



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2022

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/22/3295856

Pinewood, Foxhills Road, Ottershaw, Chertsey KT16 0NG

- 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 Mrs Zoe Christien-Miller against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RU.21/1613, dated 15 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for the erection of trellis and fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The trellis and fencing have been erected and therefore this is a retrospective scheme.
3. The description of development is taken from the decision notice and appeal form. In my view this more clearly and concisely describes the development and I have used it for my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Pinewood is a detached property fronting Foxhills Road but has a lengthy side boundary to Tringham Close. The erected fence runs the full length of this boundary sited on the back edge of the footpath and curves around to adjoin the front boundary wall.
6. Boundary treatments in the area vary but are generally formed of low brick walls and hedging demarking the front of properties. Where gardens adjoin Tringham Close there are some close-boarded fences, however these are relatively standard 6ft fences (approximately 1.8m high) and are limited in length providing screening to the rear gardens. While the appeal fence panels are of a similar height they sit on a concrete plinth and have a deep trellis on top resulting in a substantial height which has an imposing presence. This is exacerbated by its substantial length, which as well as screening the rear

garden extends to the front alongside the house and detached garage, with a significant step down in height to the front boundary wall.

7. Due to its corner position the boundary treatment is highly visible in views both along Foxhills Road and Tringham Close and its stark appearance contrasts with the more open and verdant character of the area.
8. The fence colour is lighter than others in the vicinity but will undoubtedly weather in due course, and I acknowledge that existing fencing can be painted and replaced. However, fencing under permitted development rights is restricted to the height of the former fence or 1m adjacent to a highway¹. The exact form and siting of the boundary treatment that existed prior to this new fence being erected is not clear from the information before me. Nonetheless, in my view the increased height creates an incongruous feature which has an adverse impact on the street scene.
9. Overall, I find that the boundary treatment is harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to policy EE1 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan, which amongst other things, requires development to be well designed and take account of the existing character of the area.

Other matters

10. I have taken into account the benefits that the proposal may bring in terms of increased privacy and security for the occupiers of the property, but this does not outweigh my concerns.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR

¹ General Permitted Development Order Schedule 2 Part 2 Class A – gates, fences, walls etc