



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L5810/D/24/3355783

220 Sheen Road, Richmond TW10 5AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sean Alleyne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/1148/HOT.
 - The development proposed is the addition of wooden trellis/screening on top of the existing wall running along the front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development described above and shown on the application drawings has been carried out. This appeal therefore relates to a retrospective planning application.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.
4. The information before me indicates that the Richmond Publication (Regulation 19) Local Plan (2023) (PLP) is at an advanced stage of adoption. I therefore attribute weight to the policies in the PLP referred to by the Council.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached 2 storey house that is set back from the street and has a long street frontage that is dominated by a substantial mature tree. It fronts onto a busy road and forms part of a group of houses of similar age, size and appearance. These properties feature low front boundary walls at the front with mature vegetation behind them. Many properties nearby in Sheen Road also

feature front boundaries that are dominated by vegetation. This gives the street scene a notably verdant character, a matter to which I attach significant weight.

7. The appeal scheme comprises a timber slatted fence which has been erected above the front boundary wall and in front of the tree. This structure rises to above head height and occupies all the frontage apart from the access to the driveway. In this context, characterised by low walls and boundary vegetation, this structure is a wholly incongruous addition that is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. I recognise that the appeal scheme would enhance levels of privacy within the appeal property and may have some security benefits. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that these aims cannot be secured by other means and therefore I attach limited weight to these largely private benefits. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to a site's unique local context, I attribute limited weight to planning permissions granted for replacement front boundary fences in the wider area.
9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that due to its size, materials and appearance, the appeal scheme results in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such it fails to accord with Policy LP1 of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018) and PLP Policy 28 which require all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality and compatible with local character. There is also conflict with the aims of the Richmond and Richmond Hill Village Planning Guidance (2016) and the Council's Residential Development Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2010), the latter of which states that tall solid front boundaries can result in a defensive and hostile street environment, which is generally not a characteristic of the Borough.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR