



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 28 September 2021

by Ms S Watson BA(Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/Y/20/3261727

9 St Johns Grove, Richmond, LONDON, TW9 2SP

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Hilary Chisholm against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2112/LBC, dated 29 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2020.
 - The work proposed is the installation of partitions to facilitate the subdivision of existing front bedroom at first floor level into 2 rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the installation of partitions to facilitate the subdivision of existing front bedroom at first floor level into 2 rooms at 9 St Johns Grove, Richmond, LONDON, TW9 2SP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/2112/LBC dated 29 July 2020 and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant submitted amended plans as part of the appeal. The amendments are minor and the local planning authority has commented on them. No party has been prejudiced by the amendments and therefore they are the plans upon which I have based my decision. The plans also include photographs provided of the works undertaken. The works have been completed and I was able to see them at my visit.
3. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's decision notice as it is more concise than that on the application form.
4. As the appeal relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special interest of the Grade II listed house.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a mid-19th century 2-storey terraced house. It is constructed of stock brick with a slate roof. The bow window at ground floor level on the front elevation is not original. The upper windows are square headed with gauged brick sashes and glazing bars. The house does not have its original

front door but it retains a doorcase with paterae in the frieze. Its significance derives from its age, external architectural interest, its use of traditional materials, the sash windows and the doorcase.

7. The first floor of the house had two bedrooms. The appeal is for the reconfiguration of part of the first floor which resulted in the original bedroom doorways being blocked off, the insertion of new doors and the erection of stud walls in order to subdivide the rear bedroom into two rooms.
8. The Council has previously granted Listed Building Consent for internal alterations to the ground floor kitchen and dining area and for a single storey rear extension. Whilst I appreciate that the original and simple first floor plan remained, this layout is extremely common in terraced houses and the Council has not provided details of how that contributed to the significance of the heritage asset. The alterations retain a simple floor plan, albeit different to the original.
9. The Council has commented that no details have been provided to illustrate the impact of the works on features including cornice, skirting, doors and architraves. It is clear from the evidence submitted that the Council did not undertake a site visit before determining the application. However, the appellant states that such features did not exist and the Council has not provided any evidence that they did. I was able to see at my visit that the first floor is plain with no evidence of any such features, even in the parts of the bedrooms and landing which remain unaltered by the subdivision.
10. Policy LP3 of the Richmond Local Plan (2018) seeks to retain and preserve the original structure, layout, architectural features and materials of listed buildings, and to resist the removal or modification of these features that are of architectural importance or that contribute to the significance of the asset. On the evidence before me, I consider that the alterations have not harmed features that contribute to the significance of the asset. Therefore, I conclude that the alterations preserve the building and its special interest. Consequently, I find no direct conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy LP3.

Other Matters

11. The house is within the Kew Foot Road Conservation Area. As the works are internal the character and appearance of the conservation area is preserved.

Conditions

12. The works have been carried out so I have not attached any conditions.

Conclusion

13. I allow the appeal.

Ms S Watson

INSPECTOR