



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2019 by Ben Phillips Bsc Msc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/19/3234096

52 Cranbrook Drive, Esher, KT10 8DP

- 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 Leon Cosens against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0185, dated 22 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the removal of existing brick fence wall and installation of new boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the removal of existing brick fence wall and installation of new boundary fence at 52 Cranbrook Drive, Esher, KT10 8DP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/0185, dated 22 January 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1847 – 01, – 22A, – 23A, and – 24.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed fence upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The semi-detached appeal property sits on the corner of Cranbrook Drive and Blair Avenue, within a pleasant residential estate characterised by a combination of terraced and semi-detached dwellings of similar design and scale, set back from the highway with off street parking. The set back from the highway, wide pavements and tree planting provide a verdant sense of space.
5. The front boundary treatments in the vicinity of the appeal site are mostly dwarf brick walls with short hedgerows above. However, the corner properties

in the vicinity do have some close boarded fencing along the side boundaries, for example at the junctions of Cranbrook Drive and The Woodlands to the south, and Cranbrook Drive and Grove Way to the north. There are further examples of close boarded fencing of similar height along the side boundary of No 41 Blair Avenue, visible from the appeal site. Close boarded fencing, visible from the road and on corner plots is therefore also a characteristic of the area.

6. The proposed close boarded fence would be sited along a short stretch of the side boundary of the property adjoining the pavement along Blair Avenue. The area of land to the side and front of the host property would not be fenced and would remain largely open, allowing views of the host property and reflecting the open character of the area. Given the amount of fencing proposed along the side boundary, the symmetry of the junction of Cranbrook Drive and Blair Avenue would also be retained.
7. Although the fencing would be visible from both Cranbrook Drive and Blair Avenue, it would not result in a prominent feature in the street scene, being set back from the junction and viewed in the context of other close boarded fences in close proximity in Blair Avenue. It would not appear incongruous in the street scene.
8. In light of the foregoing I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property, or the surrounding area. I find no conflict with Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015) which collectively require development to achieve high quality design and preserve and enhance the character of the area. The proposal would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 127), which, amongst other matters, requires development to be sympathetic to local character, visually attractive and add to the overall quality of an area.

Conditions

9. Apart from the standard time limit condition the Council has suggested a condition that the development is constructed in accordance with the approved plans, in the event that the appeal is allowed. Such a condition is necessary to ensure that the development is constructed as approved.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR