
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/W/20/3248045
8 Uxbridge Road, Hampton TW12 3AB

- 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 Jamal Payedd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/3426/HOT, dated 8 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2020.
 - The development is new front sliding gate and wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Although different to that given on the decision notice, I have taken the description of development from the application form as no confirmation that a change was agreed has been provided.
3. On the application form the appellant confirms that at the time of submitting the application the development had been completed. At my site visit I saw a wall and gates in place that match those shown on the submitted plans and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues of the appeal are the effect of the development on;
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - Highway safety, with particular regard to the adequacy of sightlines.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is within a short row of properties that have no uniform appearance. Similarly, there is a mix of frontage boundary treatments. However, the open frontages, low level walls/fences or landscape features give a soft and open appearance to this part of the streetscene.
6. The height of the wall and railings in the appeal scheme is discordant with this. While the set back from the edge of the site boundary is not obvious, the height of the features creates a much harder and more enclosed frontage. The scale of the wall and railings, as well as the uncharacteristic fair colour of the

brick, results in the development drawing the eye. The development is prominent in views coming over the bridge and approaching the site from the other side.

7. Further along Uxbridge Road there are several examples of high front walls and gates on to the pavement. Nevertheless, these properties are located over the bridge some distance from the appeal site. Moreover, they are not in the same Character Area as delineated in the Hampton Hill Village Planning Guidance. They are not seen with the appeal development and, unlike at the appeal site, are located on a stretch of Uxbridge Road where high walls and gates are typical.
8. Consequently, the appeal development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the area. It fails to accord with Policy LP 1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (Local Plan) where it requires developments to contribute to and enhance the local environment and character. It would also be contrary to the Hampton Hill Village Planning Guidance where it seeks to promote high standards of design.

Highways Safety

9. The Front Garden and Other Off Street Parking Standards SPD (SPD) states that as a minimum pedestrian sightlines of 2.1m x 2.4m will be required at a property boundary with a public highway. The proposal would not comply this. It also states that boundary treatments should not exceed 0.6m, although railings above may be acceptable to enable safe entry and exit.
10. The pavement width varies near the appeal site with it being relatively wide at the site itself. Nonetheless, the height of the wall and pillars would obstruct the vision of drivers leaving the site, those along the road, and pedestrians walking towards it. Furthermore, while the vehicular and pedestrian gates and railings allow views into the site from the front, more angled views on the approach to the site limit the ability to see through them and further obstructs views.
11. To the other side, although the partly open boundary fence allows views into the site, there is a pillar and telegraph pole to the front. While these may not be within the appellant's control, they nonetheless obstruct visibility.
12. Details of the visibility splay dimensions of the other access points along this section of Uxbridge Road have not been provided. In addition, I do not know the circumstances that led to those accesses being permitted. In any event, the attached property has an open frontage while the property to the other side of the appeal site has a wall lower than that subject to this appeal with no railings.
13. Therefore, the appeal scheme adversely affects highway safety with regard to sightlines. The proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework where it states development should be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. It would also be contrary to the SPD where it requires the provision of appropriate sightlines.
14. Policy LP45 of the Local Plan is included in the refusal reasons. However, the scheme before me is not for the provision of front garden car parking. Therefore, from the information before me, the policy is not relevant in this instance.

Conclusion

15. Therefore, for the reasons above, and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR