

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2017

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 09 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/17/3176307
19 Rosemont Road, Richmond TW10 6QN

- 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 Nigel Penney against the decision of Richmond upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0059/HOT, dated 5 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is replacement of windows with like for like, replica, replacements.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the St Matthias Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a distinctive, two-storey, semi-detached house dating from the nineteenth century. It forms part of a row of similar pairs of houses which contribute towards this side of this part of Rosemont Road having a strongly designed and regular appearance. In recognition of the property's distinctive appearance, it is designated a Building of Townscape Merit by the Council. Rosemont Road forms part of the St Matthias Conservation Area. The appeal property and the row of semi-detached houses of which it is a part are an attractive feature in the street scene and contribute strongly to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.
 4. The appeal concerns the replacement of the windows in the house with new, painted, timber framed, double-glazed windows. The new windows have side hung casements and stand out in the street scene as being of a very bold and chunky design in contrast to the windows of the adjoining property which are sliding sash windows of a much more delicate design. A noticeable characteristic of the properties on Rosemont Road is that most have sliding sash windows which are in keeping with the age, character and appearance of their host properties. In this respect the new windows of the appeal property do not reflect the character and appearance of the local area.
-

5. However, whilst the appeal property would probably have had sliding sash windows when it was built, the new windows are replacements of timber framed casement windows which pre-dated the designation of the Conservation Area in 1977. The Council confirms that because these casement windows had been in place for a prolonged period of time they would be the basis for a decision on the replacement windows, not the original sash windows.
6. Photos in the appellant's heritage statement show that the two new windows in the front elevation of the property are of different design to the windows they replaced. In particular, they have prominent transoms and mullions which, in combination with the casement frames, result in the window panes being noticeably smaller than the ones they replaced. As a consequence of their design, these two windows stand out particularly prominently in the street scene and are incongruous features which are at odds with prevailing pattern of lightly framed sliding sash windows in the local area. In these respects the replacement windows in the front elevation of the property fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and do not meet the requirements of Policy CP7 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Core Strategy and Policies DM DC1, DM HD 1, DM HD 2 and DM HD 3 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Development Management Plan.
7. The new windows in the side elevation of the property are virtually the same in appearance as those they replaced. Whilst their design does not complement the prevailing pattern of fenestration on Rosemont Road, their very close resemblance to the windows they replaced means that they preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In this respect the side windows would not be reason to dismiss the appeal.

Other Matter

8. The Council refers to policies of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan Publication version for consultation 4 January to 15 February 2017. It is unclear what stage this emerging Local Plan has reached and, therefore, I attach limited weight to it in considering this appeal.

Conclusion

9. Whilst the new side windows are of very similar appearance to the ones they replaced, the front windows are not. The front windows stand out very prominently in the street scene and detract from the character and appearance of the host property and this part of the St Matthias Conservation Area. Therefore, on balance and for the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR