
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/23/3314126

20 Faversham Avenue, Chingford, London E4 6DT

- 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 Declan Cullen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 222731, dated 19 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front boundary wall and bike shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has already been constructed and I had the benefit of seeing it at my site visit.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to the front boundary wall and bike store of this semi-detached house. The property is located within a suburban residential area where there is a variety of house types, including bungalows and detached properties.
5. The properties are built to a consistent building line which gives a degree of consistency to the area. There is a variety of front boundary features here and some have been removed completely. The great majority, however, are formed by low walls or fences, some with planting behind. The overwhelming impression is of open frontages with low and unobtrusive boundary features. This characteristic is a feature which adds positively to the area. There are some exceptions where taller features appear to have been erected so that privacy can be maintained in the gardens of corner properties. The Council refers to one such example, which has no planning history. The appeal property is not at a corner and the wall would not protect a rear/private garden area.

6. I can see from the submitted information that the low wall that was here prior to the appeal scheme was consistent with the character and appearance of the area that I have described. It had brick piers, said to have been 1m in height and a lower curved section of brick wall between them.
7. The wall which is the subject of the appeal is said to be a maximum of 1.6m in height and has a consistent height. I can see that the materials used and the design of the wall reflects that of the previous wall, to some extent. However, within the context that I have described, its height means that it forms an obtrusive feature within the street-scene. It appears unusually tall within the context of the neighbouring modest fence and walls. I consider that it is unacceptably disruptive of the character and appearance of the area and causes harm to it.
8. Although the Council have raised no objection to the bike store itself, the appeal scheme has an unacceptable effect on the area. Taking account of the requirements of Policies CS15 of the Core Strategy (2012) and DM29 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), I consider that the appeal scheme is in conflict with those policies. I have taken account of all matters raised in the representations but find nothing sufficient to outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR