



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/20/3253868

17 Prowse Avenue, Bushey Heath, WD23 1JS

- 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 and Mrs Patel against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0195/HSE, dated 11 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is upgrading the front boundary wall and the addition of gates to the existing vehicular entrances.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached house which is located within a residential area of other mainly detached houses. Many of the houses have differing designs but are mostly set within generous plots. The frontages of the houses are mainly made up of a combination of landscaping and areas used for car parking.
4. The front boundaries within the area are marked by a variety of features including low walls, hedges and wooden fencing and the great majority of the vehicle entrance points are open, with no gates. These features combine to give an informal appearance to the street frontages which appear more open in nature.
5. The proposal would result in a combination of brick walls, metal railings and metal gates enclosing the frontage. The brick piers are indicated as being 2m in height and the railings and gates would be virtually the same height. Within the context that I have described, I consider that the proposal would appear high and dominating and would lack the informality and openness that characterises the area. I find that it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appellants indicate that the individual designs of the properties here mean that the proposal could be accommodated within the area. However, although the houses vary, there is a character to the frontages, as described, that the proposal would be at odds with. In relation to the appellants' comments in relation to crime, I have no evidence that there is a particular issue within this area or in relation to this property and in these circumstances I consider that the harm that I have identified is not outweighed by this matter.
7. I have taken account of all other matters raised by the appellants but find that nothing is sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies SP1 and CS22 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policy SADM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (contrary to the appellants' assertion, I can find nothing which indicates that this latter policy applies only to Heritage Assets). The proposal is also contrary to the guidance within the Council's Planning and Design Guide.
8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

ST Wood

INSPECTOR