



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2023

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/23/3328675
85 Spring Grove, Loughton IG10 4QE

- 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 Marcin Marynnczak against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/0281/23, dated 8 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2023.
 - The proposed development is 1.9-metre-high front garden wall.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The original description used was 'replacement of front garden wall' however the above description more accurately describes the proposal. In addition, whilst the 'existing materials' are described as rough cast yellow brick there appears to be no other information regarding any pre-existing wall and at the time of my site visit there was no existing front boundary feature.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a residential area characterised by large, detached properties predominantly of traditional appearance and character. The dwelling on the appeal site is of traditional appearance though the subject of recent works. The immediate street scene contains front boundaries marked predominantly by low brick walls, a number of which are supplemented with hedging and / or with landscaped gardens behind.
5. The proposal would partly comprise a low brick wall but would predominantly consist of aluminium slats set within brick pillars which would comprise the upper part of the wall and all of the gates which would take up at least half the width of the frontage. This would result in the introduction of an unduly tall and somewhat harsh boundary feature in the street scene. In addition, having regard to the predominant appearance of frontage boundaries within the surrounding street scene, it would appear as an incongruous feature, both in terms of its height and materials.

6. Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan (2023) (EFDLP) requires new development to achieve a high quality of design that contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. Furthermore, development should demonstrate how landscaping and planting has been integrated within it. There appears to be little room for any planting within the front garden but, in any event, it would not soften the proposed boundary to an acceptable degree. Whilst this policy also supports the need to reduce the risk of crime, which the proposed boundary feature could do, this would not outweigh the visual harm resulting to the character and appearance of the street scene. I therefore conclude that the proposal conflicts with EFDLP policy DM9.
7. I have also taken into account the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework but find that the proposal would conflict with its policies that seek the creation of high quality, beautiful places and the achievement of good design, as a result of which it would fail to achieve a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusions

8. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR