



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2021

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/21/3280897

1 Summerfield Lane, Long Ditton, Surbiton KT6 5DZ

- 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 Hyong Joon Yu against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/1211, dated 5 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is installing a new black metal driveway double-gate to the entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Summerfield Lane is a residential road with no footpaths but grass verges to each side. There are a variety of front boundary treatments to the properties including low level walls/fences and planting, however, overall, the lane has an open semi-rural appearance.
4. No.1 is located at the far end of the lane with paddocks and a nursery beyond. A hedgerow currently forms the front boundary up to the open driveway. Located on the back edge of the verge, but forward of the hedgerow, the proposed metal gates with a maximum height of 1.8m would extend across the driveway.
5. This proposal follows a scheme for solid fencing and gates which was dismissed at appeal in January¹. The design has been significantly changed and is now limited to gates. The form of the proposed gates allows for views through, however, in my view, they would still create a strong formal and visual enclosure. The gates have an urban appearance which is uncharacteristic of this area, which in combination with their height and siting would have a prominent and imposing impact on the street scene.

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/20/3261026

6. Whilst there is a close boarded fence of a similar height opposite, this marks a side boundary, and is an exception to the generally more natural and open boundaries to the lane. I also understand that the appellant seeks to provide greater security to their property. Nevertheless, in my view this does not justify the introduction of a boundary treatment of the form proposed. The gates would be less harmful than the previous scheme but would still be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.
7. Overall, I find that the proposed boundary treatment would not preserve or enhance the character of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with policies CS8 and CS17 of the Core Strategy 2011, policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan 2015 and, the National Planning Policy Framework which amongst other things requires new development to achieve a high-quality design, take account of local character, and enhance the public realm and street scene.
8. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR