



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3238820

32 Studley Drive, Ilford IG4 5AH

- 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 Mrs Nusrat Ghani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1467/19, dated 02 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is remove existing 6ft timber fence. Erection of 9ft concrete gravel bound fence. (Summary).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development in the application form is: "Due to 3 multiple break in attempts we are proposing to install a new fence on our property boundaries the current fence is 6ft in height in timber and due to the break in attempts we would like to replace this with a 9ft fence to the property boundaries with concrete gravel bound to be put in place rather than standard timber fence panel." However, in the interests of clarity I have adopted the description from the decision notice in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No 32 is a 2 storey end of terrace property on a sharp bend in Studley Drive adjacent to the access to Studley Court, which is a 3 storey flatted development. The street scene is characterised by 2 storey terraces of similar properties set back from the street on regular building lines behind open frontages with low or no boundary treatments. In common with the appeal property, where residential side and rear boundaries are visible, these are formed by close-boarded timber fences, shrubs and hedgerows.
5. The proposal is a boundary treatment approximately 2.7 metres in height and nearly 28 metres in length. It would replace the existing timber fence that separates No 32 from Studley Court.
6. The proposed concrete fence would be out of keeping with the existing boundary treatments in the area. By virtue of its excessive height and

uncharacteristic materials, it would be a discordant and visually obtrusive feature that would not relate well to its surroundings. Although it would be to the side of the property, the fence would be visible in the street scene including on the approach from Eastern Avenue. It would also be conspicuous when viewed from the front of Studley Court and from the rear of Studley Drive and Wanstead lane. The proposal would not be sympathetic to its surroundings and it would not make a positive contribution to the street scene or townscape. Consequently, it would harm the character and appearance of the area.

7. My attention has been drawn to properties elsewhere in the area with concrete fences. In the absence of full details of those schemes, I cannot be certain that they benefit from planning permission or that they are otherwise directly comparable to the appeal scheme. Furthermore, they do not provide a visual context for the appeal proposal. As such, they are not a justification for the proposal, which must in any case be considered on its own merits.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the development plan, including Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 Adopted March 2018. These require, among other things, that development should be of high quality design and appropriate to the local area including in terms of scale and materials, respecting and reinforcing local character and maintaining the appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. There is evidence before me that potential burglars have gained entry to the property via the side boundary fence, which is in a poor state of repair. I appreciate that this has resulted in distress and anxiety and the appellant's desire to secure the property to reduce the risk of burglary and provide peace of mind is therefore understandable. However, notwithstanding the appellant's preference for a concrete fence, I am aware that the Council requested amendments to the scheme following consultation with the Metropolitan Police Service's Designing Out Crime Officer. In this regard, there is little before me to demonstrate that alternative schemes that would deliver substantially the same benefits without the conflict with the development plan have either been explored or would be likely to be unsuccessful.
10. I appreciate that there were no third party objections to the proposal. I also acknowledge the appellant's frustration in relation to the processing of the application. However, these are not matters that weigh in favour of a scheme that would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. I have concluded that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh that conflict. For this reason, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR