



**PLANNING REPORT**

Printed for officer  
on 04 June 2024

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE

**Application reference: 24/1721/LBC**  
**SOUTH RICHMOND WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
08.07.2024	16.07.2024	10.09.2024	10.09.2024

**Site:**

7 The Vineyard, Richmond, TW10 6AQ,

**Proposal:**

Demolition of existing single storey rear extensions, internal alterations and new single storey rear extension.

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr Brendan Tracey  
7 The Vineyard  
Richmond  
Richmond Upon Thames  
TW10 6AQ

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Brendan Tracey  
Unit 1  
Times Court  
Retreat Road  
Richmond  
TW9 1AF  
United Kingdom

**DC Site Notice:** printed on 17.07.2024 and posted on 26.07.2024 and due to expire on 16.08.2024

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

21D Urban D

**Expiry Date**

07.08.2024

**Neighbours:**

-

**History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:**

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date:09/10/1997

Application:97/1879

Demolition Of Existing Boundary Wall To No.s 7 & 5 To Re-build Wall Matching Existing Style And Theme.

Development Management

Status: GTD

Date:11/10/2004

Application:04/1965/LBC

Replace existing synthetic slate mono pitch roof to single storey rear extension with natural slate. Brick on edge coping to party wall to

replace existing coping stones.

---

Development Management

Status: INV

Application:24/1720/HOT

Date:

Demolition of existing single storey rear extensions, internal alterations and new single storey rear extension.

---

Development Management

Status: PDE

Application:24/1721/LBC

Date:

Demolition of existing single storey rear extensions, internal alterations and new single storey rear extension.

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 15.08.2014      Installation of 1 Windows (U-Value=1.4)

Reference: 14/VEK00078/VEKA

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 28.12.2017      Install one or more new circuits Install a replacement consumer unit

Reference: 18/ELE00007/ELECSA

---

Building Control

Deposit Date: 19.12.2017      Install a gas-fired boiler

Reference: 18/FEN00138/GASAFE

---

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>24/1721/LBC</b>
<b>Address</b>	7 The Vineyard Richmond TW10 6AQ
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of existing single storey rear extensions, internal alterations and new single storey rear extension.
<b>Contact Officer</b>	Jasmine Loftus
<b>Target Determination Date</b>	10.09.2024

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This application is of a nature where the Council's Constitution delegates the authority to make the decision to Officers rather than it being determined by the Planning Committee.

Before preparing this summary report the planning officer considered any relevant previous planning applications in relation to the development and considered any comments made by those interested in the application such as consultees with specialist knowledge and nearby residents.

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant Local Plan Policies, the planning officer has considered the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, any comments received in connection with the application and any other case specific considerations which are material to the decision.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The subject site is property is part of a group of terraces on 1-7 The Vineyard (Micel's Place) which are Grade II listed. No.7 (the site) forms a bookend of this short terrace group. It is a modest late Georgian terrace; 2 up 2 down with garret behind a simple brick parapet screening a more substantial double-pile and stacked mansard roof it would appear clad in slate. This could suggest an earlier origin, re-faced in up-to-date brick and 'modernised' in the early C19.

It has two unusual extensions to the rear, which appear later, albeit historic: comprising a mono-pitched lean-to understairs WC/storage (with lightwell serving no.5) and a similar single storey outrigger which could have been a workshop or similar, now storage. The interior adds to this complexity. It would appear from the roof that the rear was extended at some point and an odd dog-leg stair, reassembled (poorly) utilising spindles and newels consistent with the suggested early C19 provenance survive, alongside a relative 'mishmash' of paneling in isolated places, some simple fireplaces, grates etc. Otherwise, the historic room plan form and proportions appear to survive.

The Richmond Hill Conservation Area is of exceptional significance. This derives from the rich layering of C18 to C19 architecture in a spectacular Arcadian Thames landscape setting spanning River and Common. The site is in The Vinyard Character Area. As described in the Area Appraisal: a dense early residential suburb on land rising out of Richmond's town centre, an intricate mixing of C18 and C19 detached and terraced dwellings. The Area Appraisal acknowledges it is characterised by variety, traditional proportions, grain and details of 2/3 storey properties around the landmark presence of the Church of St Elizabeth. The site makes a significant contribution to the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area.

The application site is situated within Richmond and Richmond Hill Village and is designated as:

- Archaeological Priority
- Critical Drainage Area
- Main Centre Buffer Zone
- Risk of Flooding from Surface Water 1 in 1000 chance
- Throughflow Catchment Area
- Grade II Listed Site
- Richmond Hill Conservation Area
- South Richmond Ward

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises the following works:

- Demolition of the existing rear extension.
- Erection of a contemporary full-width (5.9m) rear extension with dual-pitched roof. It would be situated at ground floor level, with the apex extending towards the first floor. The structure would have a glazed appearance with floor-to-ceiling fenestration. It would have a height of 3.5m and depth of 12.3m.
- Internal alterations and reconfiguration (see “Design and Impact on Heritage Assets” in Section 6).

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above however the most relevant planning history is as follows:

24/1720/HOT	Demolition of existing single storey rear extensions, internal alterations and new single storey rear extension.	Pending consideration
04/1965/LBC	Replace existing synthetic slate mono pitch roof to single storey rear extension with natural slate. Brick on edge coping to party wall to replace existing coping stones.	Granted on 11/10/2004
97/1879	Demolition Of Existing Boundary Wall to No.s 7 & 5 To Re-build Wall Matching Existing Style and Theme.	Granted on 09/10/1997

#### **4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT**

The list of neighbours notified of this application are listed above.

1 letter in objection was received and the comments can be summarised as follows:

- Grade II listing and Conservation Area demonstrate highly sensitive site in heritage terms
- Existing rear elevation reflect development over time e.g. fenestration pattern, mix of outriggers
- Proposal results in loss of reading of original rear elevation
- Dominates the rear of the house
- Harm to fabric and character of listed building
- Overbearing scale

#### **5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION**

##### **NPPF (2023)**

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

##### **London Plan (2021)**

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D12 Fire Safety
- HC1 Heritage conservation and growth

These policies can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan>

### Richmond Local Plan (2018)

The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated Local Plan policies are:

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1	No
Impact on Designated Heritage Assets	LP3	No

These policies can be found at

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted\\_local\\_plan\\_interim.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf)

### Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version)

The Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) was published on 9 June 2023 for public consultation which ended on 24 July 2023.

The Publication Version Local Plan, together with all the representations received during the representation period, the plan and its supporting documents were submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 19 January 2024. The submission documents do not form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough, however, by publishing and submitting the Borough Local Plan for independent examination the Council has formally confirmed its intention to adopt the Publication Plan.

The Publication Version Local Plan, including its evidence base, are material considerations for decision-making. The weight to be given to each of the emerging policies and allocations will depend on an assessment against the criteria set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF. As the Council considers the emerging Borough Local Plan to be sound and legally compliant, officers and Councillors should accord relevant policies and allocations significant weight in the determination of applications taking account of the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. Therefore, the weight afforded to each policy at this stage will differ depending on the level and type of representation to that policy. This is addressed in more detail in the assessment below where it is relevant to the application.

Note that it was agreed by Full Council on 27 April, when the Publication Plan was approved, that no weight will be given to Policy 4 in relation to the increased carbon offset rate, and therefore the existing rate of £95 will continue to be used; in addition, no weight will be given to Policy 39 in relation to the 20% biodiversity net gain requirement; all other aspects and requirements of these policies will apply.

Issue	Publication Local Plan Policy	Compliance
Local character and design quality	28	No
Designated heritage assets	29	No

### Supplementary Planning Documents

House Extension and External Alterations  
Village Plan – Richmond and Richmond Hill

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning\\_policy/local\\_plan/supplementary\\_planning\\_documents\\_and\\_guidance](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance)

### Other Local Strategies or Publications

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are:  
Richmond Hill Conservation Area Statement

### **Determining applications in a Conservation Area**

In considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to that duty, decisions of the court have confirmed that for development proposed to be carried out in a conservation area, a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

In applications where the decision-maker is satisfied that there will be no harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area, the statutory presumption against granting planning permission described above falls away. In such cases the development should be permitted or refused in accordance with the policies of the development plan and other material considerations.

### **Determining applications affecting a Listed Building**

Sections 16(1) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that, when considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, or whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In this context, "preserving", means doing no harm.

To give effect to this duty decisions of the court have confirmed that a decision-maker should accord "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting when weighing this factor in the balance with other material considerations which have not been given this special statutory status. However, this does not mean that the weight that the decision-maker must give to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting is uniform. It will depend on, among other things, the extent of the assessed harm and the heritage value of the asset in question. This creates a strong presumption against granting planning permission where harm to a listed building or its setting is identified. The presumption can be rebutted by material considerations powerful enough to do so.

## **6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

The key issues for consideration are:

- Design and impact on heritage assets
- Fire Safety

### **Design and impact on heritage assets**

*Policy LP1 of the Local Plan 2018 seeks to maintain and, where possible, enhance the high architectural and urban design quality which contributes to the character and heritage of the area. Proposals should demonstrate an understanding of the site and its context when considering the design including layout, siting and access and the compatibility of the works to the neighbouring uses.*

*The Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. It should harmonise with the original appearance, either by integrating with the house or being made to appear as an obvious addition.*

### *Background*

1-7 The Vineyard (Micel's Place) are listed at Grade II as a group. No.7 (the site) forms a bookend of this short terrace group. It is a modest late Georgian terrace; 2 up 2 down with garret behind a simple brick parapet screening a more substantial double-pile and stacked mansard roof it would appear clad in slate. This could suggest an earlier origin, re-faced in up-to-date brick and 'modernised' in the earlier C19. It has two unusual extensions to the rear, which appear later, albeit historic: comprising a mono-pitched lean-to understairs WC/storage (with lightwell serving no.5) and a similar single storey outrigger which could have been a workshop or similar, now storage. The interior adds to this complexity. It would appear from the roof that the rear was extended at some point and an odd dog-leg stair, reassembled (poorly) utilising spindles and newels consistent with the suggested early C19 provenance survive, alongside a relative 'mishmash' of panelling in isolated places, some simple fireplaces, grates etc. Otherwise, the historic room plan form and proportions appear to survive.

The primary significance of 7 The Vineyard is intrinsic, deriving from its surviving fabric and plan form, as a modest (potentially refashioned) early C19 lower order Georgian terrace house, and any surviving earlier fabric. To a lesser but significant extent elements of setting contribute to significance, in particular as part of a terrace group and its wider setting in a palpable and coherent historic residential enclave. Prospectively elevating its significance, is the substantial external alterations which appear to have taken place in the remainder of the terrace, meaning the host is a rare survivor of some integrity.

The Richmond Hill Conservation Area is of exceptional significance. This derives from the rich layering of C18/19 architecture in a spectacular Arcadian Thames landscape setting spanning River and Common. The site is in Character Area 5 ('The Vineyard') in the Area Appraisal: a dense early residential suburb on land rising out of Richmond's town centre, an intricate mixing of C18 and C19 detached and terraced dwellings. The Area Appraisal acknowledges it is characterised by variety, traditional proportions, grain and details of 2/3 storey properties around the landmark presence of the Church of St Elizabeth. The site makes a significant contribution to the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area.

### *Significance of the Existing Heritage Assets*

In order to assess the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, the significance of the asset in its existing form should be understood. The Planning, Heritage and Design & Access Statement has limited details in terms of historical research. The NPPF, para 200, requires an Applicant to provide sufficient information on which to assess the significance of a heritage asset.

In this instance, there is some ambiguity around the condition prior to the first edition OS, at which point it is clear that the x2 rear extensions (in some form) existed. The fabric, fenestration and walls, would support an early C19 date, perhaps consistent with a substantial re-modelling of an earlier property. This could have provided a scullery and/or storage and WC. It is also understood at some point the land was in the ownership of the adjacent Almshouses (separately listed) and could have some form of historical relationship with them, for example as a workshop which is consistent with the present character.

It is considered insufficient research has been undertaken to understand in full the potential significance of the rear condition and so there is a lack of information to demonstrate that the significant interventions proposed would not be harmful to the significance overall. It is recommended that the applicant undertake further documentary and on-site research of their use and fabric and revert.

### *Rear Extension:*

The proposed rear extension would demolish the existing rear lean-to extensions and it is proposed to replace these with a large contemporary rear extension of metal and glass with a 'folded' roof.

This extension would be more than double the original depth of the modest historic house. The floor to ceiling heights would also be higher than the principal historic spaces at ground (and first) floor level as shown in the proposed section. The proposed floor plan would be a large open plan space contrary to the historic cellular character. The proposal would result in the substantive loss of historic (prospectively earlier C19) fabric, dating from the substantive remodelling/refashioning of the property as part of a terrace group.

The scale and detail of the proposal would fail to be subservient to the modest historic host, detracting from its plan form and character. This is not supported and would harm the significance of listed host.

On site the large rear extension at No.9 was raised. The site-specific circumstances of this particular case are unclear and they would appear from a glance at the planning history, potentially bespoke. As such, this does not provide justification for the acceptability of the proposal to No.7 set forward in this application.

#### *Internal Alterations*

The wall between the front parlour (and potentially original principal room) and what was likely (given the range) the original/historic kitchen, is original. The proposal to connect these once discreet historic rooms would result in the loss of historic fabric and would diminish the historic plan form and hierarchy of this modest house.

The removal of the timber casements, timber lintel and door(/architrave) and part of the rear wall between the potential former kitchen and associated rear outrigger would result in the loss of historic fabric and is not supported.

At first floor level, the plan form appears original (or as historically remodelled) and the room proportions are attractive and composed. The proposed subdivision to create a dressing room/linen store, and a bathroom with its associated trappings/sanitaryware, would be harmful to those proportions, hierarchy and the detail of the space (including fireplace + surround and potentially the original window. It is noted these works are not included in Schedule of Works.

At second floor level, the current plan form would appear original, even if the historic panelling between the rooms would appear re-used and re-assembled. The wall fabric, skirts and simple panelled doors and ironmongery, in part, would appear historic and commensurate with the garret floor where fireplaces survive too (even if some are blocked). The proposed works to the landing and doors result in the loss of historic fabric and plan form, causing harm.

The same applies to the rear hall door, which should be retained and restored, even in the case of a potential extension.

Reference is made to floor joints insulation. This is supported in principle. Had the application been considered acceptable in all other regards, a condition could have been applied to seek further details of these works.

It is unclear whether in removing the later C20 understairs WC any works would be required to the historic stairs, including propping.

Overall, the proposals would result in harm to the significance of 7 The Vineyard, the result of the rear extension and internal alterations, which would harm the fabric, plan form and hierarchy of this modest house.

#### *Other Heritage Assets*

The harm is mainly internal and the rear extensions discreet from public view to the rear. Thus, commensurately, the harm passing to the Conservation Area would be limited.

It is not considered the proposals, including the new party wall condition, would detract from the significance of 9 The Vineyard which is Grade II\* Listed. Its special interest / significance would be preserved.

It was drawn to our attention that the site until recently was in the ownership of the adjacent Almshouses (Grade II). The land is physically connected and share a common boundary wall. Depending on that historic relationship the site could make a contribution to the setting and thus significance of the Almshouses. This remains unexplored and further detailed understanding is required in order to understand the potential impact.

#### *Conclusion*

Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states that: 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on



the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal'. In this instance, the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the listed building and there is no public benefit arising from the proposal as such it is contrary to the NPPF.

The application, by reason of its lack of information regarding the significance of the existing heritage asset and the proposed internal works and extension would result in harm to the historic fabric, plan form and hierarchy of the host Grade II Listed Building. These works would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and there are no public benefits to outweigh this harm. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018), in particular policy LP1, LP3, Publication Local Plan policies 28 and 29, the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD and the NPPF.

### **Fire Safety**

*Policy D12 of the Local Plan states that all new development must achieve the highest standards for fire safety.*

The applicant has provided a Fire Safety Statement to comply with this requirement. The information within satisfies the intent of Policy D12.

The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. This permission is NOT a consent under the Building Regulations for which a separate application should be made.

## **7. RECOMMENDATION**

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process. In making this recommendation consideration has been had to the statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the requirements set out in Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the adverse impacts of allowing this planning application would significantly outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in NPPF (2021) and Development Plan, when taken as a whole.

### **Refuse for the following reasons**

The application, by reason of its lack of information regarding the significance of the existing heritage asset and the proposed internal works and extension would result in harm to the historic fabric, plan form and hierarchy of the host Grade II Listed Building. These works would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and there are no public benefits to outweigh this harm. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to the Richmond Local Plan (2018), in particular policy LP1, LP3, Publication Local Plan policies 28 and 29, the House Extensions and External Alterations SPD and the NPPF.

### **Recommendation:**

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers.

**I therefore recommend the following:**

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

This application is CIL liable  YES  NO  
This application requires a Legal Agreement  YES  NO  
This application has representations on file  YES  NO

Case Officer (Initials): **JLO** Dated: 28/08/2024

**I agree the recommendation:**

SG  
Senior Planner

Dated: .....02/09/2024.....

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Head of Development Management has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Head of Development Management: .....

Dated: .....