



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2023

**by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 6 September 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/23/3323838**

**Park House, 55 Buckhold Road, Wandsworth, London SW18 4AT**

- 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 Ms Amanda Gosling against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application Ref 2023/0149, dated 16 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2023.
  - The development proposed is 1.75 metre high railings, electric sliding vehicle gate and pedestrian gate to front boundary.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 1.75 metre high railings, electric sliding vehicle gate and pedestrian gate to front boundary at Park House 55 Buckhold Road, Wandsworth, London SW18 4AT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2023/0149 dated 16 January 2023 subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Site Plan, BH-PLAN-001-B, BH-PLAN-002-B and BH-PLAN-003-B.
  - 3) The pedestrian gate hereby permitted shall be installed and thereafter maintained so as to open inwards and it shall not open over the boundary of the site or over the public highway.

### Preliminary Matter

2. In July 2023, after the appeal was submitted, the Council adopted the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038 ('the LP'). The LP now forms part of the development plan for the area and supersedes policies of the Development Management Policies Document 2016 ('DMP') referred to in the Council's reason for refusal. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on any implications of the change in policy, and I have taken the representations made into account. I am therefore satisfied that no prejudice would be caused by my determination of the appeal giving full weight to the policies of the LP, and I make no further reference to the DMP.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal proposes railings and gates to the front of a detached dwelling on Buckhold Road. Other dwellings on Buckhold Road near to the appeal site are predominantly terraces of similar designs to one another which are positioned on regular building lines behind frontages marked by vegetation, low walls or fences, or in some cases left open to the street. The proposed railings and gates would be taller than the generally low level of these front boundaries.
5. However, the development would be no taller than the fencing along the side boundary of the appeal site with the adjacent King George's Park, and would be of similar height and appearance to railings and gates along the park frontage which extend up to the boundary with the appeal site. Moreover, I saw railings to a similar height as are proposed here along the Buckhold Road boundary of 19 Broomhill Road which is in very close proximity to the site, albeit on the opposite side of the road.
6. I appreciate that 19 Broomhill Road is a large detached building in use as a nursery, and that both this site and King George's Park are of clearly different nature to the residential dwelling on the appeal site and may have specific reasons for requiring railings. Nevertheless, as a detached dwelling of different architectural style and which sits on a slightly different building line and orientation to the adjacent terraces, the appeal property already appears somewhat distinct from the other dwellings typical on this part of the street. The presence of a high fence to the boundary with the adjacent King George's Park and a fairly high hedge to the boundary with 57 Buckhold Road further serve to set the site apart from its neighbours both physically and visually.
7. Seen in this context and having regard to the proximity of the site to 19 Broomhill Road and King George's Park, I am satisfied irrespective of the nature of these other sites that the development would not appear striking or incongruous in this part of the street scene. The design would also provide for reasonable spacing between the individual railings which would maintain open views through to the site frontage and to the dwelling behind which would be clearly visible at much greater two-storey height so as to remain the prominent feature with the railings a more minor addition.
8. Having regard to these factors and the specific circumstances of the appeal site, I find that the height and form of the development would not be excessive or unduly dominant, and would not unacceptably segregate the dwelling from its surroundings or detract from the suburban character and appearance of the area. In my assessment, the development would not be visually obtrusive and it would sit comfortably in the street scene here.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area, and I find no conflict with Policies LP 1 and LP 5 of the LP. These policies broadly seek high quality design that relates positively to the prevailing local character and require, amongst other things that alterations or extensions to existing residential properties respect or complement the host building and are visually subservient to it, and modifications that are unobtrusive within the street scene. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it highlights good design as a key aspect of sustainable development and seeks development that responds to local character.

### **Conditions**

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of certainty. The Council has suggested a condition concerning the opening direction of the pedestrian gate which I agree is necessary in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety, although I have slightly amended its wording in the interests of clarity.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would accord with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*J Bowyer*

INSPECTOR