
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/16/3161331

Woodridge, 40 College Road, Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire EN11 0DJ

- 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 Giuseppe Mantio against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07/16/0871/HF was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a front boundary wall and gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on an unmade road where existing mature vegetation and front gardens create an informal and verdant character and appearance to the frontages in this residential area. Front boundaries are characteristically comprised of soft landscaping. Where there are walls and fences, they are primarily low and retain the open verdant character of the streetscene.
 4. The development has been substantially completed. It comprises a curved metal railing gate reaching some 2.5 metres in height. The wall comprises metal railings above a 1 metre high rendered brick wall with capped brick piers.
 5. From my observations, the development has introduced a feature into the streetscene that has a strong harsh appearance. Due to the height and materials used, I consider that it appears as an incongruous and dominant addition to the streetscene, not in keeping with the informal verdant character and appearance of this area.
 6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development has an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 7. In reaching my decision, I have had regard to all matters raised, including the fall-back position of erecting a front boundary wall under Permitted
-

Development Rights. The representations refer to covenants for boundaries. I have not been provided with details of any covenants and these are not planning matters. Therefore, I have assumed that subject to release from any possible relevant covenants, there is a realistic assumption that such a fall-back would be implemented at the appeal site and similar developments could occur at neighbouring properties. This is a material consideration.

8. Due to the limited height of development allowed under Permitted Development Rights, I do not consider that the erection of new front boundary walls or fences at the appeal property and neighbouring properties would have such a material adverse effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene as the development at the appeal site. Therefore, I have attributed limited weight to this matter in my determination of this appeal.
9. I note that the appellant has sought to create a safe and secure family environment. I consider such a matter to be a material consideration. Nevertheless, this is not the only way to achieve such an objective. Thus, I have attributed limited weight to this matter in my determination of this appeal.
10. For the above reasons, the development is contrary to saved Policies H6, HD13, HD14 and HD16 in the Borough of Broxbourne Local Plan Second Review 2001-2011 (2005) where they seek to ensure that new development reflects and relates to local characteristics and the context of the surrounding area.
11. I consider that the saved policies referred to above are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR