
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2022

by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/D/22/3291393

91 Millfield Road, West Kingsdown, TN15 6BX

- 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 Mark Spinks against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03512/HOUSE, dated 20 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of garden wall on front and side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of garden wall on front and side at 91 Millfield Road, West Kingsdown, TN15 6BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03512/HOUSE, dated 20 October 2021, and drawing nos PL001, PL002, PL005 and PL006A submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) Within three months of the date of this decision, or such longer period as may be agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the garden wall hereby permitted shall be clad in vertical timber planks as shown on drawing no PL006A.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed wall on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. A blockwork wall has been built along part of the front and side boundaries of No 91. It has two sections of 1.88m and 1.04m in height. The original intention was for the wall to be rendered with piers and wooden inserts but the plans have been revised to show that it would be clad with vertical timber slats.
4. Millfield Road contains a mix of houses and bungalows. Some dwellings have open frontages such as those opposite the appeal site. However, tall fencing along the back edge of footway is commonplace where it is required to provide privacy or enclosure. For example, at No 97. Whilst Millfield might have been designed as an open plan estate that is not how it appears today. The prevailing treatment of boundaries is not undeveloped and verdant. Rather it is varied and fencing of a similar height to the proposal is prevalent.
5. The Supplementary Planning Document on *Residential Extensions* stresses that boundaries have a significant impact on the character of an area and its visual amenity. The proposal would not totally enclose the property as part of the

front boundary would remain open and due to the lower section in front of the house. A timber finish would reflect the material used for other boundary treatments alongside the road and so would respect the local context in a sympathetic way. The bulk of the wall would be disguised and the impact on the street scene would not be incongruous or negative.

6. Therefore the proposed wall would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As its height and materials would respond to those of the means of enclosure nearby, it would comply with the design principles in Policy EN1 of the Sevenoaks Allocations and Development Management Plan.

Other Matters

7. The wall runs alongside a pedestrian alleyway but should people meet at the corner there would be space for them to avoid one another. It is sufficiently separated from the driveway of No 93 to ensure that visibility would not be impeded to an unacceptable degree.

Conditions

8. To ensure a satisfactory appearance a condition is required to ensure that the timber cladding is applied within a reasonable timeframe.

Conclusion

9. Subject to condition, the proposal would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations to the contrary. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should succeed.

David Smith

INSPECTOR