



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/19/3243952

4 Lawrence Close, Guildford GU4 7RD

- 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 Jack Lampard against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/P/01323, dated 24 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new garden brick wall to match the existing housing estate wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It was apparent from my site visit that the wall has been partially constructed. However, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a visually prominent location within a modern residential estate. It comprises No 4 and its front garden, together with one half of a detached double garage positioned a short distance away to the south of this property. Areas of open green space are found throughout the estate. These soften the presence of built form and appear to be an important part of the original landscaping of the estate as a whole. One such area is to the front and side of No 4's garage. This softens the entrance to Lawrence Close and contributes positively to the spacious feel of this part of the streetscene.
5. This proposal seeks permission to construct a wall next to the garage. This would vary in height from just under 1m to approximately 1.75m. The wall would enclose a significant proportion of the open space to the front and side of the garage. In addition, it would abut the back edge of the footway, leaving little space for planting in front of it. Consequently, not only would a wall of this height and length create an unduly harsh entrance to Lawrence Close, but it would also erode the spacious character of the streetscene. The red and dark coloured brickwork to be used for the proposed wall can indeed be seen in

other parts of the estate. However, in my view such materials would contrast unfavourably with the lighter brickwork used for the garage and the adjacent walled boundary treatment. This would reinforce the scheme's harmful impact.

6. From the evidence, the proposed wall would follow the boundary line of land within the ownership of the appellant. However, unlike other walls of this height in the estate that tend to enclose private gardens, it would enclose an area which appears to have been designed to be read as part of the soft landscaping for the estate. Overall, I find that it would fail to respect the existing landscaping and would not integrate effectively with the character of this part of the estate.
7. I note that gates have not been proposed. However, the absence of such features would not diminish the harm identified. Furthermore, the use of the land to be enclosed by this wall is not relevant to my assessment of the effect of the development on the character of the area.
8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with saved Policies G1 and G2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan and Policy BFD1 of the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that proposals safeguard and enhance the character and quality of areas and protect open spaces that contribute to their character. The scheme would also conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as they seek to ensure that developments add to the quality of areas.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the advice of the Framework, which outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR