



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2020

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/19/3243213

12A Edulf Road, Borehamwood WD6 5AD

- 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 Valery Moiseev against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1100/HSE, dated 14 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a brick double skin front garden wall ~ 1.5 metres high with manual gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Many of the properties in the vicinity of the appeal site have open frontages. Those that are enclosed are done so mostly by hedges or low walls, some of which host taller posts and/or railings. In the main driveways are ungated. Although there is variation in the design of the frontages, there is a general openness to the frontages along this part of Edulf Road and this significantly contributes to the character of the area.
5. The proposed wall, along with its posts and gates, would be taller than any of the walled frontages along this stretch of Edulf Road. It, therefore, would appear out of keeping within this street context. Furthermore, having a longer frontage than those in the locality which would enclose most of the property's frontage, this would add to its visual prominence and conspicuous appearance. The proposal would be visually harmful in the context of this streetscene even if constructed of matching brickwork to that of the recently constructed host dwelling.

6. I have been provided with pictures of other existing front boundaries at Edulf Road, as well as other examples within the wider area. In respect of those examples at Edulf Road the brickwork of those frontages is of lower height to that of the proposed front boundary and they have much shorter boundary lengths. I do not consider that those existing lower frontage boundaries of lesser length would justify a taller longer boundary frontage close by or the visual harm arising from that development. The other examples referred to at Palmers Road, Delamere Road and Cowley Hill relate to different streets where there is a different context to the streetscene. I consider this proposal can and should be considered within its own particular street context.
7. I acknowledge that the proposal would be acceptable with regard to highway safety and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and that the site is not located within any specifically designated area, nor is it or neighbouring properties listed. In addition, the proposal would be acceptable in respect of its public/private realm, perception of crime and would not reduce natural surveillance. However, these matters, including any security benefits for the site, do not overcome my visual concerns relating to the proposal or justify the proposed development. The wall cannot be erected under the limits of permitted development, therefore, it can and should be considered on its own merits.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policies SP1 and CS22 of the Hertsmere Local Plan Core Strategy 2013, Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and the Hertsmere Local Development Framework Planning and Design Guide Part D and E. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other matters, development to make a positive contribution to the built environment.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies
INSPECTOR