



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/23/3331082

2 Old Palace Place, The Green, Richmond TW9 1NQ

- 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 Richard Peirson against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0854/HOT, dated 31 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2023.
 - The development is for a single-storey glazed rear extension with a part glazed and part flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey glazed rear extension with a part glazed and part flat roof at 2 Old Palace Place, The Green, Richmond, TW9 1NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/0854/HOT, dated 31 March 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission and Listed Building Consent were granted on appeal¹ in October 2021 for a single-storey glass extension. The appeal Inspector concluded that the alterations preserved the building and its special interest² and the Conservation Area³.
3. This proposal is for the same general scale and form of extension, however rather than full glazing, the extension would have a solid roof with a glazed section linking to the host property.
4. This appeal only relates to the application for Planning Permission (Council Reference 23/0845/HOT), the requirements for Listed Building Consent are a separate matter.
5. As this proposal relates to a Listed Building within a Conservation Area, I have statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sections 66(1) and 72(1) that require special attention is to be had to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of a conservation area, and to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting.

¹ Appeal Decisions APP/L5810/W/21/3269757 and APP/L5810/Y/21/3269769

² Appeal decision paragraph 12

³ Appeal decision paragraph 14

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property, including the significance of the Listed Building, and the Richmond Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

7. 2 Old Palace Place is part of a Grade II* Listed Building dating from the 16th Century. The previous appeal decision explained its history and the architectural details of the property which I do not intend to repeat, but I agree with the Inspector's findings that: *the significance of the building is due to its age, remnants of older architecture and its historic associations with people and places. The front elevation is architecturally more significant than the rear elevation.*
8. That appeal decision also considered the history of the rear door which the proposed extension would enclose. It was not conclusive on its background or age but found it to be attractive and that the door provides interest in terms of the development of the building over time. The details and photographs in the appellant's statement before me, illustrate that a large single-storey rear extension was present in 1928 and that the rear elevation was remodelled to the current arrangement between 1930 and 1944. The door was not part of the original building and whilst I do not necessarily agree with the appellant that it is out of keeping, its architectural style and scale are somewhat unusual for a rear elevation.
9. The proposal would create a solid roof projection above the doorcase with supporting columns and glass elevations. The glazed link section to the roof would enable visibility of the door in the context of the rear façade, and the alignment of the supporting columns (which were revised during the application process) would frame the entrance. The extension would, nonetheless, dissect views of the existing rear elevation as a whole, and obscure some views of the door from within the rear garden. While the previous proposal indicates that a fully glazed scheme without these structural elements is achievable, this is a small extension of limited bulk, which will provide protection to the door, and facilitate a reduction in solar gain and the need for artificial cooling.
10. Overall, I find that the design creates a distinct, but harmonious modern addition whilst retaining, including visibility of, the existing architectural features. It would also allow the building's composition and evolution to be read. Therefore, while the Council may prefer the previous scheme, I do not find that the proposed extension would be incongruous or unduly intrusive to result in harm to the significance of the Listed Building and that its special interest would be preserved.
11. The building also lies within the Richmond Green Conservation Area with its significance derived from the high-quality elegant buildings set around the Green with uninterrupted views. The previous appeal decision found the extension would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Sited to the rear and with limited visibility from the neighbouring properties, I do not find that the change to the materials would alter this conclusion, and accordingly, the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole would be preserved.

12. Consequently, I find that the proposal accords with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the London Borough of Richmond Local Plan⁴ and Policies D4 and HC1 of The London Plan, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these promote high design quality, seek to conserve the historic environment and avoid harm to the significance of heritage assets. There would also be no direct conflict with Policies 28 and 29 of the emerging Richmond Local Plan, Publication (Regulation 19)⁵ which have similar objectives.

Other Matters

13. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to various supplementary documents: The Richmond Green Conservation Area Statement and Study; the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD (May 2015); The Richmond and Richmond Hill Village SPD. Whilst I have had regard to these generally, I have not been directed to any specific requirements and I have found no conflict with the Development Plan which they support.

Conditions

14. In line with the statutory requirements and for certainty conditions are imposed to ensure the scheme is carried out in accordance with the appropriate timescale and the submitted plans.
15. The Council has suggested a number of other conditions and I accept in the interest of the appearance of the proposed development and the historic building the materials and details of the glazing must be approved. Additionally, a condition is required to secure the Fire Safety Statement in line with the London Plan. However, I have not been provided with any policy justification, or a specific requirement in relation to this small-scale domestic extension, for the acoustic report or the restrictions relating to industrial construction equipment.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: 1256.03.03.Exg.023; 1256.01.03.Exg.022; 1256.01.03.Exg.061; 1256.01.03.Exg.062 and 1256.01.03.Exg.001 received on 31 March 2023. 1256.00.01.IMP.001 received on 31 March 2023

⁴ London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames, Local Plan July 2018

⁵ Richmond Local Plan 'The best for our borough' Planning 9 June 2023

1256.03.03.Skt.061; 1256.03.03.Pln.023; 1256.03.03.Pln.022 A; 1256.03.03.Pln.061 A; and 1256.03.03.Pln.062 A.

3) No development shall take place until samples of all materials have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.

4) No development shall take place until larger scale fenestration details (to a scale of not less than 1:20) have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The extension shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

5) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Statement dated 29 March 2023.