



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/Y/25/3361544

1 Old Palace Terrace, Richmond, Richmond upon Thames TW9 1NB

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A. Batten against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/3209/LBC.
 - The works proposed are Internal Remodelling of a Listed Building - increasing the width of the existing door on the ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to the Grade II* listed building known as '1, Old Palace Terrace, Richmond, TW9 1NB', which is located within the Richmond Green Conservation Area (CA). In reaching my decision, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
3. The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Publication Local Plan (2025) was formally adopted on the 7/10/25. I therefore attribute full weight to Policy LP29 referred to by the Council in the refusal reason.

Main Issue(s)

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, in addition to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Richmond Green CA.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms part of a wider Grade II* listed two storey (with attic and basement) terrace dating from the late 17th/early 18th century, prominently sited facing a small square next to Richmond green. The appeal property, 1 Old Palace Terrace was listed in 1950¹, land like the remainder of the cohesive terrace² is finished in brown brick with red dressings, 3 sash windows wide with a tiled roof and one dormer.

¹ List Entry Number: 1065311

² '2-6 Old Palace Terrace', List Entry Number 1065312

6. The submitted Heritage Statement³ identifies that the building was built by Vertue Radford, and No 1 was first an apothecary and later in 1826 was used as a chemist shop. During the 20th century the building was converted again into a residential house. Internally there is notable surviving timber panelling, plan form and fireplaces.
7. Given the above, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests as a fine illustration of late 17th/early 18th century domestic architecture. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals are its high-quality architectural detailing, consistency, symmetry, surviving historic fabric externally and internally, and group value.
8. The character and appearance and therefore the special interest and significance of the Richmond Green CA are principally derived from the character and high quality of late 17th and early 18th century terraces of townhouses which overlook the Green. The Central Richmond, Richmond Green & Richmond Riverside Conservation Area Study document (2001) identifies that the block of which Old Palace Terrace forms a part is well defined and represents exceptionally high-quality townscape. The appeal property therefore contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
9. The proposal seeks consent for the enlargement of an existing internal opening in the ground floor central wall between the kitchen and front room.
10. The front room in particular contains what the appellant describes as original timber panelling. On this particular wall I observed that the panelling is not as correctly aligned as the other panelling within the room, with unaligned panels of unequal proportions above and below the dado rail. Whilst it may have been altered in the past therefore, it retains architectural and historical merit and contributes positively to the character and historic integrity of the room.
11. The panelling pattern above the existing door is to be retained and replicated above the enlarged opening and the existing architrave is to be retained and extended around the enlarged opening. Nevertheless, a section of the wall and panelling would be removed. Whilst a modest amount, measured by the appellant as 10 percent of the existing wall, this would lead to a loss of historic fabric.
12. The appellant points to a majority of the other properties in the row that have altered the opening between the front and middle rooms, to an extent that is more insensitive and *'which have caused much more loss of original fabric and features than what is proposed in this proposal.'* Whilst numerous examples have been provided, including for other buildings within Richmond, the examples within the terrace at Nos 2, 4 and 6⁴ were granted permission between 1986 and 2002, and limited details are provided of these works including the circumstances and policy context of the planning decision, which prevents direct comparison. Even if these consents were more recent however, this is not a sufficient justification for the weakening of the architectural and historic interest of No 1 Old Palace Terrace.

³ Design and Access and Heritage Statement by John Rich Architects

⁴ Application references 86/0798, 02/1029, 02/3194 and 02/1474.

13. I conclude that the proposed development and works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building '1 Old Palace Terrace' and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
14. The above harm to significance would result in some residual harmful effect to the character and appearance of the CA. It would not therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
15. Given the fairly localised nature of the development and works relative to the building and CA as a whole, I find the harm to both heritage assets to be, individually and cumulatively, at a minor level of 'less than substantial' but nevertheless is of considerable importance and weight.
16. There are aspects of the scheme that would undoubtedly be positive and of public benefit. Unlike the other opening to the front room, the existing opening to the kitchen area is slightly off centre. The enlarged opening would introduce a symmetry to the wall (particularly in combination with the removal of a non-original cabinet) when viewed from both rooms. This would improve the balance and appearance of the room and would sustain and enhance the listed building and preserve the character and appearance of the CA in which it sits. Given its scale, minor weight is given to the heritage benefits of the proposals.
17. The appellant also points to an improvement to light levels reaching the kitchen area, in addition to better functionality and circulation. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock. Again, given the scale of development, these benefits would each be small. Whilst the appellant states that the works are the minimum necessary to secure its long-term future, there is no substantive evidence before me that the works are required to secure the optimum viable use of the listed building.
18. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any harm amounts to less than substantial harm to significance. Overall, the weight I ascribe to the public benefits is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm to significance I have found.
19. Consequently, the harm identified to the significance of the designated heritage assets has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The works and development therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with Policy LP3 of the Richmond Local Plan (2018), and Policy LP29 of the Publication Local Plan (2025), which amongst other matters, requires decision makers to give great weight to the conservation of the heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of the asset.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR