contributes most to the significance and character of the non-designated heritage asset. From the car park to the rear, only the top of the proposed flat roof and rooflights would be visible above the wall. Use of matching materials would help integrate the appearance of the extension with the host building and could be secured by condition. Therefore, overall, there would be little change to the overall appearance of the buildings from this viewpoint. The harm to the rear of nos. 59 and 57 would therefore be limited.
8. The view of the rear of the parade from the yard itself would be lost, resulting in a limited degree of harm. There would also be further limited harm caused by the loss of the yard. However, the extension could potentially be used for tables and seating associated with a business occupying the rear shop unit. This would have the benefit of year-round cover from the elements, extending its usability. Even if it were not used for this purpose, the provision of more trading space would have a positive economic impact on a town centre business. This could in turn contribute to the long-term maintenance of the historic shopfront. I consider these benefits would outweigh the limited harm I have identified.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude on balance that the overall effect of the proposed extension on the significance and character of nos. 59 and 57 High Street, Teddington would be acceptable. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies LP1, LP4 and LP39 of the RLP; the RLP Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on House Extensions and External Alterations; and the Hampton Wick and Teddington Village Planning Guidance SPD. These policies seek careful design that respects local context; preservation of the significance and character of BTMs; retention of historic shopfronts; and integration of extensions through use of matching materials.
10. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which requires a balanced judgement on applications that directly

affect non-designated heritage assets, having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the asset.

Other Matters

11. The appeal site is within the High Street (Teddington) Conservation Area. This comprises the length of the High Street including the properties that front onto it, and parts of some perpendicular streets. Its significance derives principally from the concentration, variety and architectural detail of 18th Century buildings, original shopfronts (including those built onto the frontage of older houses) and later Edwardian shopping parades. These factors contribute to the traditional high street character of the Conservation Area, which can be appreciated from a series of views down the High Street. The original shopfront of the appeal site makes an important contribution to this significance and character. However, given the proposal would not change the appearance of this shopfront, I consider its effect on the significance of the Conservation Area would be neutral. The character and appearance of the Conservation Area would therefore be preserved, and the proposal would not harm its significance.
12. The position regarding any history of previous rear extensions at no. 59 is not clear. However, I have given this consideration little weight. I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits based on the evidence before me.

Conditions

13. I have undertaken some minor editing and rationalisation of the conditions proposed by the Council in the interests of precision and clarity. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty.
14. The condition requiring use of matching external materials and fenestration is necessary to integrate the appearance of the proposed extension with that of the existing building. The condition restricting use of the flat roof is necessary to prevent its use as a balcony by occupants of neighbouring premises. A condition on fire safety is not necessary as this is covered by Building Regulations.
15. A condition restricting use of the flat roof of the extension is not necessary because the drawings show it as a roof to the proposed extension and planning permission would be required for an alternative use, such as as a balcony.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, the Framework and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR