

No. 29 BARNES HIGH STREET  
BARNES

**PLANNING & HERITAGE ASSESSMENT**

28 January 2021

GARETH JONES  
HERITAGE PLANNING

## CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
2	LEGISLATION, POLICY & GUIDANCE	3
3	THE SITE AND ITS HERITAGE CONTEXT	11
4	ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT & CONCLUSIONS	23

# 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Assessment has been prepared by GJHP in support of the planning application for a roof extension at 29 Barnes High Street (the ‘Site’), Barnes, in the London Borough Richmond upon Thames. GJHP is a consultancy that provides expert advice on heritage and townscape matters.
- 1.2 The Site has identified as a Building of Townscape Merit (a non-designated heritage asset) by the Council and lies within the Barnes Green Conservation Area. The assessment considers the effect of the proposed development (the ‘Proposed Development’) on the heritage significance of the Site and the Barnes Green Conservation Area, as well as the townscape of the area around the Site.
- 1.3 The report sets out the following:
- Relevant statutory duties and national and local policy and guidance;
  - A description of the Site and its heritage context;
  - Statements of significance of the relevant heritage assets; and
  - An assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development and conclusions.
- 1.4 Gareth Jones BA Hons MA UD Dip Bldg Con (RICS) IHBC RTPI set up GJHP in 2019. He has over 25 years’ experience across the public and private sectors. He has worked in the conservation and design teams at the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Westminster City Council and the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames and was a design review advisor at CABE. At Peter Stewart Consultancy he worked on a number of high profile projects including the new library at Lambeth Palace, extensions to the Royal Opera House and proposals for Richmond House, Whitehall.

## 2 LEGISLATION, POLICY & GUIDANCE

- 2.1 This section sets out the relevant statutory duties and national and local planning policies and guidance that are relevant to the consideration of heritage and townscapes matters.

### **Statutory Duties**

#### ***The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990***

##### *Listed buildings*

- 2.2 Section 16 (2) places the duty on the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting in determining applications for listed building consent.

##### *Conservation areas*

- 2.3 Section 72 of the Act requires that when considering applications for planning permission for buildings or land in a conservation area, *'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'*.

### **National planning policy**

#### ***The National Planning Policy Framework, 2019***

- 2.4 The Government issued the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in February 2019. The NPPF sets out planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

##### *Heritage*

- 2.5 Section 16 of the NPPF deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It applies to plan-making, decision-taking and the heritage-related consent regimes under the 1990 Act.
- 2.6 Heritage assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as a *'building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes*

*designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).'*

- 2.7 The NPPF notes, at paragraph 184, that heritage assets *'should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.'*
- 2.8 The NPPF requires an applicant to describe the heritage significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, including any contribution made by their setting (para 189). It goes on to say that *'the level of detail should be proportionate to the heritage assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.'*
- 2.9 The NPPF identifies three key factors local authorities should take into account in determining applications:
- 'The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*  
*The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*  
*The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.'*
- 2.10 Paragraph 193 states that in assessing impact, the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be given to its conservation. It notes that heritage significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or from development within its setting.
- 2.11 The setting of a heritage asset is defined in Annex 2 as *'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.'*
- 2.12 The NPPF states, at paragraph 195, that where a proposed development would lead to *'substantial harm'* or total loss of heritage significance of a designated heritage asset, consent should be refused, *'...unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss'*, or all of a number of specified criteria apply, including that the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site.
- 2.13 Where a development proposal will lead to *'less than substantial'* harm to the heritage significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use (paragraph 196).

- 2.14 Paragraph 197 states the effect of an application on the significance of a non designated heritage asset requires a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the heritage significance of the heritage asset.

### ***Planning Practice Guidance***

- 2.15 The PPG includes a section called '*Historic environment*' which was updated on 23 July 2019. It explains which bodies are responsible for the designation of HAs and provides information on heritage consent processes.
- 2.16 The PPG considers the factors that should inform decision taking about developments that would affect HAs. It notes that '*HAs may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a HA, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals...*' (18a-007). It goes on to say '*understanding the significance of a heritage asset and its setting from an early stage in the design process can help to inform the development of proposals which avoid or minimise harm*' (18a-008). It states that in assessing proposal, where harm is found, the extent of harm should be '*clearly articulated*' as either '*substantial*' or '*less than substantial*' (18a-018).
- 2.17 The PPG notes that setting is defined in the NPPF and that '*all heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. The setting of a heritage asset and the asset's curtilage may not have the same extent*' (18a-013). It goes on to say, '*the extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to the visual relationship between the asset and the proposed development and associated visual/physical considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part in the assessment of impacts on setting, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust, smell and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each*' (18a-013).

### **Regional planning policy and guidance**

#### ***The London Plan – Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, 2016***

- 2.18 The London Plan policies most relevant to conservation, townscape and visual assessment are contained in Chapter Seven 'London's Living Places and Spaces'.

- 2.19 Policy 7.8 ‘Heritage Assets and Archaeology’ states that ‘*Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural details.*’

#### ***The London Plan – Publication London Plan (December 2020)***

- 2.20 In December 2020 the Mayor of London formally approved the Publication London Plan which has been sent to the Secretary of State for his consideration.
- 2.21 The policies most relevant to townscape, visual impact and heritage are found in Chapter 3, ‘Design,’ and Chapter 7, ‘Heritage and Culture.’ These chapters contain draft policies that are broadly similar to those in Chapter 7, ‘London’s Living Places and Spaces’, in the current London Plan.

#### **Local policy and guidance**

##### ***The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018)***

- 2.22 The Local Plan was adopted in July 2018. It sets out policies and guidance for the development of the borough over the next 15 years.
- 2.23 **Policy LP 1 ‘Local Character and Design Quality’** requires all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality. Development proposals must demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance, and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces and the local area.
- 2.24 The policy goes on to set out a number of considerations the Council will consider in assessing proposals. Those relevant to this assessment include:
- ‘ 1. compatibility with local character including the relationship to existing townscape, development patterns, views, local grain and frontages as well as scale, height, massing, density, landscaping, proportions, form, materials and detailing;*
  - 2. sustainable design and construction, including adaptability, subject to aesthetic considerations;*
  - 3. layout, siting and access, including making best use of land;*
  - 4. space between buildings, relationship of heights to widths and relationship to the public realm, heritage assets and natural features;*
  - 5. inclusive design, connectivity, permeability (as such gated developments will not be permitted), natural surveillance and orientation; and*
  - 6. suitability and compatibility of uses, taking account of any potential adverse impacts of the co-location of uses through the layout, design and management of the site.’*

- 2.25 All proposals (including extensions, alterations and shopfronts) will be assessed against the advice set out in the relevant Village Planning Guidance and other SPDs relating to character and design.
- 2.26 **Policy LP 2 ‘Building Heights’** requires new buildings, including extensions and redevelopment of existing buildings, to respect and strengthen the setting of the borough’s valued townscapes and landscapes, through appropriate building heights, by the following means:
- ‘1.require buildings to make a positive contribution towards the local character, townscape and skyline, generally reflecting the prevailing building heights within the vicinity; proposals that are taller than the surrounding townscape have to be of high architectural design quality and standards, deliver public realm benefits and have a wholly positive impact on the character and quality of the area;*
- 2. preserve and enhance the borough’s heritage assets, their significance and their setting;*
- 3. respect the local context, and where possible enhance the character of an area, through appropriate:*
- a. scale*
- b. height*
- c. mass*
- d. urban pattern*
- e. development grain*
- f. materials*
- g. streetscape*
- h. roofscape and*
- i. wider townscape and landscape;*
- 4. take account of climatic effects, including over shadowing, diversion of windspeeds, heat island and glare;*
- 5. refrain from using height to express and create local landmarks; and*
- 6. require full planning applications for any building that exceeds the prevailing building height within the wider context and setting.*
- 2.27 **Policy LP 3 ‘Designated Heritage Asset’** requires development to conserve and, where possible, take opportunities to make a positive contribution to, the historic environment of the borough. It sets out means by which the significance (including the settings) of the borough’s designated heritage assets will be conserved and enhanced. Part B of the policy states the Council will resist substantial demolition in conservation areas and any changes that could harm heritage assets.
- 2.28 **Policy LP 4 ‘Non-Designated Heritage Assets’** states ‘The Council will seek to preserve, and where possible enhance, the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets, and that there will be a presumption against the demolition of Buildings of Townscape Merit.



2.29 **Policy LP 5 ‘Views and Vistas’** states the Council will protect the quality of the views, vistas, gaps and the skyline, all of which contribute significantly to the character, distinctiveness and quality of the local and wider area, by the following means:

- 1. protect the quality of the views and vistas as identified on the Policies Map, and demonstrate such through computer-generated imagery (CGI) and visual impact assessments;*
- 2. resist development which interrupts, disrupts or detracts from strategic and local vistas, views, gaps and the skyline;*
- 3. require developments whose visual impacts extend beyond that of the immediate street to demonstrate how views are protected or enhanced;*
- 4. require development to respect the setting of a landmark, taking care not to create intrusive elements in its foreground, middle ground or background;*
- 5. seek improvements to views, vistas, gaps and the skyline, particularly where views or vistas have been obscured;*
- 6. seek improvements to views within Conservation Areas, which:*
  - a. are identified in Conservation Area Statements and Studies and Village Plans;*
  - b. are within, into, and out of Conservation Areas;*
  - c. are affected by development on sites within the setting of, or adjacent to, Conservation Areas and listed buildings.’*

#### ***House Extensions and External Alterations SPD May 2015***

2.30 This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out guidelines with illustrations of how changes such as side and rear extensions, basements, loft conversions and other house alterations and extensions, should be designed. The examples given are only indicative of the Council’s approach and are not intended to stifle sensitive and imaginative design.

#### ***Design Quality SPD February 2006***

2.31 The Guide notes it provides the overall context for design guidance in the borough and applies to the design of all new buildings regardless of use and size. It should be taken into consideration when designing individual buildings, groups of buildings, redevelopment and infill schemes, extensions and even minor building works.

#### ***Barnes Green Conservation Area Study January 2001***

2.32 This document provides a detailed study of the character, appearance and significance of the conservation area. This is referred to where relevant in section 3

below. No reference is made to the Site, nor are any views of the Site identified on the 'proposals map'.

### ***Barnes Green Conservation Area Statement***

- 2.33 The Conservation Area Statement explains why and when a conservation area was designated and includes a short history of the area and a map showing the boundary. This is referred to where relevant in section 3 below.

### **Other guidance**

#### **Historic England Advice Note 1, Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management (Second Edition) (February 2019)**

- 2.34 The purpose of this note is to provide information on conservation area appraisal, designation and management to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment legislation, the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the related guidance given in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The advice in this document emphasises that evidence required to inform decisions affecting a conservation area, including both its designation and management, should be proportionate to the importance of the asset.
- 2.35 At paragraph 4 of the introduction, it states, 'Change is inevitable, and often beneficial, and this advice sets out ways to manage change in a way that conserves and enhances the character and appearance of historic areas', and that 'Conservation areas can contribute to sustainable development in all its three dimensions as outlined in the NPPF.'

#### ***Historic England: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (March 2015)***

- 2.36 The purpose of this note is to provide information to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the related guidance given in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). These include assessing the significance of heritage assets, using appropriate expertise, historic environment records, recording and furthering understanding.
- 2.37 In terms of general advice on decision-taking, it notes at para 4 that, 'The first step for all applicants is to understand the significance of any affected heritage asset and, if

relevant, the contribution of its setting to its significance'. The guidance goes on to suggest a number of common steps in assessing significance.

***The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic England: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) December 2017***

- 2.38 This guidance states that it provides '*information on good practice to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties*' and that '*alternative approaches may be equally acceptable, provided they are demonstrably compliant with legislation, national policies and objectives.*'
- 2.39 At para 9 it states that '*Setting is not a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation, although land comprising a setting may itself be designated .... Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate that significance.*'
- 2.40 At para. 18 the guidance states that the '*Conserving or enhancing heritage assets by taking their settings into account need not prevent change; indeed change may be positive, for instance where the setting has been compromised by poor development.*' It goes on to say that '*many places coincide with the setting of a heritage asset and are subject to some degree of change over time.*'

***Historic England Advice Note 12, Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (2019)***

- 2.41 Historic England issued Advice Note 12, Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets in October 2019. The note covers the NPPF requirement that heritage significance is described in order to help local authorities make decisions on the impact of proposals for change to heritage assets. It states, in paragraph 2 of the introduction, that '*the level of detail in support of applications for planning permission and listed building consent should be no more than is necessary to reach an informed decision, and that activities to conserve the asset(s) need to be proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset(s) affected and the impact on that significance.*' It describes a statement of heritage significance as '*an objective analysis of significance, an opportunity to describe what matters and why.*'
- 2.42 The advice note states that a staged approach to decision making, where the significance is assessed before the design of the proposal commences, is the best approach. It states in paragraph 29, under 'proportionality', that while '*analysis should be as full as necessary to understand significance, the description provided to the LPA need be no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on significance.*'

### 3 THE SITE AND ITS HERITAGE CONTEXT

#### Location

- 3.1 The Site lies on the south side of Barnes High Street in Barnes town centre. Barnes High Street is a short route between The Terrace to the west and Church Road to the east; they all form part of the A3003. To the north-east Church Road joins Castelnau, which heads north to Hammersmith Bridge; The Terrace runs south-west to join Mortlake High Street which continues along the south bank of the River Thames. Barnes Green lies some 230m to the east, with Barnes Common beyond.
- 3.2 Barnes Bridge Railway Station lies some 235m to the south-west, accessed from The Terrace, Barnes Railway Station is some 1km to the south/south-west. Several bus routes run along Barnes High Street.
- 3.3 The Site lies within the Barnes Green Conservation Area. It has been identified by the Council as a building of townscape merit ('BTM') and is, therefore, a non designated heritage asset.

#### The Site

- 3.4 The Site, no. 29 Barnes High Street, is a double fronted two storeys high property set at the back of the footway on Barnes High Street. It has been restored by the current owners who undertook a number of improvements in 2018 including the installation of timber-framed sash windows, and the reinstatement/repair of the chimneys and chimney pots to the gable ends (see below).



The Site: no 29 Barnes High Street (following the significant renovation works by the current owners)

- 3.5 No. 29 has a rendered front, and the western flank has been rendered as part of the recent works (it is brick beneath). The projecting ground floor front addition dates from the later C19 (once a commercial shopfront, then infilled with two tripartite sash windows either side of a central entrance). There are two chamfered bay windows at 1<sup>st</sup>-floor level, with replacement small light sash windows. The whole is topped by a double pitched roof, with eaves to the street and a central gutter, expressed in the flank walls by the double gabled form (that to the east has been screened by a recent 3 storey development at no. 28 Barnes High Street).



View from the west of the Site



View of the east flank wall – the artificial slate roof of no. 28 ‘fills’ the gap of the double pitched roof of no. 29 in this view

- 3.6 The rear elevation was restored following the demolition of a large metal shed extension (see below). It is rendered and of an ordered appearance with timber-framed sliding sash windows to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor and glazed doors and sash windows below. It backs onto a small communal courtyard that provides access to the flats above the M&S development at no. 28.
- 3.7 The building comprises two residential units today and has been in various uses over the years (see below).
- 3.8 Statements of significance of the Site and the Barnes Green Conservation Area are set out below.

### Historic development of the area

- 3.9 The Council Conservation Area Study provides a useful summary of the history of the area, ‘*Barnes Green is an early settlement, possibly of pre-Conquest origins; it appeared as ‘Berne’ in the Domesday Survey of 1086, when it was held by the Canons of St. Paul’s. Fragments of Norman work survive in the Parish Church, which also has a 13th. Century lancet window. A partly triangular Green and pond are common features of rural medieval settlements and some of the long narrow plots in the High Street may also date from this period, but no buildings have survived.*’; going on to say, ‘*The earliest complete buildings date from the 18th century, and there are*

*some good examples; although Milbourne House, 70 High Street and possibly the Sun Inn are 17th century buildings encased or enlarged later, and the Church tower is 16th or 17th century. Extensive infilling, replacement and enlargement of the village took place from the 19th century onwards'. Barnes Bridge was constructed in 1849 and encouraged development locally'*

### Site context

- 3.10 The Site is surrounded today by C20 development. To the south is Sussex Court, a 4 storey high 1950s flat block set back from the street behind an area of communal gardens; a footway runs along the side of the Site to the rear of the development. It replaced a bomb-damaged 3 storey C19 house (with a half-hipped tile hung roof with a dormer in its west flank looking towards the river), that historically screened views of the west flank wall of the Site.



View east along Barnes High Street, Site right of centre (facing)

- 3.11 To the east is no. 28, a recent 3 storeys high mixed-use development from 2017 which includes a retail unit at ground floor level with apartments above. It has a wide shopfront with a long fascia to the street, and above presents two gable ends to the street. The rear, which wraps around the Site, comprises a series of stepped roof forms and has a piecemeal cluttered appearance.



View of rear of the recent development behind the Site – the rear roof of no. 29 can be seen to the far left (facing)

- 3.12 Opposite the Site, on the north side of Barnes High Street (on the site of the former police station), is a late C20 residential led scheme, with some retail units at ground floor level. It has a very long frontage to the street, articulated with various bays, gables and the use of brick and render. It is topped by a roofscape comprising a variety of pitched elements.



View east along Barnes High Street, with the development opposite Site to the right (facing)

- 3.13 The wider townscape is varied in terms of character and quality, with development that is varied in scale, age, style and materials. Many of the buildings along the High

Street are C20 or more recent and the townscape is fragmented in places. It is not a townscape that is sensitive to change nor one that relies on the uniform appearance of buildings for its character. It does, however, have the character of a busy local high street, the varied townscape contributing to the bustle at street level.



View of Site and the varied townscape character of Barnes High Street from the roundabout junction with The Terrace.

### Heritage context

- 3.14 There is one listed building within 100 metres of the Site.
- 3.15 **No. 3, The Terrace**, is listed grade II. This 3 storey, five windows wide house dates from the C18. It is built of brick with a stucco parapet cornice and has a central door with a Tuscan porch surmounted by a canopied trellised porch.
- 3.16 Just beyond the 100m radius, **no.8 The Terrace** is listed grade II. This 3 storey stuccoed house with attic and a slated mansard roof dates from the C18 or early C19.

### Statements of significance

- 3.17 No. 29 Barnes High Street, within the Barnes Green Conservation Area, has been identified by the Council as a BTM. A statement of significance for each of these heritage assets is provided below. The conservation area, a designated heritage asset, is considered first.



- 3.18 The National Planning Policy Framework defines heritage significance at ‘Annex 2: Glossary’ as:

*‘The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.’*

- 3.19 The assessments of significance below are based on an on-site visual inspection and the Council’s SPGs. They are proportionate both to the importance of the asset and to the nature and extent of the application proposals. They are sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposals on heritage interest.

### ***Barnes Green Conservation Area***

- 3.20 The Barnes Green Conservation Area was designated on 14 January 1969 and extended on the 7 September 1982, 14 June 1988, 13 January 2004, and 24 March 2018. It extends along the Surrey bank of the River Thames and includes residential areas surrounding Barnes Green. It adjoins Castelnau Conservation Area to the north, Barnes Common Conservation Area to the south and Mortlake Conservation Area to the west.

- 3.21 The Council’s Conservation Area Study (the ‘Study’) states: *‘Barnes Green Conservation Area derives its identity from four distinct elements; the Thames, the open space of Barnes Green itself, the Edwardian residential areas and the local shopping centres at Barnes High Street and Church Road. The area has no unified character, although the Green acts as a focus for most of the area. The open views of the river frontage are in strong contrast to the tightly built up High Street, as the Green is in contrast to the urban streets leading from it.’*

- 3.22 It goes on to say that. *‘Architecturally Barnes is an area of diversity. The Terrace, to the west, runs parallel to the Thames and has a number of 18th and 19th century buildings of exceptional quality... At the junction with Barnes High Street are two typical Victorian pubs with decorative tiling and etched glass, and next door a red brick late Victorian Police Station. This part of the conservation area is dominated by the listed Barnes Bridge (1849) by Joseph Locke’; and that ‘The northern end of the Green is enclosed by a number of distinctive buildings, for example Milbourne house, St. Osmund’s RC School, and the Sun Inn. Church Street is another important shopping area characterised by a continuous frontage of small shops many of which retain good details such as tiled stall risers, key-pattern pilasters and carved detail. St. Mary’s Church, the Grange, Strawberry House and the Homestead form a listed group.’*

- 3.23 In contrast, the Study states that *'Barnes High Street is relatively undistinguished architecturally, with a mixture of traditional and modern building types; its character stems from the variety of uses and traditional styled shopfronts'*. This is highlighted by the lack of listed building in the area around the Site.
- 3.24 The Study notes in respect of the wider conservation area that, *'Much of the remaining area comprises a mixture of houses of a variety of scales, dating mostly from the 19th and early 20th century, with some modern infill. The Lion Houses are a well known feature of the area, in red brick with elaborate terracotta details, balustrades, glazing and tiling and the lions, small stone statuettes on piers and first floor balconies.'*
- 3.25 The Conservation Area Analysis Map which accompanies the Study does not identify any views of the Site.
- 3.26 The significance of the conservation area is derived from its very varied townscape and the richness of character this provides. The main areas of note are the Green to the east and the River Thames to the west, and this is where the best buildings can be found.

#### ***No. 29 Barnes High Street***

- 3.27 This BTM was designated on the 5th September 1983, along with many other buildings in the Barnes Green Conservation Area.



No. 29 before the current owner's undertook their programme of restoration



This photograph of 2015 shows the attached warehouse to the rear of the property and the former open views of the east flank wall (the loss of which has not harmed the significance of the BTM).



View of rear elevation in 2016, prior to applicants' enhancements.



The East side elevation prior to enhancements

### ***History***

- 3.28 No. 29 can be seen in the 1870 OS map. Built as a house, it is believed to be C19 in date and has been significantly altered since, not least when it was extended with a large commercial shed to the rear in the late C19, and when the current owners restored the property back into residential use in 2018, at which time, it had laid derelict for 10 years and was in need of renovation.
- 3.29 At the time of local listing, the ground floor was in use as a commercial unit/shop and had a large Victorian shopfront. Records show that in 1986 the building was extensively remodelled externally and internally to accommodate industrial and office uses. In 1989 further works involved alterations to the elevations including the removal of the shopfront, when the building was converted into serviced offices. The building subsequently fell into disrepair, until the applicants converted it into two residential properties in 2018.



1870 OS map 1:2500 The blue circle shows the Site (before the ground floor extension to the street)  
 Crown copyright and Landmark Information Group Limited 2021. All rights reserved

- 3.30 The 2018 works involved extensive restoration work and included the removal of concrete render; the reinstatement of a missing chimney; the invisible re-routing of two plastic drainpipes from the flank wall; decorative tile overhangs to ridge tiles; making good of the rear elevation following alterations from the time a large industrial shed was attached, new timber frame sliding sash windows to replace modern uPVC windows of an inappropriate design; and new 1st floor decorative ironwork.
- 3.31 The 1870 OS map shows no. 29 as part of a continuous built frontage to the High Street, and historic postcards from the late C19 illustrate the varied townscape character at this time to which only the street elevation of no. 29 contributed. Taller buildings adjoined each side of no. 29, screening views of its flank walls. When built it was not intended that the west (or east) flanks would be visible. Exposure of the side elevations was a modern condition, the east side now screened by a 3 storey development. Neither of these flank wall's chimneys are original, one having been reconstructed in 2018 to provide uniformity to the building. This is evident in historic photographs, see below.



Late C19 photograph showing no.29 with its Victorian shopfront flanked by taller buildings either side.



Early C20 photograph showing the 3 storey house (with a half hipped roof and a sash window in the gable end) that once stood immediately to the east of no. 29.

**Description**

- 3.32 No. 29 is described above at paras 3.4 to 3.7. It is a pleasant building the front elevation of which positively addresses Barnes High Street. The projecting ground floor replaced a Victorian commercial frontage, and all the fenestration and doors are modern. The most interesting features (though with modern replacement windows) are the 1st floor canted bay windows., is also of note, as are the chimneys (the later reinstated or repaired by the current owners).
- 3.33 The paired gabled flank wall to the west, rendered and repaired by the current owners, is also of some (lesser) interest in the townscape, as it was never intended to be on show. The open space to the west, leftover following the clearing of a

bomb-damaged building is a modern contrivance and no formal relationship exists between it and the '*revealed*' flank of no. 29.

- 3.34 The roof form is a means to provide a top to the deep plan of the property, whilst limiting its overall height. It was not a deliberate aesthetic or design choice for the side elevations – as noted above these were both originally concealed by neighbouring development. The pitched tiled roofs are picturesque and add to the composition of the building as seen today but the primary architectural interest of the property is the street elevation.
- 3.35 This BTM is of significance as a surviving, albeit altered, historic building on the High Street, in an area where the later C20 and more recent schemes have moved away from the finer grain of the earlier buildings. Its setting has been transformed since it was built. It is the picturesque quality of the street elevation that contributes most to the local townscape and is best appreciated when the building is read as part of a continued built edge to the street, as when originally built (and seen today to the east). The views to its western flank – recently rendered to improve its appearance – is a modern contrivance (following bomb damage and the redevelopment of the neighbouring site) with a flat block uncharacteristically set back from the street.
- 3.36 In summary, the building is of some significance for its historic interest, predating its neighbours as found today, and its contribution to the townscape along Barnes High Street. Much of what can be seen today is modern, including the render finish, windows, ground floor street front, side elevation detailing and chimneys. It has undergone successive phases of alteration since built and in the last 35 years alone, has seen significant alterations to the street elevation, the rear, and both flank elevations. Its current appearance and positive contribution to the local area is as a result of the applicants' recent investment and restoration works to bring the building back into residential use.

## 4 ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT & CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 This section assesses the effects of the Proposed Development on heritage significance. It sets out the recent planning history for the Site and goes on to assess the Proposed Development as relevant to the consideration of effects on heritage significance. It then assesses the effect of the Proposed Development on the heritage significance of no. 29, a BTM, and the Barnes Green Conservation Area (statements of significance of both are set out in section 3).
- 4.2 Reference should be made to the DAS, scheme drawings, and planning statement accompanying the application, which set out in detail the Proposed Development.

### Planning history

- 4.3 The LB Richmond refused an application for a roof extension at the Site, ref: 18/1051/FUL on 3 December 2018. The reasons for refusal stated:

*'The proposed roof additions, by reason of its design, bulk, form, fenestration and materials, would represent a discordant, and incongruous form of development that would alter the appearance of the existing roof form to an unacceptable degree and building as a whole and subsequently would harm the character and appearance of the host Building of Townscape Merit, and the wider Barnes Green Conservation Area. The development is thereby contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2018) and policies LP 1, LP 3 and LP 4 of the Local Plan (2018); and the 'House Extensions and External Alterations' (2015) Supplementary Planning Document.'*

- 4.4 The delegated report notes, *'The application site is considered a prominent and attractive asset within the area, and its design respects the form of surrounding development.'* As noted above the Site, which historically had neighbours adjoining it either side, predates its current neighbours all of which are taller and have longer street frontages. The report also notes the Site is visible from a number of public vantage points, but no views of the Site have been identified in any Council document (compared for example to the Council's studies for the Mortlake or Kew Green Conservation Areas where many views are identified).
- 4.5 The Council considered *'the increase in bulk'* to be *'a substantial addition to the roof form'*. The report also referred *'to recent consents that have allowed generous alterations to this BTM'* and that *'the addition of the roof extensions are considered to be, in context with these implemented consents, overdevelopment of the site'*. The applicants have not extended the external envelope of the building, and the consented works relate to the restoration and enhancement of this BTM for which the owners care very much. In fact, in 2012 a large metal-clad shed attached to the rear was removed (with a loss of 353sqm of floor space from the Site).



- 4.6 The Council claimed it would *'result in very visible over-development of the building'*, despite accepting the dormers complied with the Council's own guidelines. This is difficult to understand given there was no increase in the overall height or width of this building, the approved changes were within its general envelope, and there have been no external extensions to the building in recent times.
- 4.7 The Council found that the proposal, *'in addition to the bulk at roof level would unduly detract from visual amenity and the street scene within this highly prominent and sensitive location. The character of the unique roof would be compromised, resulting in the loss of an original and positive feature of this property.'* They concluded *'The resulting effect would appear discordant and compromise the integrity of the BTM'*. This gable (since restored by the current owners) is viewed across a space created in the early post-war years, in the context of a large 4 storey high 1950s flat block, along a street the Council's appraisal describes as *'relatively undistinguished architecturally'*, and as such it is not considered to be a sensitive location within the conservation area.
- 4.8 We do not agree with the Council's assessment of the effects of the refused roof extension nor their view that the infilling of part of this roof form (without increasing the ridge height or extending beyond the existing envelope) constitutes *'very visible over-development'* to this property (which has not been extended).

### **The Proposed Development**

- 4.9 The Proposed Development, a modest infill roof extension, comprises the part infilling of the valley between the double pitch of the existing roof (a double pitch roof form is not unique), with a flat roof that lies below the existing ridge height, with tile-hung roof slopes with modest dormer window to each side, to provide usable space at this level. Each side pitch is set in from the flank wall preserving the roof form as found today in these locations. There will be no alteration to either the west or east flank walls (the latter is not visible today).
- 4.10 The design has been modified to directly address the concerns raised by the Council in respect of refused application ref: 18/1051/FUL.
- There are no balconies
  - 1m of the roof is retained as today at each end of the roof
  - There are no alterations to either flank wall
  - The infill element is no longer fully glazed (it is now clad with salvaged tiles and has a modest dormer with a timber frame sliding sash window, see below)
  - The lead clad flat roof lies below the pitches of the existing roof
- 4.11 The new roof pitches will be hung with tiles from the existing inner pitches of the roof (which will also be used to repair the rear roof slope). The new lead clad

dormers with timber frame sash windows are in keeping with the age and style of the building. It would not be apparent to those who did not already know the building well that this was in fact a later extension.



CGI image illustrating the approach to the proposed extension

- 4.12 Salvaged clay tiles will be used to repair the rear external roof slope, enhancing its appearance. Instead of the 4 dormers previously proposed the scheme now includes 4 conservation style roof light which will remain flush with the roof slope. There are no alterations to the front roof slope.

### Views

- 4.13 The following pages include 3 before and after view images. These have been prepared to illustrate the minimal effect of the Proposed Development in local views. They are not verifiable view images but are accurate and provide a reliable indication of how the Proposed Development will appear. The three images illustrate the views when approaching the Site from the junction with The Terrace to the west. There are no views of the Proposed Development from the north or east, or of the roof extension from the rear (the rooflights will be visible to the rear).

## View 1 The Terrace

### *Existing*



- 4.14 The existing inner roof pitch fills the gap in between the double gables of the flank wall. The new roof at no. 28 Barnes High Street can be seen beyond.

### *Proposed*



- 4.15 The Proposed Development is barely noticeable in this view. The doubled gabled flank wall and chimneys remain the prominent element of no. 29 at roof level.

## View 2 Grove Road - view across the communal garden at Sussex Court

### *Existing*



- 4.16 The artificial slate clad roof of no. 28 Barnes High Street appears in the gap between the two gable ends of the flank wall.

### *Proposed*



- 4.17 The Proposed Development, of an appropriate design in keeping with the character of the host building, will partially screen views of the modern roof of no. 28 beyond. It will positively terminate this view.

### View 3 Barnes High Street

#### *Existing*



- 4.18 The Site can be seen beyond the street clutter to the right (facing). No. 28 Barnes High Street can be seen beyond, including in the gap between the gable ends of the flank wall.

#### *Proposed*



- 4.19 The Proposed Development, of an appropriate design in keeping with the character of the host building, will be visible but not prominent in this view. It will screen views of no. 28 beyond.

## Assessment

- 4.20 The Proposed Development is well considered and modest in nature. The design is wholly in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and will not alter its principal external envelope. It is a sensitive approach to providing additional usable space within the building, as encouraged by national planning policy, without detracting from its appearance or harming its contribution to the significance of the Barnes Green Conservation Area (or having any effect on any neighbouring property). It reflects the owners' careful approach to the restoration and refurbishment of this building which was in a derelict state when they purchased it in 2017.
- 4.21 The extension remains within the overall envelope of the building and maintains the profiles of the flank walls to the east and west, from which it is set back on both sides, as found today (that to the east was enhanced significantly by works undertaken by the current owners). The Proposed Development is of a traditional design, finished in traditional materials, and wholly appropriate as an addition to the host building, the double pitched roof of which is not a unique roof form.
- 4.22 The roof extension remains below the existing ridge height and will not be visible in views from the north of the principal elevation to the street, or from the rear. Nor will it be visible to the east, screened by the 3 storey development at no. 28. There will be views of it from the west, and the very minimal effect on these is illustrated in the CGI views above. The new roof pitch has been set back from the flank walls, retaining parts of the existing roof to either side, clearly illustrating the original roof form. When seen it will be apparent the new roof slope is well set in from the flank wall and it will appear as a recessive, visually subservient and sympathetic addition to the host building. The double gable profile of the flank wall to the west will remain the prominent roof level element in views.
- 4.23 The open space to the west of no. 29, which today allows views of the west flank, was left over following the clearance of bomb-damaged buildings and is a modern contrivance: no formal relationship exists between it and the flank of no. 29. The recent rendering and decoration of the flank wall and the rebuilding of a chimney stack at no. 29 by the applicants enhanced this view.
- 4.24 Other buildings along the high street have windows in flank walls/roofs that face west and the design of the infill extension is in keeping with these. As such it is characteristic of the conservation area, affording views of the river. Historic photographs of Barnes High Street show a similar window to that proposed in the half-hipped roof of the now-demolished building that stood to the east of the Site. Throughout the local area both historic and modern building have been built with, or extended to include accommodation at roof level.



View east along Barnes High Street showing the varied townscape and windows in flank walls and gable of other properties. The Site is just out of shot to the right (facing).

- 4.25 The Proposed Development is consistent with the aims of the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD which seeks to ensure that extensions harmonise with the building, and at roof level, much of which relates to new dormers. The roof's existing form would remain apparent and the extension does not alter the 'external' front and rear roof slopes (there will be four modest conservation style rooflights in the rear roof slope, which will be repaired reusing tiles from the inner valley). The infill would be a sensitive addition to the building and would not lead to any visual intrusion or result in an overbearing impact.
- 4.26 The detailed design, scale and massing of the Proposed Development are sympathetic to the host building and its context. It is neither visually intrusive nor will it result in a discordant or incongruous form of development. There will be no harm to the significance of this BTM or the Barnes Green Conservation Area. The modest proposal retains the profile of the flank walls as found today and a section of the existing roof, maintaining the character of the building. It is the rendered gables of the west flank wall that are the main features that are noticed in the street views, and the infill extension will be barely noticeable, as seen in the views above.
- 4.27 Notwithstanding our assessment that the Proposed Development will cause no harm to either the host buildings or the Barnes Green Conservation Area, should others disagree this could only be said to be very minor, and in the case of the conservation area, at the very low end of '*less than substantial*'. The works already undertaken by the applicants have delivered significant public benefits restoring and enhancing this building, including the west flank wall. These enhancements are considered to outweigh any minimal harm that could be considered to be caused by this modest infill roof extension to the BTM (in line with para 197); or the wider

conservation area (in line with para 196), the very varied character of which the Council acknowledge. This application is coming forward now as the applicant needed to progress with roof repair works (as this was best for the building) and were not able to pursue the roof extension at the time of the refusal of the previous application.

### **Council policy and guidance**

- 4.28 In line with **Policy LP 1 ‘Local Character and Design Quality’** the proposed development is of high architectural and urban design quality, based on a thorough understanding of the Site and its context. It is compatible with local character including the existing townscape, views, local grain and frontages as well as in respect of scale, height, massing, proportions, form, materials and detailing. The modest infill roof extension makes the best use of the Site, and is sensitive to the host building and the local townscape.
- 4.29 In line with **Policy LP 2 ‘Building Heights’** there is no increase in the height of no. 29. The infill roof extension remains below the existing ridgeline and does not alter the front or rear roof pitches.
- 4.30 In line with **Policy LP 3 ‘Designated Heritage Asset’** the Proposed Development, which will have a very minimal visual effect and is of an appropriate design, as set out above, will cause no harm to the significance of the Barnes Green Conservation Area. It is a discreet addition within the existing envelope of the building, which will not be very noticeable where visible in views (as illustrated above), and lies in a part of the conservation area described by the Council as *‘relatively undistinguished architecturally, with a mixture of traditional and modern building types; its character stems from the variety of uses and traditional styled shopfronts.’*
- 4.31 In line with **Policy LP 4 ‘Non Designated Heritage Assets’** no. 29, identified as a BTM by the Council, has been extensively renovated by the applicants. The detailed design of the Proposed Development is wholly in keeping with the host building, and the extension, only visible from the west, does not alter views of the main street elevation, views from the east or views of the rear. If noticed it will appear as an addition that could have happened at any stage in the building’s life and will add to the successive phases of adaption and alterations the building has undergone during its various uses. In determining an application for an extension to a BTM it is only the effect on the external appearance of the building that is the concern of planning policies.
- 4.32 In line with **Policy LP 5 ‘Views and Vistas’** there is no effect on any view identified by the Council. The Proposed Development will have a minimal effect on views from the west along Barnes High Street, the minimal nature of this effect is



illustrated in the CGI views above. In these views, the west flank wall remains unaltered and the new set back roof slope maintains part of the existing roof form.

## Conclusions

- 4.33 The Proposed Development is an intelligent and carefully considered response to the Site, its heritage significance and the significance of its heritage context. The applicants have restored no. 29 sympathetically and to a high standard and the Proposed Development reflects and will accord with these recent improvements and the heritage significance of this BTM. The concerns expressed by the Council in respect of the refused scheme ref: 18/1051/FUL have been addressed in full in the detailed design of the current roof extension application. There were no local objections to the refused application.
- 4.34 In respect of the design considered in its own right, and the relationship between the Proposed Development, the host building and its heritage context, the proposals are entirely sensitive and appropriate. There will be no increase in the ridge height of no. 29, nor any changes to its flank walls. The extension is not visually intrusive, nor does it represent a dramatic change to the building or conservation area.
- 4.35 Special attention has been paid to the effect of the Proposed Development on the significance of the Barnes Green Conservation Area. The Council's own appraisal notes Barnes High Street is '*relatively undistinguished architecturally*' and identifies no views of the Site. There are no harmful effects to any heritage asset on Site or in the surrounding area, and it therefore accords with the objective set out in sections 16(2) and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).
- 4.36 The Proposed Development is in line with relevant legislation, the policies and guidance on heritage set out in the NPPF and PPG; London Plan policies; Local Plan policies LP1 to 5; relevant SPDs; and HE guidance.

Gareth Jones Heritage Planning  
28 January 2021