



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3340493

32 Lower Teddington Road, Hampton Wick, Richmond Upon Thames, KT1 4HJ

- 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 & Mrs Syers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 23/3198/HOT.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a lightweight, glazed garden room adjoining to the existing garage, reinstating the former glasshouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a lightweight, glazed garden room adjoining to the existing garage, reinstating the former glasshouse at 32 Lower Teddington Road, Hampton Wick, Richmond Upon Thames, KT1 4HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/3198/HOT, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule of Conditions.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and on the Hampton Wick Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within Hampton Wick Conservation Area (CA). The CA is centred upon the High Street, the historic core of the village of Hampton Wick, and includes its riverside setting and the landscape setting of Bushy Park. The Hampton Wick Conservation Area Study 1999 (the CA Study) identifies several character areas within the CA, with the appeal site being located within the Seymour Road, Glamorgan Road and Lower Teddington Road character area. The CA study describes this area as consisting of large Victorian villas set on generous plots away from the pavement edge, this more grandiose scale being in particular contrast to the village core. The adjacent dwelling at 30 Lower Teddington Road and the boathouse to the rear of 34 Lower Teddington Road are also designated as 'Buildings of Townscape Merit' and are non-designated heritage assets.
4. The appeal property is one of many large properties along Lower Teddington Road which are set back from the pavement edge behind high boundary walls. At the time of my site visit the dwelling was undergoing substantial alteration

and renovation. The original dwelling is of an Arts and Craft style and although of a later phase of development and style, the dwelling does reflect the form of surrounding development which characterises this sub-area of the CA. Overall, I find no reason to disagree with the conclusions of the Heritage Statement that the site makes a limited contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Similar advice is contained within the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) and in Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan (2018).
6. The proposed garden room would be sited to the rear of the existing garage which, I understand from the submissions, was rebuilt in about 1992. I also understand that historically there was a substantial glasshouse connected to the garage and the main house which was also demolished in 1992.
7. The proposed new structure would in a sense, reinstate this historic connection whilst retaining a suitable gap between the building and the main dwelling. It would not be as deep as the existing garage and as such would not project forward of its side elevation. Whilst attached to the garage, the linking element would comprise a fixed picture window and the entrance door with vertical timber fins and would be recessed further to emphasise the subservience of the structure.
8. The remainder of the front elevation as well as the corner of the garden building closest to the existing dwelling would be glazed with a lightweight frame. The structure would have a flat roof which would align with the eaves of the adjacent garage. The siting of the proposed garden room would therefore be discreet, and it would be largely screened from Lower Teddington Road by the higher pitched roof of the existing garage, the high wall along the road frontage and by the solid gates across the entrance to 32A Lower Teddington Road. I conclude that the proposed building would not overly dominate the front garden area of the plot and would maintain an appropriate and subservient relationship to the host dwelling thereby preserving its integrity and legibility. Accordingly, I find the siting and scale of the proposed building to be acceptable.
9. The Council has raised particular concern regarding the proposed roof design and materials. The roof would comprise an anodized bronze fascia that would be 100mm thus, in my view, providing a lightweight appearance to the structure. The modest parapet wall would be set back from the fascia and would not significantly detract from the glazed frame. A series of rooflights are also proposed which would add to the lightweight design and appearance of the building. I therefore find the design and external appearance of the proposed building to be acceptable. Accordingly, I conclude that it would not detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling, its front yard area or the surrounding area.
10. The existing wall to the rear of the garage would form the northern elevation of the proposed building. Whilst I was unable to view the wall from the adjacent access, it does not hold the same historic significance as the wall to the front of the site as it appears to be of a more recent construction. A section of the side wall would be increased in height by 570mm. Given the stepped nature of the

existing boundary wall I do not consider that the raising in height of a small section of it would be particularly appreciable. The wall is, in any event, well set back from the Lower Teddington Road frontage, sited behind the existing garage and is very well screened by a combination of existing vegetation, the high front boundary wall and the gates at the entrance to No 32A. In this regard, I do not share the Council's concerns regarding the effect of this aspect of the proposal on the integrity or appearance of the wall or on the wider CA, the character and appearance of which would be preserved.

11. Whilst the Council do not object to the removal of trees from the site, their concern is that the proposal would not adequately mitigate for the loss of these trees in the interest of the visual amenities of the locality. The Council confirm that a previous planning permission (LPA ref. 22/3096/HOT) granted permission for the removal of these trees with replacement planting secured by condition. Details relating to the condition were subsequently approved. However, whilst works are currently taking place to the appeal property, I have no information whether these works are in relation to the implementation of the above planning permission. Therefore, in these circumstances, should I be minded to allow the appeal, it would be appropriate to secure replacement planting by way of a condition in order to ensure that the character and appearance of the site and the CA is protected.
12. The Council has not alleged any harm to the nearby non-designated heritage assets. I concur with this view given the small scale of the proposed building and its siting in relation to these buildings.
13. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) is of considerable importance and weight. However, for the reasons outlined above, I am satisfied that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and not harm its significance.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and on the Hampton Wick Conservation Area. The proposal would comply with the design, landscape and heritage aims of policies LP1, LP3 and LP16 of the LP and the Framework. Together these policies seek to protect heritage assets and require development proposals to be of a high architectural and urban design quality that contributes to and enhances the local environment. The proposal would also comply with the main design aims of the Council's House Extensions and External Alterations Supplementary Document 2015.

Conditions

15. The Council has suggested a list of planning conditions in the event that this appeal was to be allowed. I have incorporated most of the suggested conditions, with some adjustments for clarity.
16. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials and replacement planting is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the building and the local area. A condition requiring the implementation of the Fire Safety Strategy is required in the interest of public safety.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: 556-P-001; 556-P-002; 556-P-003; 556-P-010; 556-P-020; 556-P-021; 556-P-030; 556-P-031; 556-P-100; 556-P-101; 556-P-200; 556-P-201; 556-P-300; 556-P-301.
- 3) No new external finishes, 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 drawings.
- 4) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Fire Safety Strategy received 30th November 2023, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 5) No development above ground shall take place until full details of soft landscaping works and tree planting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such details to include:
 1. Planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment;
 2. Planting methodology;
 3. Specification of the quantity, density, size, species, position and the proposed time or programme of planting;
 4. Details of earthworks, to include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing a relationship of proposed mounding to existing vegetation and surrounding landform;
 5. A 3-year maintenance and management programme;
 6. Details of permeable materials to any hardstanding;

This scheme shall be written in accordance with the British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations (sections 5.6) and BS 8545:2014 Trees: from nursery to independence in the landscape. Recommendations.

End of conditions