
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

by Rachel Walmsley BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/16/3157750

39 and 41 Washington Road, Barnes, London SW13 9BQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Verma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/1957/HOT, dated 18 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is to remove shared archway to entrance of number 39 & 41 and relocate doors to front of properties.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The planning application and appeal form refer to the appeal site as No 39 Washington Road. However, the development proposed relates to No 39 and No 41 Washington Road. I have therefore adopted the address on the Council's decision notice which more accurately describes the site.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host properties and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No 39 and No 41 Washington Road are within a row of terraced houses which front the road. A defining feature of both No 39 and No 41 is a brick archway which serves as a porch to both houses. The brick archway is also a feature of properties within the local area although the contribution these archways make to the character and appearance of the area has been reduced as archways have been removed and front doors altered to lie flush with the front elevation of the houses. These changes are apparent within the row of terraced houses within which No 39 and No 41 sit.
 5. Retaining the brickwork above the front doors to No 39 and No 41 would fall between two stalls; it would not form part of a brick archway, nor would it complement the rendering on adjoining properties or on other houses within the street. Consequently the brickwork would appear incongruous and alien to
-

the character and appearance of the host dwellings and to the character and appearance of the area overall.

6. As part of the proposal the archway would be removed and the front doors would be installed to be flush with the front wall of the houses. This would not be out of keeping with the position of the other front doors within the terraced row of houses and evident within the wider area. Nevertheless, I have found that the brickwork proposed would appear as an alien feature on the existing houses and within the street.
7. Retaining the brickwork would at first appear to comply with Policy CP7 of the Core Strategy¹ and the SPD² which seek development that recognises distinctive local character and retains any decorative and ornamental architectural details which give a house a distinct character. However, the architectural detail which gives the houses their distinct character is the archway which would be removed as part of the proposed development. For this reason, therefore, the development would be contrary to policy CP7 and the SPD, as well as Policy DM DC1 of the Development Management Plan³ which seeks development that is compatible with local character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and therefore the appeal is dismissed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames, Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Adopted April 2009

² London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames, Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document, House Extensions and External Alterations (May 2015)

³ London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames, Local Development Framework, Development Management Plan, Adopted November 2011