



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/F/24/3342220

18 & 20 Hill Rise, Richmond, TW10 6UA

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Princesgate Estates Ltd against a listed building enforcement notice issued by Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 6 March 2024
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is: without listed building consent the application of a white render to the rear brick garden wall, Installation of four garden lights to the rear brick garden wall, Installation of four black electrical boxes to the rear brick garden wall, Installation of an artificial turf in the rear garden.
 - The requirements of the notice are: (i) remove the render from the Garden Wall and restore the weathered brick of the same colour, pointing and joinery, and with lime mortar, to match that which existed previously; (ii) Remove the Lights from the rear garden wall; (iii) Remove the Boxes from the rear garden wall; (iv) Remove the Artificial Turf from the rear garden.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 2 months.
 - The appeal is made on the ground set out in section 39(1) (c), (e), (h) and (i) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the listed building enforcement notice be varied by the deletion of “2 months” and its substitution with “6 months” as the period for compliance and the deletion of requirement (iv). Subject to this variation, the listed building enforcement notice is upheld and listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Applications for costs

2. An application for a full award of costs is made by the appellant and is dealt with in a separate letter.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council by way of a letter dated 30 April 2024 waived requirement (iv) to remove the artificial turf. I have therefore not considered the artificial turn in this decision and shall delete the requirement from the notice.
4. Although there are appeals on grounds (c) and (i), they are more sensibly dealt with through ground (e). Ground (c) is that the matters alleged have happened but do not contravene the Act. That is they do not alter the listed building in any manner which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest. As will become clear this is not the case. Ground (i) is that the steps required by the notice for the purpose of restoring the character of the

building to its former state would not serve that purpose. The argument here is that once removed the works could be re-instated in a different way that would be more harmful. I am not sure that technically this is a ground (i) argument, but even so it is best dealt with below in ground (e).

The Appeal on Ground (e)

5. 18-20 Hill Rise comprise an attractive 18th century four-storey house with a commercial unit on the ground floor. Being in the centre of Richmond it is unsurprisingly listed, partly for its group value. The listing description concentrates on the front façade but that is not unusual and does not imply the rest of the building has no value. Indeed, a casual visit to the rear garden, currently in use as a sitting out area for the ground floor café, places the garden in its townscape context. This context is very much part of the historic centre of Richmond with the backs of similar attractive and no doubt many listed properties all around it. It was bounded by traditional brick walls, but the tallest side wall has been rendered and painted off-white. This immediately stands out as the other gardens that are visible have brick walls, as does the rear of No18-20.
6. The rendered wall has four garden lights attached to it by wires that run along the top of the wall and drop down to meet the lights. At ground level (at about shin height) there are a number of external electric double-sockets that are similarly fed by wires tucked under the artificial grass and running up the wall to meet the sockets.
7. The rendering is clearly modern, with squared off edges. It is an alien intrusion into a world of brick and wholly inappropriate. Georgian buildings may well often be rendered, but not this one and not in this location. The garden was surrounded by brick walls and that was part of its significance. The garden also forms an important backdrop to the building and to the general character of the area. Thus alterations to the garden walls do affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.
8. I have no particular issue with the design of the lights. I agree with the appellant modern design clearly differentiates them from historic surroundings. A pastiche Georgian style carriage light may well look twee. However, the wiring has been crudely applied without thought as to how it looks, or how it could be achieved more sensitively. It also stands out even more against the rendered wall. The same argument affects the electric sockets, although their sheer number detracts from the quality of the garden and the setting of the listed building, but my main concern is the crude wiring that stands out against the rendered wall.
9. None of these works are major in their own right, but they are all unnecessary and could have been avoided with a little thought and discussion. It may be possible for the appellant to replace the lighting and sockets with some form of temporary, freestanding solution. That as maybe, but the very fact they are freestanding and temporary means they would have a less harmful effect on the listed building. The ambience of the garden might not be as pleasant but that is matter for the appellant to decide. In any event it should be possible, once the render is removed, to devise a lighting and electric socket scheme that satisfies both parties.
10. There is a ground (h) appeal that 6 months is needed to find a contractor to remove the render etc. I agree that render removal is a specialist field and that

extending the time would also provide an opportunity to rethink the lighting proposals as suggested above. I shall thus allow 6 months for the compliance period.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR

