

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022 by Emma Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/D/21/3284497

Swallow Tiles, 64 Leas Road, Warlingham CR6 9LL

- 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 R Osborn against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2021/1392, dated 28 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is gates and railings to drive front boundary.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey detached dwelling with an in-and-out driveway, lawn and four protected trees to the front of the property. The front of the appeal site is currently open with no existing boundary treatments. The surrounding area is residential in nature and is characterised by its verdant appearance with trees and hedging to the front of many dwellings. This landscaping makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed development would introduce a boundary treatment to the front of the property, devised of central metal railings with brick pillars and entrance gates either side. The entrance gates would be set back from the site's frontage. However, the proposed railings would be adjacent to the road and therefore would appear as a prominent visual addition within the site and be highly visible from the public realm.
6. The prominence of the railings would be exacerbated due to the difference in ground level between the appeal site and the road, with the railings thereby appearing greater in height than the 2 metres proposed. The excessive height of the proposed railings along with their hard, urban appearance would be out of keeping with the green and verdant nature of the surrounding area. They

would therefore be an incongruous addition to the streetscene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

7. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would therefore be contrary to Policies DP7 and DP9 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014) and Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008). These policies collectively seek to ensure that new development integrates effectively with its surroundings, respecting the character, setting and the local context, with means of enclosure, such as gates, fences and walls, unlikely to be permitted if they involve harsh and/or incongruous features.

Other Matters

8. I note the dwellings on both Leas Road and Tydcombe Road that have been highlighted by the appellant. The photos provided show that these have entrance gates of a similar size, design and material to the proposed development. However, most of these appear set back from the road and are entrance gates only. They therefore do not have a front boundary which is similar to the railings proposed in this appeal.
9. It was noted during my site visit that one property on Leas Road did have a front boundary treatment similar to the proposal before me. However, this was some distance from the appeal site and was not a prevalent feature in the streetscene. Therefore, it does not set a precedent for the proposed development and would not outweigh the harm found.
10. The circumstances which have led to the need for the development are noted. However, whilst I am sympathetic to these, there would seem to be other means of providing the necessary security measures which would have a lesser impact on the character and appearance of the area. The appellant has not provided any evidence that these have been considered and discounted as options. Therefore, I am not persuaded that the proposal would be the only option to address the contended need, and this would therefore not outweigh the harm found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, and I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Emma Grierson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR