



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31ST July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3344802

180 Sheen Road, Richmond Upon Thames TW9 1XD

- 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 Rahul Puri against the decision of Richmond Upon Thames London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 24/0577/HOT.
 - The development proposed is to demolish the existing front garden wall and railings, and replace with a new brick wall with timber and metal gates with intercom and post-box.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Sheen Road is part of the A305 which is a main route through the area. It is a wide road with properties to each side set back. No.180 is part of a group of five properties to the northern side of the road located between a petrol station and Manor Road.
4. Currently, along the frontage the appeal property has a dwarf wall with higher piers. The proposal would replicate, in a handed form, the existing boundary treatment to the neighbouring property, No.182. This is formed of solid vehicular and pedestrian gates with a bricked section between at a height of approximately 2m with additional height to the piers. The Council advises that this boundary treatment to No.182 does not benefit from planning permission and there is no information before me on its background or how long it has been present.
5. The Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance (2016) identifies the character of Sheen Road (part of character area 8) as *a busy traffic route but is wide and noticeably green due to the mature trees surviving in the front gardens of large houses*. An identified development threat to the character area is the replacement of front garden boundary walls with other designs or materials that reduce the ordered uniformity of the streets, and it also highlights an opportunity to upgrade the public realm.

6. Within the vicinity of the appeal site front boundary treatments vary. However, excluding No.182 the front boundaries to the other properties in the group are formed of low walls. This form, together with planting generally provides the arrangement for residential properties nearby. There are some exceptions with higher boundaries although these serve specific buildings. There is a continuous length of high walling to the other side of the road which relates to the primary school and the walls to Nos.188 to 196 and Nos.149 to 161 relate to rows of larger detached villas. The latter is also visually separated from the appeal site sited some distance to the west.
7. The height and length of the proposed front boundary would create a sense of enclosure which is not characteristic of the boundary treatments in the locality of a lower level with a softer and more open appearance. I acknowledge the privacy and security benefits of the proposed arrangements, but the boundary also has a relationship with the public realm. Sited on the back edge of the footpath, the boundary treatment would create a hard and imposing edge. Such a barrier would diminish the visibility of the buildings and front gardens which contributes to the street scene.
8. Overall, I find the height and solid form of the proposed boundary treatment would be an unsympathetic and dominating feature. It would be out of keeping with the prevailing form and adversely impact the appearance of this part of Sheen Road.
9. The development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018) which seeks high-quality design and amongst other things compatibility with local character including the relationship to existing townscape, development patterns, views, local grain and frontages. There would also be conflict with Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance which promotes the retention and unity of the front garden walls.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

