



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3339550

Petersham Farm, Petersham Road, Richmond upon Thames TW10 7AA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mark Hunter against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref. is 23/2854/HOT.
 - The development proposed is for the installation of a dormer window and two rooflights on the eastern elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of a dormer window and two rooflights on the eastern elevation at Petersham Farm, Petersham Road, Richmond upon Thames TW10 7AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 23/2854/HOT 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:
2202_00_00_001, 2202_01_00_001, 2202_01_00_101,
2202_01_00_200, 2202_01_00_300, 2202_01_00_301,
2202_01_00_312, 2202_01_00_313, 2202_01_00_314,
2202A_00_00_002, 2202A_00_00_101, 2202A_00_00_200,
2202A_00_00_300, 2202A_00_00_301, 2202A_00_00_312,
2202A_00_00_313 & 2202A_00_00_314.
 - 3) No new external finishes (including for fenestration), including works of making good, shall be carried out other than in materials to match the existing, except where indicated otherwise on the submitted application form and/or approved drawings.
 - 4) The rooflights shall be black framed, conservation type with a central vertical bar and sit flush with the roofline.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') was published in December 2023, but there are no material changes relevant to the substance of the appeal. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Petersham Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The house at Petersham Farm is a large, high quality, contemporary dwelling designed to appear as an historic barn conversion with a mixture of stone, render and weatherboard to its elevations. The eastern roof slope is substantial in scale and currently unbroken, whereas the western roof slope has the benefit of planning permission for the installation of a wide, clerestorey dormer looking across the dwelling's terraced courtyard.
5. The Conservation Area 6 Statement highlights that Petersham Conservation Area is a distinctive well defined historic settlement; there have been important views between the village and the surrounding green space of Riverside Meadows, Parkland and Richmond Hill with the village remaining subservient to this landscape, its trees and topography. Petersham Farm itself is located between the River Thames and the foot of Garter Hill and is accessed via a private track off Petersham Road that leads to a Public Right of Way and on to Petersham Meadows.
6. There are casual glimpses of the dwelling and its eastern elevation from the woodland path which runs along the eastern boundary of the site, parallel to Petersham Road; and I note from the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that whilst greater during winter time when the trees and other vegetation are not in leaf, views of the dwelling still remain filtered by such natural features.
7. The proposed dormer would be smaller than that permitted on the opposite roof slope. By virtue of its significant set-down from the main ridge line as well as distance from the eaves and both gable ends, combined with its mono-pitched roof and the proposed employment of high quality materials, including lead cladding and hardwood timber framing and fenestration it would sit comfortably within the roof slope and appear as a logical addition to the modern dwelling.
8. The Council's Officer Planning Report, under the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) section that it is stated that the dormer would add a distinguishable additional feature to the main house that would be subordinate in design and presence compared to the main aspect of the residential building and its gable roof. I have no reason to come to a different conclusion on this.
9. I note reference to the Officer's Report for planning permission 07/1426/FUL that a long clerestorey dormer facing Petersham Road was negotiated out of the scheme as it was considered detrimental to the rustic, uncomplicated form of the buildings. I have been provided with no drawings of these, but ultimately I must determine the scheme that is before me. The Council considers that the roof slope in question should be free of dormers, in order to preserve the

original agricultural design aesthetic in outward appearance. However, the subject building, whilst well-designed, is not of an historic nature and whilst I admit that when viewing the two-dimensional black and white drawings it could appear as a slightly stark addition, nonetheless the 3D coloured perspective views bring it to life and I consider would appear as a subservient logical addition much like the Council found in its assessment within the MOL.

10. Therefore, while the dormer would be slightly visible from the public realm, that does not automatically render it as harmful, even during the winter time when the trees running between the site boundary and Petersham Road lose their leaves. I appreciate that the Council has provided consistent comments, over a number of different applications that a dormer would not be appropriate to the street facing roof slope; but I consider that the dormer of the design proposed would not be out of character with the subject building, even though it may conflict with the strict wording of the House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.
11. Overall, I consider that the proposed development would not give rise to harm to the Designated Heritage Asset with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area being preserved. Therefore, I find the proposal complies with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Richmond upon-Thames Local Plan 2018 which together require all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality, ensuring that development respects, contributes to and enhances the local environmental character along with conserving where possible, and taking opportunities, to make a positive contribution to the historic environment of the Borough. I have also had regard to Policies 28 and 29 of the Richmond Local Plan 'The Best for our Borough' draft for consultation, although I can only give these limited weight in the decision making process at this point in time.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
13. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council suggest a condition requiring external materials to be used in the construction of the dormer to match those of the existing building; that the roof lights be of a conservation style; and that the development be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans. I consider these conditions necessary in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, no policy justification has been provided for the fifth suggested condition that non-road mobile machinery used during construction be fitted with cleaner diesel engines, but in any case, due to the modest scale of the proposal, any plant and machinery is unlikely to give rise to significant emissions to air.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR