



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/D/19/3234141

Homelands, 115 Carfax Avenue, Tongham GU10 1BH

- 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 Shukra Shrestha against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/P/00478, dated 18 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is, "install a metal gate and widen existing cross over".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
4. The applicant for the planning application has indicated that the appeal can proceed under the name of her husband and I have considered the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is situated on a street where the front boundary treatments of nearby properties largely consist of low walls with fairly insubstantial soft landscaping. Many driveways are either completely open, or have low, unobtrusive gates. The proposal would unduly contrast with this context, by adding an overly tall metal gate, the bottom part of which would be perceived

as a solid mass in the street scene, due to the narrow spacing between the bars. The heavy-weight appearance of the proposal would be noticeably at odds with the front boundary treatment of properties in the immediate vicinity.

7. My attention was drawn to the tall gate at 105 Carfax Avenue, but I observed that this example is very much the exception, rather than the rule, on this street. It is acknowledged that the proposal would allow the appeal property to be visible from the road, but this does not overcome the harm caused due to the incongruous nature of the proposal. Whilst the property currently contains a wooden gate, the proposal would be significantly taller and of a materially different design. Although the appellant has indicated that the gate is required for security reasons, this concern has not been substantiated and accordingly this limits the weight that I can give this matter in my consideration of this case.
8. Overall, the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal conflicts with Policy D1 of the Guildford borough Local Plan: strategy and sites (2015 – 2034) (adopted 25 April 2019), which provides that all new developments, amongst other matters are of a high quality design that responds to the local character of the area in which it is set, and the guidance contained within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2018) in respect of the size and style of boundary treatment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR