



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2ND March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/D/21/3284987

39 Lindenthorpe Road, Broadstairs, Kent, CT10 1BG.

- 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 Paul Cobb against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref FH/TH/21/1026, dated 15 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as *building a wall around the front and side boundaries of my property*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal is a detached dwelling located in a larger residential area.
4. As I observed the dwellings here are set back from the road, generally behind low boundary walls, fences and hedges. Although there is some variation in the height of front boundary enclosures this is typically limited to pillars or railings above a lower wall. Accordingly, the area has an open feel while still maintaining a sense of enclosure to the private front gardens. Although not typical render has been adopted as a finish on a boundary wall near the appeal site.
5. The appellant proposes the construction of a new boundary wall to the street frontage of the property. From the evidence before me I understand that the original boundary wall, now removed, comprised a low brick wall and railings set between 1.3 metre high brick high piers. Due to the use of railings and piers the open character of the area would have been maintained. However, the new wall would be 1.3 meter high and built of blockwork with a white render finish. The new wall would have a simple contemporary appearance and less open with a more enclosing appearance than that removed.

6. Due to the height of the wall, its solid form and stark appearance I consider that it would serve to visually enclose the front garden so as to significantly detract from the open and spacious feel of the street and the area.
7. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the boundary wall, by virtue of its prominence, overall height, finish and solid appearance, would form an incongruous and visually intrusive element in the street scene, making it detrimental to the open and spacious character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, to allow it would be it contrary to the objectives of Policy BSP9 of the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan and Policy QD02 of the Thanet District Council Local Plan (Adopted July 2020) as they relate to the need for new development to respect and enhance the character of the area.

Other Matters

8. I note that in the local neighbourhood there are other boundary walls much higher than that proposed. However, I have considered this proposal in the context of this road and immediate surrounding area.
9. I understand that the new wall would be the same height as the original pillars. However, the design of the old wall, incorporating metal railings would have resulted in a more open visual appearance than that proposed.
10. I have noted that the Council do not raise any highway concerns. However, this consideration does not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR