



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26TH February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/23/3328899

84 Hookfield, Epsom, Surrey, KT19 8JG.

- 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 James Smith against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00568/FLH, dated 11 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a new fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 84 Hookfield, is detached two-storey house located on a corner plot at the junction of Hookfield and Lindsay Close.
4. The access road to Lindsay Close is between number 82 and 84 Hookfield. The private gardens of both these properties are set back behind a wide grass strip of open land laid to grass either side of the road. This gives an open feel to the approach to Lindsay Close.
5. The appellant proposes the erection of a new 1.83 metre high fence and gates along the western boundary of the property facing to Lindsay Close. The fence would be position 2.0 metres or so closer than the existing to the road edge, thereby enclosing part of the green land closer to the public highway. The new fence would, as a result also be in front of the street façade of 1 Lindsay Close. This would make for an uncomfortable visual relationship with this neighbouring dwelling. The overall effect of the new fence would be to denude the openness of the approach to Lindsay Close.
6. On balance I conclude in respect of the main issue that the new fence, although replacing a visually poor fence, would be inappropriate, having a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS5 of the of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Local

Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted 2007) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Development Management Policies Document (Adopted September 2015), which, along with other objectives, require development to respect the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area.

Conclusions

7. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR