
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27TH October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/22/3298612
181 Derinton Road, London SW17 8HZ

- 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 Robin Flindell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/5719, dated 19 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a red brick wall with York-stone copings and black metal railing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The wall and railings have already been constructed and I had the benefit of seeing them at my visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this 2 storey house which is located within the Totterdown Fields Conservation Area. The conservation area contains mainly residential properties which were said to be constructed between 1901 and 1911 and planned in the Garden City and Arts and Crafts movement styles. The design of the houses, the layout and other features were evidently carefully conceived to provide an area of homes where themes and features unite the area, in design terms.
5. In relation to front boundary features, I can see that numerous properties have retained the original dwarf wall with a rounded soldier course of engineering bricks. Originally these would have been backed by a wooden picket fence and hedging. A good number of houses within the area have retained such features. This is consistent with the Garden Suburb design and provides a soft frontage to the houses, consistent with their 'cottage' style designs.
6. The appeal property is now provided with a red-brick wall with brick piers and black metal railings. Stone copings are provided on the piers, which have a

height of 1m. The boundary at the property appears formal and harsh, particularly when compared to those original boundary features within neighbouring properties. I consider that it is inconsistent and at odds with the design of the dwellings and the estate. The Council's document '*Totterdown Fields Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy*' identifies the original boundary features as being important to the character and appearance of the area and states that removal of them has had a negative impact on the area.

7. I observed a number of properties within the area that have evidently removed and replaced the original front boundary features. Some of these have been done unsympathetically and detract from the qualities of the area. Even though the number of such properties is not insignificant, I do not consider that those new and unsympathetic boundary alterations can now be taken as the norm in the area; they are numerous but still have a negative effect, in my judgement. In this respect, I remain of the view that the wall and railings at the appeal property fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
8. The appellant raises the fact that the wall and railings replaced a low close boarded fence, which was not the original feature here and so, if he were to be compelled to remove the wall and railings, he could only be required to replace it with a close boarded fence. Although it is not for me to decide on any enforcement issues in this respect, it is my view that even if a close boarded fence is the only alternative, it would provide a softer and more sympathetic feature than the existing wall and railings.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons set out above, I find that the wall and railings fail to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. This results in less than substantial harm, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. I consider that there are no public benefits arising from the development which outweigh the harm. The development raises conflict with policies DMS1 and DMS2 of the Council's Development Management Policies Document 2016. As a consequence of these matters, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR