



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 June 2022

by Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/L5810/Y/21/3285890

44 Christchurch Road, London SW14 7AF

- 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 Mrs Jane Lawrence against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/3094/LBC, dated 29 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2021.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear and side extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L5810/Y/21/3279767

44 Christchurch Road, London SW14 7AF

- 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 Mrs Jane Lawrence against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/1446/LBC, dated 9 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2021.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension and terrace.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. There are two appeals against refusal to grant listed building consent at this site. The scheme in relation to Appeal A proposes a single storey rear extension, whereas the proposal with regard to Appeal B seeks a larger rear extension and scale of works, with a first-floor terrace above. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

3. The dwelling 44 Christchurch Road is at the northeast end of a row of houses which comprise the Grade II listed building 44-48 Christ Church Road SW14. The listed building also falls within the Christ Church Road No 13 Conservation Area (the CA). Against this background, the main issue to be considered is the effect of the proposals on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and, linked to that, whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Reasons

4. The significance of the listed building derives from its somewhat understated but nonetheless fine architectural detailing and also its modest, linear plan

form, which together with the adjacent public house, embody a historic core of the settlement at East Sheen. These attributes also allow the listed building to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

5. No 44's role in the listed building has already been undermined to a degree by extensions, notably to its side, joining the listed building to the adjacent public house, and a larger 20th century rear extension over two floors. A row of stores and a W.C. have also been added behind the dwelling, but as small and clearly subservient outbuildings they do not add notably to the scale of redevelopment.
6. The proposals, however, constitute extensive enlargements which, cumulatively with works that have already taken place, would render No 44 considerably transformed from its humble and historic plan form. This is particularly the case for Appeal B, as the extension would subsume the back of the dwelling and extend beyond its original flank. It would also result in harmful fabric loss, with a swathe of side wall and, at the rear, a segmental headed and likely original opening, currently with a fine Victorian tripartite sash, making way.
7. Moreover, whilst I note the intention to provide a low profile and contrasting design response, the works would present as somewhat basic and unrefined, without the subtle elegance of the detailing present within the historic parts of the dwelling. Appeal B would introduce a first-floor terrace, incongruous to the house's genteel demeanour. As such, the works, whilst tucked away to the rear, would harm the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CA. Given the relatively limited scope of the works, I would quantify the harm to both designated heritage assets as less than substantial.
8. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) explains that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Paragraph 202 goes on to require decision makers to weigh any less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset against the public benefits of the scheme, including securing its optimum viable use. That balancing exercise must take place in the context of s.16(2) and s.72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which set a strong presumption against a grant of listed building consent for works that would cause harm to the special interest of a listed building and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area.
9. The proposals would address the personal circumstances of the appellant by providing accessible ground floor living accommodation. This is also a public benefit insofar as it would contribute towards the creation of places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. However, the weight I attach to this benefit falls short of justifying the harms that would be caused; harms that must be given considerable importance and weight in the balance.
10. That conclusion also draws the proposals into conflict with Policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan (adopted 2018), which respectively seek to promote high quality design and protect designated heritage assets.
11. For these given reasons, and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Matthew Jones
INSPECTOR